Also, a bill (H. R. 7565) granting an increase of pension to Ben van Steinburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7566) granting an increase of pension to Oliver M. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7567) granting an increase of pension to John M. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7568) granting an increase of pension to William Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7569) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia S. Greenwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7570) granting an increase of pension to Mary Anna Yohum; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7571) granting an increase of pension to Lee Henning; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7572) granting a pension to Virginia Dickinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7573) granting a pension to Emma E. Stacey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7574) granting a pension to Bert E. Lockwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7575) granting a pension to Annie Twiggs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7576) granting a pension to Addie M. Munroe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7577) granting a pension to Belle S. Gould; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7578) granting a pension to Carrie Record; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7579) granting a pension to Lucy Coleman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 7580) granting an increase of pension to Martha York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 7581) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin L. Sheppard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7582) granting an increase of pension to Benton Braden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7583) granting a pension to Tela K. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 7584) to relinquish and quitclaim to L. J. Anderson, of Pensacola, Fla., his heirs and assigns, and Eva M. Anderson, of Pensacola, Fla., her heirs and assigns, respectively, all right, title, interest, and claim of the United States in, to, and on certain properties in the city of Pensacola, Escambia County, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 7585) for the relief of George E. Mansfield; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7586) granting a pension to James A. Gaffney; to the Commitee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7587) granting a pension to Julia Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7588) granting a pension to Joshua H. Brackett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7589) granting a pension to Clarence E. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7590) granting a pension to Kate B. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7591) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Barlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Peoria, Ill., favoring improvement in living conditions of our seamen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Society of Automobile Engineers, protesting against the passage of the Oldfield bill; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the North Carolina Pine Association, protesting against the passage of House bill 5773; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Peoria, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of the Anacortes Chamber of Commerce and Manufactures of Anacortes, Wash., favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for the improvement of the Edison Slough; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the city council of Vancouver, Wash., asking permission to build an electric railway through Vancouver Barracks without requiring the paving of the roadway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the South Bend Commercial Club of Washington, favoring the fortification of Willapa Harbor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Petition of the Japanese residents of Hawaii, protesting against the removal of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of the Friends of Bird Protection, of Omaha, Nebr., protesting against the Senate amendment for plumage proviso and favoring House proviso; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Association of German Authors in America, of No. 1 Broadway, New York, protesting against the 15 per cent import duty on books published in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, protesting against the passage of the workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Peoria, Ill., relative to legislation to extend the authority of the locomotive boiler inspection division of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Inventors' Guild, protesting against the passage of the Oldfield bill; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Peoria, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation requiring headlights of a certain candlepower on all locomotives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Peoria, Ill., favoring the passage of legislation to improve the living conditions of our seamen in the merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Switchmen's Union of North America, protesting against the passage of any of the proposed workmen's compensation bills now before the House; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Interstate Cottonseed Crushers' Association, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the Austria-Hungary duty on cottonseed oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation exempting associations not organized for profit, but for the general good of a community, from the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Zoological Society, New York, favoring the passage of legislation preventing the importation of wings, plumes, skins, etc., of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of Orts-Verband, of Amsterdam, N. Y., protesting against a duty on books in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Central Labor Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Government manufacture of armor plate for the battleships; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *August 20, 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed, in accordance with the provisions of the Indian appropriation act approved June 30, 1913, Mr. STEPHENS of Texas and Mr. BURKE of South Dakota members of the commission to investigate the question of tuberculosis among the Indians in connection with an inquiry into the necessity and feasibility of establishing, equipping, and maintaining a tuberculosis sanitarium in New Mexico, and an inquiry into the necessity and feasibility of procuring impounded waters for the Yakima Indian Reservation.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed, in accordance with the provisions of the Indian

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

appropriation act approved June 30, 1913, Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BURKE of South Dakota members of the joint commission to investigate Indian affairs.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1353) to authorize the board of county commissioners of Okanogan County, Wash., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Okanogan River at or near the town of Malott, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1681. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Red Lake River, in township 153 north, range 40 west, in Red Lake County, Minn.;

H. R. 1985. An act to authorize the county of Aitkin, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in Aitkin County, Minn.;

H. R. 3406. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River at Orange, Tex.;

H. R. 5891. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across White River at Newport, Ark.;

H. R. 6378. An act to authorize Robert W. Buskirk, of Matewan, W. Va., to bridge the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at Matewan, Mingo County, W. Va., where the same forms the boundary line between the States of West Virginia and Kentucky; and

H. R. 6582. An act to authorize the city of Fairmont to construct and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, in the State of West Virginia.

MEMORIALS.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented a memorial of Local Union No. 205, Cigar Makers' International Union of America, of Battle Creek, Mich., remonstrating against an increase in the internal-revenue tax on cigars, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of Local Unions Nos. 22, 340, 46, 167, and 69, Cigar Makers' International Union of America, of Three Rivers, Detroit, Traverse City, Grand Rapids, and Owasso, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the importation of cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands, which were ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3015) designating certain lands as "The Parthenon"; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 3016) granting permission to Capt. Dorr F. Tozier to accept a gift from the King of Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

On motion of Mr. KERN, it was

Ordered, That Senator JOHN F. SHAFROTH, of Colorado, be appointed a member of the Committee on the Philippines in place of Senator MARTINE of New Jersey, who has resigned therefrom.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. PENROSE. I desire to submit an amendment to the pending tariff bill in the nature of a substitute for Schedule K. I will take this opportunity of saying that this amendment is the same as the one introduced by me in the last Congress, which received nearly all the then majority votes in this Chamber. I ask that the amendment may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. PENROSE. I submit also an amendment to the same bill relative to the hosiery paragraph of the cotton schedule. I ask that it may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

CONDITIONS IN MEXICO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The following resolutions come over from the preceding day.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 162, by Mr. PENROSE:

Resolved, That the President be requested——

Mr. PENROSE. I ask that those two resolutions may lie on the table until I call them up, if there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 164, by Mr. POINDEXTER.

Mr. JONES. My colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is not present, and I ask that the resolution may go over. I will make the same request the Senator from Pennsylvania has made. I ask that the resolution may lie on the table until called up by my colleague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

IMPORTATIONS IN AMERICAN VESSELS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolution 165, coming over from yesterday.

Senate resolution 165, submitted yesterday by Mr. JONES, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to transmit to the Senate copies of all protests filed against paragraph J, subdivision 7, of Section IV (V as amended), of H. R. 3321, "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," together with copies of all correspondence that has passed between this country and any foreign country relating thereto, and copies of any report or reports prepared or made thereon by any officer of the United States; the subject referred to being the provision in the tariff bill providing for a discount of 5 per cent on all duties on goods, wares, and merchandise imported by vessels admitted to registration under the laws of the United States.

Mr. JONES. It was suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday that the words "if not incompatible with the public interest" should be inserted.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was going to make that suggestion.

Mr. JONES. I have no objection to the insertion of those words.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

THE SUGAR SCHEDULE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate House bill 3321.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from North Carolina if he will defer just a moment?

I desire to state, Mr. President, that I was very much impressed with the intense earnestness of the address of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] yesterday on the sugar schedule. I have thought over in my mind a good many times the picture of desolation and sadness that was depicted for the western plains that are now or recently have been in the culture of beets. I realize and appreciate that it was the voice of an honest, conscientious, and earnest man in the behalf of that which he deemed right. That that address was the opinion and judgment of one with patriotic purposes I have no doubt, yet of one who was prejudiced in favor of the theory as well as the practice of protection.

Lest this thought shall go to the public and find lodgment in their minds and hearts without the least thought of contradiction, a matter has come to me within a few hours that I deemed it but fair to the people of the United States should be stated to them. Within the past few hours I have been in conversation with a gentleman largely versed in the western interests, largely versed in both the culture and planting of sugar beets and sugar cane and the manufacture thereof, a man whose judgment certainly should be taken for something.

I have realized the criticisms that my friend from Utah made, but within a few hours it has been my privilege to have been in conversation with no less a gentleman than Rudolph Spreckels. Mr. Rudolph Spreckels had just arrived here from the Pacific coast. I asked him what he felt was the feeling of the people in the West and in California and on the Pacific coast with reference to the tariff bill. His statement to me was in these words, plain and flat: "I feel that the bill will be well received and thoroughly appreciated by the people of California. It is in line with that which you have promised and in line with that which the people had reason to anticipate."

I then said, "Mr. Spreckels, I want to ask your judgment. I have heard and we all have heard and the Senate has heard pictures of the doleful conditions that would take place from the abandonment of beet-sugar planting. I want to ask if, in your judgment, that will be the case?" He said, "I can see nothing of the kind." I asked him if he felt that the sugar mills would close in dearth of beet culture. He said they would not, that there are some mills which should close, there is no doubt. Then I asked him as to the situation in Louisiana. He said, "I feel that in Louisiana they have had no legitimate and just right for many years to have been protected as they have been."

I then said, "Now, Mr. Spreckels, as to Hawaii, what is the situation there?" He said, "I am glad you have raised that question. I used to be an owner and a planter in Hawaii." I asked, "Are you still not an owner and planter and refiner?" He said, "No, sir; I am out of sugar, and have been for a num-

ber of years." He said Hawaii will prosper, anyway; their profits are inordinate; that whatever the tariff, the conditions, and the soil are such that their profits are inordinate, and will represent in many instances as high as 80 per cent.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit a question at this point?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator has quoted a very distinguished gentleman. In order that the Senate may know the impartiality of this witness, I would be glad if the Senator from New Jersey could inform the Senate what was the amount of his campaign contribution to Mr. Wilson's candidacy.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I know nothing of that. I know the fact, however, that he has been the greater part of his life a most staunch and stalwart Republican. It is true, I believe, that as God gave him wisdom he saw the light of day and he did vote for Woodrow Wilson. I believe I have heard—I do not know of my own knowledge—that he may have contributed some money to the Democratic campaign. But be that as it may, the position is pretty well established, I feel, in the minds of the people that there can be no justification for taxing 100,000,000 people inordinately in order to enrich a few. I believe the public will indorse and sustain the action of the Democratic Party in this very controversy for a lower tariff.

Now, this is a view that many of us now have, and I present it in contrast with the desperate picture that has been drawn for us day after day, and the desperate picture that was drawn by the distinguished Senator from Utah, I am willing to admit patriotically in his own judgment and conscience. There are many things I feel in common with him. I love your earnestness and I love your intensity. I would not give a rush for a man who had no convictions, and I would give less for a man who had convictions and had not the courage to stand up and defend them. But I do believe that the Senator from Utah has been misguided. I want that the public may know that there is another side to this question, and that gentlemen who are in close touch with this great sugar industry and who can view it as readily as can the Senator from Utah see no result of desolation and sadness and woe.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just one word. I wish to say to the Senator from New Jersey that I appreciate his kind reference to me, and I do want to say that I have the highest respect for the Senator from New Jersey, because I believe him absolutely honest in his belief in free trade on many, many of the items produced in this country.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not a Senator on the other side of the Chamber who is so consistent in his politcial views affecting the tariff as is the Senator from New Jersey.

However, Mr. President, I do believe that the people of California have just as much confidence in the judgment of her two Senators as they have in that of Mr. Spreckels, a man who is directly interested in seeing that we have free sugar.

I do not know the situation in California as well as I do in the State of Utah, but I want to say to the Senator from New Jersey if ever I spoke the truth in my life as I understand it and as I see it I presented it yesterday to the Senate on the sugar question.

I am not going to discuss the question any further. I will let the people of California judge between the views expressed by the two Senators from that State and those of Mr. Spreckels, expressed through the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, since the Senator from New Jersey has seen fit to raise this question I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Mr. Spreckels, whom he has cited as a witness, is distinctly a beneficiary of this tariff bill. We have heard a great deal, with much unction, of consultation and conferences in past years with the beneficiaries of tariff legislation.

I had not intended to bring it up, but since the Senator from New Jersey has been consulting with Mr. Spreckels for the last two or three days, I happen to have here——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Quite to the contrary, sir, I only saw him a few hours ago.

Mr. PENROSE. I have seen the Senator in his company a number of times.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I think the Senator's vision must be utterly in error. I have met him but once in my life.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator seemed to be on very intimate terms with him when I saw them together yesterday.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That is very possible. I was reasonably close to him and trying to gather what information I could to offset the unfortunate stories of calamity which have been stated by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to know from the Senator from New Jersey whether Mr. Spreckels authorized him to repeat the conversation which he has given to the Senate this morning.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say that first Mr. Spreckels told me this, and a few moments afterwards I thought how bright in comparison with the clouds that have been depicted; and I said to myself, "Great heavens, a thousand men and women in our land who are interested would love to hear that story!" Then I went back to Mr. Spreckels, and it may be the Senator——

Mr. PENROSE. Then the Senator has seen him twice?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. You may have it so, but it was within a few minutes, and perhaps the Senator was near by, and through the crack of a door heard the conversation.

Mr. PENROSE. I saw the Senator talking with him in the corridor.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Now, this is my authority and authorization. Then it was that I said, "Mr. Spreckels, I have been impressed with that which you told me, which is so in contradiction to those things we have heard. I want to know if I may use that." I recited it over and over, and his acquiescence was entire and complete. If the Senator needs any further evidence, God knows where he will get it.

Mr. PENROSE. Then the Senator admits that instead of seeing Mr. Spreckels once, he has seen him twice?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Call it what you may.

Mr. PENROSE. When I saw them together there was evidently an affinity of two kindred souls that had long been parted and now had met and talked in mutual interest.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am very fond of kindred souls. It is a good part of my make-up. I have met the Senator sometimes pleasantly and kindredly and I would love to meet him more.

Mr. PENROSE. Since the Senator from New Jersey has seen fit to cite the testimony of Mr. Spreckels against the unanimous testimony of the growers of Louisiana, who are threatened with destruction and will be destroyed, and against the unanimous testimony of the beet-sugar growers and manufacturers of the western country, whose industry has been started after so much experiment and so much labor and trouble, with the encouragement of the Federal Government; since he has seen fit to cite the case of this one man, distinctly a beneficiary under the bill, I desire to call his attention and that of the Senate in this connection to Mr. Spreckels's record. It will not take long.

The agitation for free sugar has been conducted for a number of years by Mr. F. C. Lowry, acting as the secretary of an alleged organization known as the Committee of Wholesale Grocers. Mr. Lowry was the sales agent for the Federal Sugar Refining Co., the head of which is Mr. Claus A. Spreckels. Mr. Lowry admitted that $16,000 had been expended by him in the effort to work up a sentiment for free sugar.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. "By him." By whom?

Mr. PENROSE. By Mr. Lowry——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That is all right.

Mr. PENROSE. Representing Mr. Spreckels.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. You are saying "representing Mr. Spreckels." He does not say that he represents Mr. Spreckels.

Mr. PENROSE. In other words, this spontaneous sentiment coming from the American consumer was aroused at an expense of $16,000, admitted to have been expended, and how much more has been expended we are not informed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Did he say he was the agent of Claus Spreckels?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was not talking about Claus Spreckels; I was talking and distinctly stated that it was Rudolph Spreckels.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the wrong Spreckels.

Mr. PENROSE. I want to give the history of the whole Spreckels connection.

In the last political campaign, Mr. Spreckels contributed $5,000 to the Democratic campaign fund toward the election of President Wilson. In California, Rudolph Spreckels, brother of Claus A. Spreckels, had charge of the California Republican Wilson organization. He contributed large sums in financing it and had numerous meetings under its auspices throughout the State. I should say that fully $5,000 was expended by Mr. Rudolph Spreckels in his efforts in behalf of Mr. Wilson in California. This is a horrible narrative of beneficiary tariff legislation. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am not responsible for anything Claus Spreckels says. I simply stated what Rudolph Spreckels told me.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator will get acquainted with Claus later on.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes; but the Senator will just confine himself to Rudolph.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator will get Claus in due time.

Both these brothers believe in free sugar—at $5,000 apiece. They are antagonistic to their two elder brothers, John D. Spreckels and Adolph B. Spreckels. In fact, there has been a family feud among these brothers that extends over a period of years. At one time their father, Claus Spreckels, sr., disowned his two younger sons. He had presented them with some stocks in Hawaiian sugar companies and for some reason he became dissatisfied with the action of his younger sons regarding these stocks and brought a suit in the California courts to recover the stocks upon the ground that the gift of the stock was not joined in by his wife and that under the California law this failure on the wife's part to join in the gift invalidated the gift. The Supreme Court, however, held that the law which had been relied upon applied only to real estate.

Toward the close of his life Claus A. Spreckels, sr., made up with his younger sons and disinherited his two elder sons. The will is still in litigation. It is an interesting family, Mr. President.

It is within the range of possibility that the bitter fight that is being waged by these younger sons of Claus Spreckels, sr., against their elder brothers is due to family hatred and a desire to ruin the two elder sons by the two younger sons. The two elder sons are interested in Hawaiian plantations and in the beet-sugar mills of California. I am informed and I believe that the two elder sons are not interested in any refineries whatever.

The testimony that was brought out before the Hardwick committee shows that if the duty on sugar were removed absolutely we could produce neither cane nor beets in this country; that this removal of the duty would absolutely destroy the industry in this country, and that the people interested in the refineries would approve of such a course. You will find something to this effect on page 292 of the Hardwick committee hearings; you will also find some evidence of this kind on pages 1195 and 1196 of the same hearings.

There is no doubt in my mind that this bitterness on the part of Claus A. Spreckels and Rudolph Spreckels against John D. Spreckels and Adolph B. Spreckels has a good deal to do with the action of the former in trying to break down the beet-sugar industry of this country and the cane-sugar industry of Hawaii. It would mean practically ruin for John D. and Adolph B. Spreckels if such a law were passed. The fact that Claus A. Spreckels contributed $5,000 toward the Wilson campaign and Rudolph Spreckels probably spent as much for the election of Wilson in California, it seems to me, would indicate that the attitude of the administration in supporting free sugar so energetically after the President's partisans had accepted these contributions is more reprehensible than is the action of those men whose money is invested in the sugar industry in this country and the Hawaiian Islands, and whose presence in Washington to protect their investments has been denounced as "an insidious lobby."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I only desire to say, Mr. President, that if I had any thought of working up a family tree I would never look any further than to the Senator from Pennsylvania. He certainly has worked up the Spreckels family tree and its finesse; but I want to know who signed this communication. You know signing a communication means everything. Only a few days ago I presented a communication with reference to Pennsylvania, and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania asked that it be expunged from the RECORD and, if possible, obliterated from the hearing of the Senate, simply because it came here without a signature.

I do not care what Mr. Claus Spreckels may say, nor do I care about the family alliances and connections, nor the quarrels that the Spreckels family have had; but I do say that what I have stated was the statement of Rudolph Spreckels, and in his desire for free sugar he is not alone. Many other people, and there were a great many in Pennsylvania——

Mr. PENROSE. I never heard of one.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, well, your hearing was poor at times. You have lived so long in the clang and the riveting of the boiler and in the clang of the machine shop that you know of nothing else of the cry of humanity. The welding of a plate and the riveting of a boiler had more charms for you than the cry of struggling and of suffering humanity. [Laughter.]

Mr. PENROSE. The boilers that are being riveted in Pennsylvania are daily growing fewer in number.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Are they? Just let me read something to you which I have here.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I will state for the information of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] that California has 11 beet-sugar factories, which have been erected at a cost of $20,000,000, and the disbursements for labor and beets have aggregated $15,000,000 a year, thereby giving a market to many farmers and employment to many laborers. Two other factories have been projected, which will not be built if this bill passes in its present form, and it will be impossible for those now in existence to continue to manufacture beet sugar under prospective conditions.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the tariff bill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. One moment——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the tariff bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, 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.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I desire to say that I hope we shall go on with the cotton schedule. In that connection I wish to add that so anxious are Senators on this side of the Chamber to make progress with the bill that on yesterday, when we had the sugar schedule under consideration, we refrained from any discussion, and I hope that we shall not now go back to the sugar schedule and enter into a discussion of it to-day. I ask that we proceed with the reading of the bill, Schedule I being the one under consideration, as I understand.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I did not understand the statement made by the Senator from North Carolina, my attention being diverted for a moment.

Mr. SIMMONS. I stated that on yesterday we were so anxious on this side to proceed with the bill that a number of Senators refrained from speaking when the sugar schedule was up, and that I hoped we would not go back to it to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then there is a "conspiracy of silence" on the other side of the Chamber?

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator can characterize it as he pleases. I have just made a plain statement that we did not consume the time of the Senate yesterday in discussing the sugar schedule.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think that is agreeable to this side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 73, after line 7, the committee propose to strike out paragraph 255, as follows:

255. Cotton thread and carded yarn, combed yarn, warps, or warp yarn, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form, except spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning and embroidery cottons, hereinafter provided for, shall be subject to the following rates of duty: Nos. 1 to 9, inclusive, 5 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 10 to 19, inclusive, 7½ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 20 to 39, inclusive, 10 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 40 to 49, inclusive, 15 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 50 to 59, inclusive, 17½ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 60 to 99, inclusive, 20 per cent ad valorem; No. 100 and over, 25 per cent ad valorem. Cotton card laps, roping, sliver, or roving, 10 per cent ad valorem; cotton waste and flocks manufactured or otherwise advanced in value, 5 per cent ad valorem.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

255. Cotton thread and carded yarn, warps, or warp yarn, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form, not combed, bleached, dyed, mercerized, or colored, except spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning and embroidery cottons, hereinafter provided for, shall be subject to the following rates of duty:

Numbers up to and including No. 9, 5 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 9 and not exceeding No. 19, 7½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 19 and not exceeding No. 39, 10 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 39 and not exceeding No. 49, 15 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 49 and not exceeding No. 59, 17½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 59 and not exceeding No. 79, 20 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 79 and not exceeding No. 99, 22½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 99 and not exceeding No. 199, 25 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 199, 20 per cent ad valorem. If combed, bleached, dyed, mercerized, or colored, they shall be subject to the following rates of duty; Numbers up to and including No. 9, 7½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 9 and not exceeding No. 19, 10 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 19 and not exceeding No. 39, 12½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 39 and not exceeding No. 49, 17½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 49 and not exceeding No. 59, 20 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 59 and not exceeding No. 79, 22½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 79 and not exceeding No. 99, 25 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 99 and not exceeding No. 199, 27½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 199, 20 per cent ad valorem. Cotton waste and flocks, manufactured or otherwise advanced in value, cotton card laps, roping, sliver, or roving, 5 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] correctly, yesterday afternoon he announced that it was his intention, or it might be his intention later on, to offer an amendment to the committee amendment, and in view of that fact——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We have determined not to offer it. On looking into the matter further we do not think it necessary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then I have nothing further to say.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We were doubtful whether the word "combed" properly fell into the class where it appears; but we now think it does, and for that reason we leave it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and paragraph 256 was read, as follows:

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the committee has authorized me to offer, after the word "form," in line 14, an amendment reading:

Not exceeding 600 yards in length.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator please repeat the suggested amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In line 14, after the word "form," to insert the words "not exceeding 600 yards in length."

It was believed that longer threads would cause trouble in classification and that by limiting the number of yards covered by this section it would simplify the enforcement of the section and prevent an effort to bring in under this section yarns that were not really intended to be covered by it.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, all darning cotton and embroidery cottons or cottons on spools or reels or balls or skeins, in order to come in under this paragraph, must be under 600 yards?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; the others will take their classification under the general yarn count.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the present law applying to these same items contains the clause, "containing less than 600 yards." I think the amendment ought to be adopted. In this connection I will ask the Senator if he has taken into consideration the suggestion which I offered last night adding the proviso:

That in no case shall the duty be assessed upon a less number of yards than is marked on the spools, reels, cones, tubes, skeins, or balls.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Our inquiry led us to conclude that this was not necessary, for the reason that most of these goods are shipped in by standard houses; they are sold under the names of the houses and on their reputation, and we were advised that there is no danger of the trouble feared by the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Really the insertion of the words in this bill can do no harm.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This amendment will carry the paragraph into conference; and if, on further inquiry, we conclude that it is necessary to do so, we can provide for it in conference.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say to the Senator that even in conference that provision can not be incorporated if it be not placed in the bill in the House or in the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have not taken up that further proposition for the reason stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia on behalf of the committee to the paragraph.

The SECRETARY. On page 75, paragraph 256, line 14, after the word "form," it is proposed to insert "not exceeding 600 yards in length."

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

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I also desire to offer an amendment to be inserted after the word "form," in paragraph 256.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island will kindly suspend for a moment. It is impossible for the Chair to hear anything that the Senator from Rhode Island has been saying, on account of the disturbance in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I said that I also desired to offer an amendment to paragraph 256, to be inserted after the word "form," in the following words: "Shall pay the same rate of duty as the single yarns of which they are composed, but not less than," so that it would read, "but not less than 15 per cent ad valorem."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the committee amendment would first be in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island is in order.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, the adoption of that amendment, I think, would make it necessary for me to move that paragraph 256 be stricken out and that in place of it there be inserted:

Spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons, on spools, reels, or balls, or in skeins, cones, or tubes, or in any other form—

And here are the words I wish to insert——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator's amendment is perfectly germane to the paragraph of the bill under consideration, but his amendment would strike out the words "not exceeding 600 yards," which have been inserted on motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not ask to strike out those words.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that; but the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator would have the effect of striking them out.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, would not this be the parliamentary situation: The amendment of the committee agreed to and then the Senator from Rhode Island moves to substitute the provision he has read for the committee provision as amended as a substitute for that paragraph?

Mr. LIPPITT. I think on further consideration, Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia somewhat confused me, and I will offer the amendment to follow the words inserted on motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "length," in the amendment just agreed to, it is proposed to insert:

Shall pay the same rate of duty as the single yarns of which they are composed, but not less than.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, in explanation of the amendment which I have offered, last night at the time the session adjourned I was discussing the discrimination exhibited in this paragraph against threads as compared with all other forms of cotton yarns. I had shown that thread was composed of what is ordinarily known as cotton yarn by taking two or more single strands of yarn and twisting them together to form a thread; that in the great majority of cases the single yarns paid a higher rate of duty than 15 per cent, and that the cost of twisting the single yarns into thread was, in most instances, as large as the total cost of changing cotton into yarn.

On the subject of discrimination, of which the duty on yarns is one of the most glaring instances to be found in the cotton schedule, I want to take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Senate to a very remarkable memorial which was sent to this body a few days ago, signed by 96 of the leading distributors of textile fabrics in New York and elsewhere, protesting against the discrimination in this schedule. They represent, in a large measure, the wholesale textile trade of the United States. They are importers; they are commission merchants; they are jobbers of all kinds of textile fabrics. Among them are many of the best-known names in the United States. I will only instance one of them as a sample of the whole—the firm of H. B. Claflin & Co.—which is one of the largest importers of textile fabrics in this country, which is one of the largest users of all classes of textiles, and not of cotton alone. I mention that name as a sample of the signers of the petition.

What I wish to call attention to is what they are protesting against. They are not protesting against a change in the duty, in the case of the silk schedule, from 55 per cent to 45 per cent, although they are large users of silk goods. They are not protesting against a reduction of the protective duty upon woolen goods from in the neighborhood of 50 or 60 per cent to 35 per cent. They are protesting in this emphatic way solely on account of the gross discrimination which has been made with regard to these three sister industries in reducing the duties on cotton fabrics from between 50 and 60 per cent to 16 per cent. They are protesting against the injustice of treating so differently one industry, as is done in this bill, by putting upon cottons a duty of only one-half of what is put upon woolens, and only one-third of what is put upon silks.

I offer this amendment, not for the purpose of putting the labor that is employed in the manufacture of cotton thread on a parity with the labor that is employed in making cotton yarn, but simply so that the duty shall not be less than the duty on the raw material of thread. I think it is a subject that ought to have the consideration of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. 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	Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bacon	Gronna	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Overman	Smoot
Borah	Hollis	Page	Sterling
Brady	Hughes	Penrose	Stone
Brandegee	James	Perkins	Sutherland
Bristow	Jones	Pittman	Swanson
Bryan	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thomas
Burton	Kern	Reed	Thompson
Chamberlain	La Follette	Robinson	Thornton
Clapp	Lane	Saulsbury	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lea	Shafroth	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Lewis	Sheppard	Vardaman
Colt	Lippitt	Sherman	Walsh
Crawford	Lodge	Shively	Warren
Fall	McLean	Simmons	Weeks
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	Williams

Mr. JAMES. My colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY], is detained from attendance here by reason of illness. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I should like to ask the Senator in charge of this schedule whether or not the intimation made by the Senator from Rhode Island is correct—that without his proposed amendment and with the duty as carried in the bill the duty upon these completed products will be less than the duty on the constituents that enter into them?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator probably was not here yesterday afternoon when we discussed this subject. That is true in some instances, but it is also true under the present law, under the specifics.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am not speaking of the present law. Attention has now been directed to the fact; and it occurs to me that if it is a fact this amendment or some amendment ought to be placed in the bill. It hardly seems the right levying of a duty that the duty upon a raw product that enters into a manufactured product should be more than the duty upon the manufactured product itself.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The statement of the Senator is correct, that in some instances this duty is less than the duty on the yarn, and the same is the case now. The articles that come in are principally of the highest character, and there is more competition where the duty is less than 20 per cent under the specifics. We went into that matter pretty fully yesterday afternoon.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, while this schedule has a very important bearing upon a great industry in my own State. I do not propose to occupy more than a minute or two in discussing it. I wish to put in the RECORD, however, a couple of statements which came to me some time ago regarding the industry and which I think are of interest.

Mr. A. Barton Hepburn, the well-known New York banker, who had recently been in England, gave out this statement:

> Business activity in England is at the high-water mark and there are no apparent signs of recession. Undoubtedly her manufacturers are rushing the making of goods in the expectation of finding a profitable market in the United States when the Underwood tariff bill becomes a law.

Mr. Frank S. Turnbull, director of the Rogers-Peet Co., of New York, who has been consulting prominent manufacturers in Yorkshire, Scotland, and other places, said to the correspondent of the New York Sun in regard to the Underwood tariff bill:

> The feeling of manufacturers here is one of surprise that the cut in textile duties is so radical. They would have preferred a bill which was less drastic, for such a measure would have indicated permanency and stability. The English and Scotch manufacturers would like a 35 per cent ad valorem duty. They will sell a much greater quantity of goods in the United States, but they will not put themselves to the expense of increasing their plants until they are certain that the new tariff is to last. It would please them greatly if they were sure of that, and they would not have to hesitate to increase their plants.

It seems from this testimony, which I give for what it is worth, that even the manufacturers in Great Britain are somewhat alarmed at the tremendous cut that is made in this schedule, because they think that in the future, if another party comes into power, the present duties will be overturned and much larger duties imposed. Their feeling apparently is that if a less radical cut had been made it might have resulted in a law that would have been permanent so far as this industry is concerned.

Personally I greatly regret that our Democratic friends have seen fit to strike so severe a blow as they have at this industry. I think I know what the result will be; but we are powerless on this side of the Chamber to prevent that result. All we can do is to record our votes, when we have an opportunity, against the provisions that have been incorporated in the bill regarding the different articles in this schedule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT].

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment may be stated, so that we may understand it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 75, line 14, after the word "form" and after the comma, the Senate has already agreed to an amendment, proposed by the Senator from Georgia, adding the words "not exceeding 600 yards in length." After the word "length" the Senator from Rhode Island proposes to insert:

> Shall pay the same rate of duty as the single yarns of which they are composed, but not less than—

So that, if amended, it would read:

> Not less than 15 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I transfer that pair for the day to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON]. I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McCUMBER. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] to the junior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] and vote "yea."

Mr. JONES. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is necessarily detained from the Chamber and that he is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I will state that with reference to the votes yesterday my colleague was paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], although I did not know it at the time.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]; that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]; that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]; and that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON].

Mr. BANKHEAD. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Borah	Crawford	McCumber	Smoot
Brady	Fall	McLean	Sterling
Brandegee	Gallinger	Nelson	Sutherland
Bristow	Gronna	Norris	Townsend
Burton	Jones	Page	Warren
Catron	Kenyon	Penrose	Weeks
Clapp	La Follette	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Sherman	
Colt	Lodge	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—39.

Ashurst	Hughes	Pomerene	Smith, Md.
Bacon	James	Reed	Stone
Bankhead	Kern	Robinson	Swanson
Bryan	Lane	Saulsbury	Thomas
Chamberlain	Lea	Shafroth	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Lewis	Sheppard	Thornton
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Vardaman
Gore	Myers	Shively	Walsh
Hitchcock	Overman	Simmons	Williams
Hollis	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—23.

Bradley	du Pont	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.
Burleigh	Goff	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Chilton	Jackson	Owen	Stephenson
Culberson	Johnson	Poindexter	Tillman
Cummins	Martin, Va.	Ransdell	Works
Dillingham	Newlands	Root	

So Mr. LIPPITT's amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the committee was to strike out paragraph 257 in the following words:

257. Cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, Jacquard figured, or mercerized, containing yarn the highest number of which does not exceed No. 9, 7½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 9 and not exceeding No. 19, 10 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 19 and not exceeding No. 39, 12½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 39 and not exceeding No. 49, 17½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 49 and not exceeding No. 59, 20 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 59 and not exceeding No. 99, 22½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 99, 27½ per cent ad valorem. Cotton cloth, when bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, Jacquard figured, or mercerized, shall be subject to a duty of 2½ per cent ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

257. Cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, woven-figured, or mercerized, containing yarns the highest number of which does not exceed No. 9, 7½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 9 and not exceeding No. 19, 10 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 19 and not exceeding No. 39, 12½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 39 and not exceeding No. 49, 17½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 49 and not exceeding No. 59, 20 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 59 and not exceeding No. 79, 22½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 79 and not exceeding No. 99, 25 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 99, 27½ per cent ad valorem. Cotton cloth when bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, woven-figured, or mercerized, containing yarn the highest number of which does not exceed No. 9, 10 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 9 and not exceeding No. 19, 12½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding number 19 and not exceeding No. 39, 15 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 39 and not exceeding No. 49, 20 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 49 and not exceeding No. 59, 22½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 59 and not exceeding No. 79, 25 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 79 and not exceeding No. 99, 27½ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 99, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the committee desires to change the amendment in two respects, in line 8 to substitute the word "average" for the word "highest," so the estimate will be made by the average number of the yarns instead of the highest, and in line 22 again to substitute the word "average" for the word "highest."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the proposed amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 76, line 8, before the word "number," strike out the word "highest" and insert the word "average," and the same on line 22.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the proposed change will be made.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I wish to speak on that subject. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he has figured or has any information upon how much he is reducing the duty upon cotton cloth by the amendments which he now proposes as compared with the duty which that same cloth would pay under the original amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Coupled with the amendment suggested, we desire also to amend paragraph 258, by adding in the seventeenth line, after the word "included":

In counting the threads all ply yarns shall be separated into singles and the count taken of the total singles.

The factors of count, length, condition, and weight shall be taken as found in the fabric as imported.

We have had the estimate made to which the Senator refers. We find that in the large majority of the instances, even in the higher class goods, it makes no substantial effect upon the rate. The only goods upon which it affects the rate to any extent are the novelty goods. Later on we expect in connection with the damask paragraph to bring in an amendment, although we may have to pass it over to-day, making a special provision for those novelty cloths. I have quite a lengthy sheet here in which that estimate has been made, which I will be glad to submit to the Senate. The proposed amendment is largely for administrative purposes. It simplifies administration vastly beyond what it is under the present law and also under the pending bill.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, of course I appreciate the personal compliment which is paid in this amendment. In the remarks which I made to the Senate upon this question I pointed out that, although the method of classifying goods which is contained in the original amendment had been the policy of the Democratic Party for more than two years, it was an impossibility of administration. The substitution of the simple word "average" for "highest" is a recognition of the fact that for two years they have been trying to put before this country something which they could not do; and there was no evidence of any change of that policy, if I may go so far as to say it, until I brought it to the attention of this body.

But I also pointed out at that time that if they were going to adopt the policy which I suggested, and which is a very simple and a very much more perfect method of classification than the one they originally had, they should also accompany it by a differential between the duties that cloth pays and the duties that yarn pays as compared with the one they have. Between the duties on yarn in the bill reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee there is a difference of 2½ per cent in each classification as represented in the chart which hangs against the wall. Where the duty on cloth is 10 per cent on cloth composed of No. 9 to 19, it would be 7½ per cent for yarn, and so on.

It is a matter of great practical difficulty to determine the fineness number of yarn in cloth. It is not a very difficult proposition to discover the average number of yarns in a piece of cloth, but when they classify their goods by the fineness number of which the fabric was made, as is very commonly the case, the yarn of the warp would be No. 35 or 33 and the filling would be No. 42 or 43 or 44, which are very common constructions, the rate of duty on that piece of cloth would be in the gray 20 per cent. Under the amendment which they have now proposed the rate of duty would be 17½ per cent. In other words, by making the amendment in this form and without perfecting it, as I took the liberty of indicating in my speech should be done, they are reducing the duty over the duty that they have proposed to levy.

The occasion and reason for using the average number is because that is simple to administer. In addition to making that average number and taking advantage of that easy administration, which is very proper, they should also increase the differential between cloth and yarn 2½ per cent more than now exists. In other words, I am not asking for any more duty than they have proposed, but I do ask that if they adopt one suggestion of mine they will not destroy its effect and purpose by not adopting the companion suggestion that is a necessary and integral part of it.

As I pointed out, in their method of applying the duty not merely would the duty be raised 2½ per cent, but in some cases, by the presence of a very small amount of fine yarn cloth on which the average duty would not exceed under the now proposed change 17½ per cent, would pay as high a duty as 25 per cent. I do not think that those cloths are entitled to the change, but I think it is very plain to anybody who will study this question that if they are going to make at this late hour, without adequate study of the question, a change in the plan they have steadily pursued for two years, they at least ought to accompany it with the other changes that will make the rate of duty they propose to pay on cotton cloth the equivalent of what they proposed to this body before they made this change.

Mr. President, I have pointed out here over and over again that the duties on cotton fabrics are only one-third the duty of their sister industries of silk and wool, and now by putting in this amendment they propose to reduce those duties another 2½ per cent. That is not a fair way of perfecting a bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to take issue with the Senator from Rhode Island with reference to the feasibility of determining the highest yarn count. It has been discussed by the Bureau of Standards and fully sustained by them, and also by a number of writers upon textiles in publications on that subject. It seemed, however, scarcely just that a product which might have only 5 per cent of a very high-class yarn and the balance of a low-class yarn should follow the 5 per cent instead of following the average whole. It is conceded by all that the average yarn count is the simplest of all plans. Our officers in the customhouses so believe.

It can be explained, after working out a mathematical problem which is somewhat difficult, that there is a simple and easy formula for applying the test as to the average number of yarns. The officers of the Government have also been at work for some time upon the effect on the rate of taking the average yarn. I furnished the Senator quite a detailed statement made by them on the subject.

It does reduce somewhat the duty, but, Mr. President, the report of the Tariff Board shows that the duties on cotton goods can be reduced and must be reduced very substantially to bring them to a competitive basis.

It is surprising to find how many of our cotton products are sold at the mills in the United States as cheap as they are in England. The chief benefit perhaps to the public from these

reductions will come through a suspension of the system of sales after they leave the mill. So far as the mill owners are concerned, they will be perhaps less effective than they will be upon the trade where trade agreements exist that have carried the cost to the final consumer at high prices.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he has submitted this proposed change in its partial form to anybody who could be called a textile expert? In asking that question I do not mean by a textile expert a member of the board at the customhouse. They are not experts in the methods of applying tariff laws that have been written; they are not experts in the sense of knowing about the cost of cotton cloth and textile fabrics or the various changes in cost which come about in changes of fabric. Whom has the Senator consulted?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we have not considered it from the standpoint of the cost of conversion, because anyone who examines the report of the Tariff Board must be satisfied that it is practically impossible to handle fairly the subject from that standpoint. The varying cost of production of the same goods in this country at different mills is so great that when we go from the highest cost of production to the cheapest cost of production, the variation is startling. The matter has been considered, however, in connection with the relative selling prices abroad and here, and it has been considered with reference to the character of threads in many of the cloths. The result worked out has been what I submitted to the Senator on the lengthy sheet that I gave him. The work has been done, of course——

Mr. LIPPITT. I will ask the Senator from Georgia if he will tell me whether he has consulted with any experts?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was just going on to state that the work was done for us by representatives of the Government in the customhouse in New York and by the utilization of the reports of the Tariff Board.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Georgia to say that he recognized the fact that the amendment offered reduces the duties.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In some instances.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it not a fact, Mr. President, that in nearly every instance it would reduce the duty about 2½ per cent outside of the first bracket?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; not as the figures were worked out and given to me. Of course, I do not pretend to have any personal knowledge on the subject.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course the Senator knows, if he has had his attention called to it, that most of the cloths are made with the filling of one number and the warp of another number, and when the filling is finer or vice versa, it is to obtain a certain effect or finish upon the clothes. It seems to me, this being true, it will in many cases—I will not say in every case, but at least in a great many cases—bring the cloth, if the amendment offered by the Senator is adopted, to a lower bracket than the provision in paragraph 256 with the word "highest" used. If it does bring it within a lower bracket, then, of course, the Senator from Georgia must admit that it would be 2½ per cent reduction.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Of course if it lowers it, it lowers it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator would look it up I believe he would find by taking the average size of the yarns in a piece of cloth, in the warp and the filling, that in a majority of cases this would bring it into a lower bracket than the word "highest" would bring it under the paragraph as it stands to-day.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. As worked out for me by the experts, there are few cases in which it brings it to a lower rate. As to those I took the Tariff Board's report, and as to all except two or three I found the relative selling prices in England and the United States such that I felt that the reduced duty would only be competitive.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just take the case the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] called attention to, which is an ordinary one. The warp of 35s and the filling of 42s—the average of those two would be 38½s. Paragraph 257, as originally reported, would bring the duty based upon a 42 thread within another bracket from ?8½, as the Senator knows. Those are very common numbers used in this country in the manufacture of cotton goods. As I think the Senator has already stated upon the floor, 70 per cent of them fall within this very bracket or the two brackets in which these sizes fall. If that is the case—and I have no doubt but that it is so—the change is going to result in a decreased duty of 2½ per cent on the great bulk of American manufactured goods.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I was interested in one statement made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] which he did not make entirely clear to me. I have come to the same conclusion that he has from reading the Tariff Board report, that not only are many cotton goods sold as cheaply abroad as they are here, but that in some cases they are sold cheaper here than they could be manufactured abroad to-day. What I was not clear in was the statement of the Senator as to what benefit he expected would accrue to the American consumer by reducing those duties.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I stated that I found from the Tariff Board report that there were many instances in which the real loss to the consumer took place between the factory and the final sale to him; that it was due to trade agreements in this country, which increased the price to the consumer even where the manufacturer here sold at prices that were entirely competitive and in some instances cheaper than those of the English manufacturer, yet that through trade agreements, incident to subsequent sales, the consumer here finally received his goods at a higher price than that at which the consumer received them in England——

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understood that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. By bringing competition between the factory abroad and the factory here, the result would be that these trade agreements would be abandoned and the consumer would naturally be relieved of some of the increases now placed upon him.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I can not follow that very clearly myself; but it would indicate to me that there was the very closest kind of competition now between the producers abroad and the producers here if the price here was less than the foreign price, or at least even the cost of the foreign article was less.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not care to go into the details, which are very many and very complicated, of this matter, but I do want to call attention to certain general considerations, which I think are very serious, in regard to the arrangement adopted in this bill. I am not now speaking of rates of duty whether low or high, but of the adjustment of the classes. If we are to have duties at all, whether revenue duties or protective duties or duties for any other purpose, they ought to be properly classified and adjusted with relation to the different productions of an industry so very complicated as is the cotton industry.

There can be no question whatever that the coarser weaves are better treated in this bill than the finer weaves. I do not for a moment intend to suggest that that was done intentionally, or with a view of striking at New England or other northern mills which are the chief producers of the fine goods; but there can be no doubt of the fact. I can not suppose that it is intentional, because it would be a short-sighted policy if it be thought that the interests of the makers of coarse goods would be safeguarded by leaving them a sufficient protection and allowing the fine goods to suffer. Of course if the fine-goods mills are compelled to cease the manufacture of fine goods and are forced to go to the manufacture of print cloths, sheetings, and the coarser goods, inevitably an intensity of competition will be created which will drive the domestic coarse goods below the point of profitable production.

We had such a situation some years ago when the southern mills and the northern mills alike suffered from the intensity of competition in the same lines of goods. Speaking broadly, that condition, which is certainly not desirable to the industry either North or South, was greatly relieved by the increasing tendency on the part of the longer established mills in the North to devote themselves to the manufacture of fine goods. I think the industry of the finer goods and the manufacture of the finer yarns has been also begun in the South and is developing there. Nothing is more important to a healthy condition of the cotton industry in this country than the greatest possible diversification of their product.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me?

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to say that the men engaged in manufacturing the coarser goods who appeared before our committee all came to urge rates for the high-class goods, taking exactly the position the Senator has taken, that their interest in the matter was that the high-class goods should receive a tariff that was satisfactory to them——

Mr. LODGE. Which would encourage their production.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And encourage their production. There was no contest before our committee between the producers of the coarser grade goods and the higher grade goods,

so far as I can recall. The low-grade-goods people were as warmly the friends of the high-grade-goods people as they were of themselves.

Mr. LODGE. That was my own conclusion from my own experience; but the fact remains that in the bill——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. So that whether the goods are high class or low class or are produced in one section or the other the manufacturers, whether of high-grade or low-grade goods, were all more interested in the rates on high-grade goods than they were in the rates on low-grade goods.

Mr. LODGE. I have no question that the manufacturers in all parts of the country, whether they make the coarse goods or the fine goods, take the view of what is best for the industry as a whole which I have tried to express.

Now, as I have said whether intentionally or not, it seems to me to have been demonstrated—I will not go over the arguments—that the fine weaves have suffered unduly, and that the inevitable tendency of the bill, owing to the maladjustment of the rates among the different classes, will be to bring about an oversupply of the coarse goods, due to the compulsion which it will exercise on many of the fine-goods mills to return in whole or in part to the making of print cloths, plain cloths, or the coarser fabrics, such as sheetings.

I think the fact that the duties are not properly adjusted is a fatal objection to the scheme. I am saying nothing about the rates, whether they are too high or too low; I am simply speaking of the adjustment. On that adjustment rests, in the first place, fairness to the industry, and, in the second place, it prevents the industry from becoming overweighted or one sided along certain lines of production. It is for the interest of the whole industry, in a word, to encourage the fine weaves.

The Tariff Board report has been frequently referred to during the debate, and I want to call attention to their statement that we can make goods here at a lower cost than they can be made in England. That is true of some fabrics, but I do not think attention has been sufficiently paid to precisely what the Tariff Board did say. Here is their report on Schedule I, page 12. The Tariff Board says that the weaving cost of the fabrics produced on automatic looms, which are more common in this country than in England, is no greater here than abroad; but they go on to say:

> In the case of finer goods, however, especially figured goods with complicated weaves, the cost of weaving is higher here than in England. This is due largely to the fact that the difference in the number of looms tended per weaver is less than in the case of plain goods. On a large part of these fancy goods (those requiring more than one kind of filling) the automatic loom can not be used. Even disregarding the question of automatic looms, the difference in the number of looms tended per weaver on such fabrics is less than in the case of plain cloths. Consequently the comparatively small difference in output per weaver does not offset the higher wages paid in this country.

That is the statement of the Tariff Board; and I think in substance that it is correct. The reason why weaving done on the automatic looms reduces the cost of production in the United States is simply because it reduces the labor cost per unit, showing incidentally that the labor cost is the key of the situation in the cotton industry, where labor is a very large part of the cost of the fabric produced. One man can attend to 20 or more of these automatic looms—that is, we have a man multiplied by 20, we will say, by the automatic loom—and as we use a great many more of those looms than they do in England we reduce the labor cost, the labor unit, just that much, because in England, where they do not use them on the coarser goods, a man is multiplied by 6 or 8 by his machinery, and they are putting a man multiplied by 6 or 8 in competition with a man multiplied by 20.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only as to the greater number of looms that can be attended to by one man, but wherever an automatic device is used upon a loom it runs continuously, with the exception of when there is a thread broken in the warp or a break in the filling requiring the stopping of the loom.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. If the automatic device is not on a loom, it must stop to change the shuttle every time a bobbin runs out.

Mr. LODGE. When we come to the finer weaves the automatic loom can not be used, and that, of course, fundamentally changes the whole situation. In the manufacture of the finer weaves our weavers use substantially the same kind of machinery as the English weavers. So the weaver is no longer multiplied by 20 by his machinery, but only by the same amount as the English weaver; and therefore our labor cost immediately rises when you pass from the coarser goods to the finer goods.

The increase in cost is shown by the following extract from the Tariff Board report, Schedule I, page 456. I take their figures. I am not sure that they are right in all respects in regard to cotton; but I will take them, because they have been the basis of so much argument.

The Tariff Board say:

> The labor cost of the plain weaves varies from 3.5 cents to slightly over 6.5 cents per pound, constituting from 8 per cent to 21.5 per cent of the total cost. * * * The conversion cost on the same cloths varies from 29.5 per cent to 35.8 per cent of the total cost. * * *
>
> Treating the three fancy-weave groups as a whole, we find that the labor cost varies from 15.2 cents to 29.3 cents per pound, constituting from 20 per cent to 42.7 per cent of the total cost. The conversion cost forms from 35.7 per cent to 58.6 per cent of the total cost.

That shows clearly, on the authority of the Tariff Board, the immense difference between the fine weaves and the coarse weaves. I do not see how it is possible to have a fair schedule where the arrangement is practically reversed from what it ought to be. I repeat that I am not arguing the rate. Make your figure what you please on the coarse weaves; but build it up proportionately, so as to give the fine weaves the same chance that the coarse weaves have so far as they are affected by the tariff. That seems to me the fundamental difficulty with this whole schedule, without going into the details.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask the Senator if he has made a study of the English selling prices of the factories of these finer goods and the American selling prices of the factories, to see whether it is not true, relatively speaking, that the increases provided by this bill about represent the difference in the selling price of the various classes of goods at the factories?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have not examined those prices. I have at times gone into the cost of distribution with some thoroughness. While I have not the figures here now, I am very sure, broadly speaking, that I am correct when I say that what the Senator states about the cost at the factory in America as compared with the English factory cost applies chiefly to the coarse goods. I do not think it is true of the fine weaves. I think the fine weaves cost more. The factory cost is more, speaking broadly. There may be exceptions; but speaking broadly, I think the fine weaves cost more at the factory.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was not referring to the cost of production. I was referring to the selling cost of the factory.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely. Let me take a single case about which I think I am correctly informed, though I am speaking from memory of a year ago.

In the case of the Amoskeag Manufacturing Co. of New Hampshire, the great makers of ginghams, while I have not compared the figures, I have no doubt their gingham costs at the mill are no higher than the costs of the factories making ginghams in England. I think they could probably meet them on that basis. I am speaking only of their coarse goods. But I was told, and I think correctly, by one of the officers of the mills some time ago when the subject was under discussion—I may not have the figures exactly right, but if I am very far wrong the Senator from Rhode Island will correct me—that they sold their ginghams in the neighborhood of 3½ cents a yard, and by the time they went over the counter in department stores, dry-goods stores, and so forth, some of them had climbed up to 9 or 10 or 12 cents a yard. There is not any question of the monstrous additions that are made to the factory costs. In the past, in the debate on the Payne-Aldrich bill, we tried to show that it was not the manufacturers' cost from which the people were suffering, because the cost at the factory was in many cases very low; but to it there were added these huge costs of distribution, which present another problem. I am aware of that; but I am very sure, speaking broadly, that the fine weaves made in America can not be sold at the factory door or anywhere else in competition with the English fine weaves without some protection or without some duty favorable to the American producer.

I will frankly say that, of course, I have a great interest in this particular matter of fine goods. Their manufacture has grown enormously in my State within a comparatively short time. The great city of New Bedford, which now has 100,000 inhabitants, has been built up on the fine-goods industry. It is, therefore, a very serious matter, in the interest of the business of my State, to have such a change made—I do not mean in the rates, but a change of classification—which, I believe, would be fatal to many of the establishments.

I am not sure as to the exceptions made in fancy weaves. Unfortunately I am so little of a practical man on the question

of cotton spinning that I am not sure I am right when I say that I find only one exception. There may be some other smaller ones on the Jacquard tapestries that have been put in by the Senate committee, but the only exception I find is the cotton damasks. I think the others are all treated in the general schedule.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator probably was not in the Chamber when I stated that the committee desired to add to the cotton-damask schedule a provision including certain classes of novelties, but we are not prepared to present it this morning. When that paragraph is reached we wish to pass over it. Upon examining some of those novelty cloths we found they have a small proportion of very fine threads, perhaps a fourth of very fine yarns or threads, and a large proportion of very coarse threads, and we thought they ought to be classed by themselves. We have in view a classification for novelty cloths which we are not prepared to submit this morning; so that when we reach the damask paragraph we shall ask to pass over it.

I desire to add that I have prepared a statement showing a large number of producers of table damask or towel damask. Towel damask, just in the next paragraph, will take the same 25 per cent rate. I should have regretted it if we had been in the attitude of bringing in a measure that took care of a single industry, even if it was by inadvertence. It certainly would have been by inadvertence if we had done so, but I should have regretted the inadvertence. Table damask always has been classed by itself.

When we reach that paragraph I will give the Senate a list of a large number of firms, both in Philadelphia and in Massachusetts, that produce damask. I am glad to say that my investigation has relieved us of what would have been an embarrassment, through inadvertence, if the Senator's suggestion, made a few days ago, had been correct, that this bill singled out cotton table damask made by one firm only for a special rate of duty.

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad the committee is considering a reclassification of what are known as the fancy weaves and novelties. I really think it is only just that they should be classed together, and not that one division should be set off by itself.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from Georgia has suggested that he is going to bring in some other changes in this schedule. The change which he has brought in this morning, and which we are now discussing, is a very radical change. I understand he has other changes that are also very radical. It seems to me under the circumstances that it would be a very wise thing for the Senators in charge of the bill to withdraw this paragraph until such time as they can present it to us with at least a day's notice of the radical revisions they are making, so that we may have a reasonable time in which to consider them. The changes about which the Senator is talking go to the root of the whole matter. They can not be discussed here offhand without consideration and without warning.

Two years have been spent on this bill, and particularly on the cotton schedule. Now, at the very last moment, when the Senators in charge of the schedule are going to urge us to take a vote perhaps within an hour or two, they come in and propose radical changes to it. Mr. President, that is not the way to put before this body a matter of such importance as this paragraph. I think it only reasonable that the whole thing shall be passed over until it can be reported to the Senate at least with a day or two of notice of what is going to be proposed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, although I think it would have been better if we could have had them all to consider beforehand, I am not disposed to find fault with any method which has resulted so far in what seems to me very marked improvement. But when the Senator from Rhode Island says this schedule has been under consideration for two years, I wish to say that I think it has been under intelligent consideration for only about two months, or perhaps two weeks; certainly not more than two months. I will go further than that, and say only since the day it went before the subcommittee of the Finance Committee. However I may differ from the members of that subcommittee in some of their conclusions, I have no hesitation in saying that I know they made every effort to inform themselves in regard to this schedule. While I never had occasion to go before them about anything, I know they made every effort to inform themselves about it and to try to deal intelligently with it. In the case of the earlier efforts to which the Senator refers, which came to us from the House, dealing with the cotton schedule alone, intelligence was conspicuous chiefly by its absence.

In view of the changes which the Senator from Georgia predicts, I shall not say anything more at this time in regard to the matter of the fancy weaves or novelties, but shall wait until I learn what is proposed along that line.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will state the proposed change.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator said he was going to ask to have that clause passed over.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will read the amendment that I hope to propose later to the paragraph dealing with damasks or cloths:

Cotton cloth composed of threads or plied yarns made of singles of different numbers.

We are still considering whether or not that is a proper definition of the cloth intended to be covered.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly read that again?

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

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may make a suggestion, I do not wish to hold the floor indefinitely; but if this clause is to be passed over——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; that clause will be passed over.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment which the subcommittee decides upon, I think, ought to be printed, so that the Senate can see it for a day before it is taken up. In the meantime the clause which the Senator has just read as a tentative amendment will be printed in the RECORD to-morrow, so that we can examine it then.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and to whom?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I stated that when the damask paragraph was reached we intended to ask to have it passed over. We hope to dispose of the balance of the schedule but to leave that paragraph undisposed of. I stated at the time that we probably should bring in an amendment of the character I read a few moments ago.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly repeat the language he has just read?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; I will read it in a moment.

The difficulty about the matter, so far as our labor upon it is concerned, has been to reach a description—to put into words something that would cover the particular class of goods intended to be covered and not also cover a good deal else that we did not intend to cover. Two or three times we have worked out a description and then have found that we were also describing something else that ought not to have been covered. The duty that we contemplated would have put the goods in a position where there would have been no competition at all from abroad.

The language which we have in view is:

Cotton cloth composed of threads or plied yarns made of singles of different numbers.

We contemplate adding that to the paragraph dealing with table damask cloths, with a duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. LIPPITT. Exactly where would it come in?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It would just be added to the paragraph dealing with damask cloths. The damask paragraph puts a duty of 25 per cent on table damask. What we were contemplating was to add this description of these novelty cloths, with a 25 per cent duty.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the Senator's attention to paragraph 257, the one now under consideration, if it is contemplated adding those words to the damask paragraph, because in paragraph 257, on line 7, he uses the words "woven figured," and on lines 21 and 22 he also uses the words "woven figured." Does not the Senator think "woven figured" should be stricken from this paragraph if he is going to add those words to the damask paragraph?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; because it applies to other goods besides these. These are not the only woven figures, and these woven figures should remain with the 2½ per cent duty as to woven-figured goods generally. In the damask paragraph, if we carry out our present view upon further studying the subject, we

will impose a specific duty upon a particular class of novelty goods. The work is largely done on the thread. The thread itself, as shown by the Senator from Rhode Island, has the novelty attached to it. I think the Senator from Rhode Island had here a little package of the threads and presented them to the Senate. They are largely made from that class of thread, as I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, I do not quite catch the full meaning of the amendment suggested, and therefore I will wait to see it in print.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in regard to this matter of the yarns I believe it is a mistake administratively to abandon the count of the threads per square inch and come to the number of the yarns in the fabric as the test for the imposition of a duty. There must be a necessary uncertainty if you base it on the number of the yarns. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] has shown to the Senate the imperfection and the uncertainties in determining the number of the yarns even when done by the Bureau of Standards. But the average custom-house inspector, without all the means and appliances which the Bureau of Standards possesses, on looking at a piece of cotton cloth, of course with a microscope, and telling the number of the yarns from looking at it, it is impossible that he should come within three or four numbers of the correct number, except by luck or guess. It is an uncertain way of determining the value of the goods on which the duty is to be levied. It is certain to lead to undervaluation and to the escape of the importer from the payment of the duties which the law intends to collect.

Mr. President, if we must have the number of the yarns as the basis of the duty, I think it is a great advance to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia to-day to make it the average number in a piece of cloth instead of the highest, as was the former test. But if the addition that is proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island is not made, when that perfecting amendment is adopted, the result will be a reduction in the duty which the committee have decided to be fair, and they are not likely to have erred on the side of lenity. They have fixed a certain rate of duty. Now, they put in a desirable amendment, and without a further provision the effect of that desirable amendment, as I understand it, will be to lower the duties through these schedules, without any intention on their own part of lowering the duties, as I understand it.

I really think the committee ought to take that into consideration; when they change from highest to average they ought to make such additional amendment as is necessary in order to secure the rate of duty which they have themselves reported as proper to be imposed.

Now, Mr. President, I pass to another point. I do not suppose my protest will have the slightest effect, but I want to make it. You will find in the bill, on page 76, line 21, and so forth, "cotton cloths, when bleached, dyed, colored," and so on. There are Senators who know—and if I blunder they will correct me—but I understand there is a much wider gap between the bleached and dyed, and so forth, than there is between the gray cotton cloth and the bleached. Am I wrong?

Mr. LIPPITT. No.

Mr. LODGE. In a brief presented to the committee it is stated that the number of operations in a cotton-printing establishment is about 23—that is, in the print works. Of these 23 operations only 6 appear in the process of bleached goods. That is, up to the point of producing the bleached goods there are 6 processes and there are 17 that follow in order to produce the dyed and printed fabric. Yet bleached goods are given the same rates as all these other goods, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, woven, figured, or mercerized. It can not be right to put bleached goods on the same plane with the others.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The only difference would be in the ad valorem. The difference would have to depend on the relative value of the goods. That is where it leads to.

Mr. LODGE. I understand the ad valorem, but unfortunately I do not think it will quite work out in that way. I think there ought to be a distinction drawn and they should not be given the same rate. The dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, figured, woven, or mercerized should be put together. There is no fault to find with that. But I think the bleached should be separated from them and separated from the gray cloth in order to make a proper adjustment between the different processes.

I reiterate what I have said many times. I am not now contesting the rates at all. You make the rates too low, in my judgment; but whether you make them low or high I want them to be adjusted so that they will be fair to all the different grades of manufacture.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. In fact, Mr. President, I yield the floor, for I have concluded all that I desired to say. What I have said is mostly in the way of protest against what I think are mistakes in the framing of the bill in the administrative rates. I am very glad to hear that there are to be even some slight improvements. I will not say slight, for if properly arranged they will be very important improvements. If the Senator will unite with his average number some provision that will prevent that average number from making a general reduction of all the rates, I think it would be a very great improvement upon the bill. I think he is contemplating a very great improvement administratively and in every other way by the change which he suggested in the cotton damask schedule. I sincerely hope those changes will be made.

Mr. SMOOT. I was simply going to call the Senator's attention to a further fact in connection with the statement he has just made. Where the cloths are dyed they are dyed with colors carrying a rate of duty of 30 per cent.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly, and the bleached——

Mr. SMOOT. I am only speaking of dyed cloths now. Of course, printed and mercerized——

Mr. LODGE. Bleached cloths, obviously, do not have to bear that expense.

Mr. SMOOT. In the low numbers of cloths dyed a rate is provided of only 10 per cent ad valorem. The Senator's objection is a protest against putting the bleached cloth at the same rate as the dyed cloth, while the dye that is used for the dyeing of the cloth carries a rate of 30 per cent.

Mr. LODGE. It is an incitement to bring in the dyed cloth.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A large part of the dyes are put on the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. All that are put on the free list are the alizarins and indigoes. All the coal-tar dyes that are imported into this country carry a rate of duty of 30 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. All vat dyes are put on the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can not say that alizarin is a vat dye.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is so classified in the trade.

Mr. SMOOT. Alizarins are used in dyeing cloth in the same way as coal-tar dyes, whether they be brown, red, scarlet, or any other color.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But the dyes that are used, I understand, in the finest goods are the dyes that we put on the free list. The sulphur dyes are not on the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. What does the Senator mean by sulphur dyes?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not sure that I know beyond the fact that the classes of people who make the cheaper goods in addressing us said that we left their dyes taxed and the tariff is the lowest on their goods and the dyes used for the finer goods we put on the free list. I am repeating the statement somewhat like a parrot, as it has been presented to me in communications and discussions of the subject, because I know nothing about it from the standpoint of being inside of a factory and seeing the work performed.

Mr. SMOOT. The very finest color and the most delicate shade of cloths are dyed from coal-tar dyes provided for in paragraph 21 of the bill carrying a rate of 30 per cent. It is true that alizarin and colors obtained from alizarin are on the free list. So is indigo on the free list. The reason why indigo was put on the free list was because it is used in the cotton mills of the South in dyeing denims. The fine cloths are dyed generally with coal-tar dyes enumerated in paragraph 21.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the interest that I have felt in this schedule and the inquiries that I have made concerning it have led me to the conclusion that no subcommittee of the Democratic side gave more patient and intelligent consideration to the problems they had in hand than the subcommittee on this schedule. It gives me pleasure to publicly express my appreciation of the industry, the courtesy, and the intelligence the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] brought to the consideration of these problems. I realize how difficult it would have been for me, with a much longer legislative experience than the Senator from Georgia has had, to be able to master even to any considerable extent the rates and the classifications that are required to reach fair and just conclusions.

I think I am safe in saying that the Senator from Georgia appreciates to-day, as he did not when he took up this question, the great difficulties he had to contend with, and I think I am justified in saying now what a distinguished Democratic Senator suggested to me, that a very much abused former Member of this body, a Republican, deserves great credit for the grasp he had of these difficult and perplexing problems.

There is trouble more or less in adjusting fairly matters connected with the paragraph now under consideration. I wish to say that when we reach paragraph 267 I will want to call the

attention of the Senator from Georgia to what I think are some very serious mistakes in that paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator refers to the industry in Keene, N. H.?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; and also in Barnstead, N. H.

Mr. JOHNSON. We have it under consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am glad to know that. I have correspondence and I have samples. I do not want to use a single unnecessary moment now in discussing even this schedule, because I am anxious that this bill will be proceeded with as rapidly as possible; but I was going, when that paragraph was reached, to ask the subcommittee if they would not take what I have in my possession and give fresh consideration to the paragraph, because I feel sure that unintentionally an injustice has been done to one phase of that manufacture.

In view of that, Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Georgia, inasmuch as he proposes changes in the paragraph now under consideration, if it might not be well to pass over, perhaps not all the schedule but all controverted paragraphs, so that the subcommittee could give a little further attention to them, and come in here very likely with propositions that would meet the acquiescence of us all. I do not want to be factious or obstructive, or to undertake to force my individual views upon the other side, which I know would be futile, but I think probably we would make more speed if the committee would pursue that course rather than ask us to vote upon these matters at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The only change, Mr. President, I believe, in the paragraph under consideration is the one I have suggested. When we reach the damask paragraph we wish to attach, if we can, certain specialties with a specific rate, and for the present I will ask to have it passed. I believe to have the balance out of the way will make it easier for us to work on the damask paragraph. The other changes that we make are not material. When we reach the final paragraph we will ask to restore the words "whether composed in part of," which are stricken out. These changes are very simple. The important additions we will probably make will be on damask. I should like very much to get rid of the balance of the schedule and save that one paragraph for our special study.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I introduced an amendment this morning to the hosiery paragraph, concerning which I should like to make a few explanations to the Senate. I will not have my data ready until to-morrow, and I would ask the Senator from Georgia to kindly pass over the hosiery paragraph, as I shall be out of the Chamber when it is reached.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. When we reach the hosiery paragraph I will do so.

Mr. PENROSE. I will be prepared to go on with it to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am perfectly willing to pass it over to-day.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia if the specialties which he refers to as those which they have under consideration in the damask paragraph are the products of the Jacquard loom?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think the work is done on the threads before they are woven.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I must confess that the situation in which this paragraph is now left is one that gives me perplexity. I had given it some consideration, and I thought I was prepared to discuss it in some way, but the changes that have been suddenly made here are revolutionary. As regards the damask paragraph, I have an amendment, which I proposed yesterday, which I had intended to offer for the consideration of the Senate. Whether I do it or not in the form in which I proposed it depends upon what is done with some of these other things.

It is so evident to my mind that the difficulties and, if I may say so, the inconsistencies of this cotton schedule as it has been drawn up and presented to the Senate have appeared so plainly to the minds of the gentlemen particularly in charge of it that I do feel it would be very much fairer for everyone if the committee would take the whole thing under consideration, digest it, and bring in to us here for our consideration and discussion a settled policy. How can anybody undertake to discuss intelligently a long and intricate schedule like this, the component parts of which overlap and interlock each other in many different ways, when we are told they think they are going to change it in this way and perhaps may be changed in some other way? Of course the gentlemen on the other side have the power to go ahead with it as they think it wise, but the situation seems to have reached a point where I should think it needed further digestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be stated, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 8, strike out "highest" and insert "average," and in line 22 strike out "highest" and insert "average."

Mr. LIPPITT. Before that question is put I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether among the other changes there is any possibility of his also changing the differential between yarn and cloth, as has been suggested here. It would make all the difference in the world as to how we should vote on this amendment. If the differential is to be taken under consideration and possibly changed, I should vote for this amendment. If there is to be no change in the differential, I think it is a very unjust amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is not our purpose to change the differential. The differential stands at 2½, the difference between the cloth and the yarn.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have an amendment which I have offered to paragraph 268, which includes the amending of paragraph 257 by striking out the words "woven-figured."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer that amendment now?

Mr. LIPPITT. I was going to offer it when we came to paragraph 268. I presume I will not find myself in any parliamentary difficulty if it is left until that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair should think not.

Mr. LIPPITT. I would prefer to leave the amendment until we get further along in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 258, page 77, line 12, after the word "piece," to strike out "or cut in lengths," so as to make the paragraph read:

258. The term cotton cloth, or cloth, wherever used in the paragraphs of this section, unless otherwise specially provided for, shall be held to include all woven fabrics of cotton, in the piece, whether figured, fancy, or plain, and shall not include any article, finished or unfinished, made from cotton cloth. In the ascertainment of the condition of the cloth or yarn upon which the duties imposed upon cotton cloth are made to depend, the entire fabric and all parts therof shall be included. The number of the yarn in cotton cloth herein provided for shall be ascertained under regulations to be prescribd by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In this paragraph, after the word "included," page 77, line 17, the Senator from Georgia offers an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is a committee amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert:

In counting the threads all ply yarns shall be separated into singles and the count taken of the total singles.

The factors of count, length, condition, and weight shall be taken as found in the fabric as imported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LIPPITT. Does that mean that a thread that is weighted shall be weighed without any attempt to remove the weighting material from the thread? I do not know whether the Senator is aware to what an extent in the manufacture of cotton cloth, in England particularly, weighted materials are used. They are very uncommon in this country, but it is usual in the South American trade and in the trade in other parts of the world. The English cloth is frequently weighted to the extent, I am told, of 20 and 25 per cent. By "weighted" I mean that material other than cotton is used to produce the weight.

I know that not long ago some people in New England sent a representative to South America to investigate the possibilities of an export trade with those countries. The gentleman who went was a very efficient expert in the business. He spent two or three months in a careful examination of the situation, and his report was that unless the people in New England were prepared to weight their goods artificially they would have no chance in competing with the English products in those countries. There are some cases—I am very sorry I have not the samples here; I have some over at my office—in which the goods are filled with materials so that while the weight of the thread as it actually appears in the cloth might be No. 30 thread, it would easily be as coarse, perhaps, as No. 20. I think

the customary way in all such cases is simply to wash or boil the fabric a little, so that any extraneous material may be removed. I think the gentlemen who are familiar with the customhouse could explain that to the Senator in such a way that he would see the point and not insist on an amendment that would prevent manifestly foreign material from being removed from the cloth before the size of the thread was determined.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I will ask to pass over that paragraph for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paragraph will be passed over.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will say to the Senator and to the Senate that the object of that provision was to facilitate the measurement of the average thread so that an inch of cloth or more than an inch of cloth which was to be measured could be handled without separating the thread.

The suggestion of the Senator that the boiling process, or the process which could be had without unraveling the thread to make a complete removal of the foreign matter, is one that we may wish to take under consideration. There was no purpose intentionally to add the weight, but to facilitate the measurement by space without unraveling.

Mr. LIPPITT. I presumed that was the case.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think it very probable that a slight addition will obviate that trouble. I ask that that paragraph go over.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, is that paragraph 258?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is passed over.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is that the paragraph that has just been passed over?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it is passed over for the time being.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That was what I meant by the phrase "passed over." It was not passed or adopted by the Senate?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; the paragraph just passed over is paragraph 258—the definition of cloth.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what I thought. In connection with that, if the paragraph is not going to be considered at this time, I want to ask the Senator what is the effect of changing the language in line 10, on page 77, from the language of the old law, which was "in the paragraphs of this schedule," while in the proposed law the language is "in the paragraphs of this section"? This paragraph reads:

The term cotton cloth, or cloth, wherever used in the paragraphs of this section, unless otherwise specially provided for, shall be held to include all woven fabrics of cotton.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for the suggestion. I think that should be "this schedule." As we have passed over the paragraph, I will look into it. In a number of instances we found it necessary to correct language of that sort.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. As I looked at it at first blush, if that language stands it would lead to utter absurdity, because it would result in cloth, which might be woolen cloth, spoken of in this section, which is the dutiable list, being classified as cotton.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think the word should be "schedule" instead of "section."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But I will look at it, as we shall return to this paragraph.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 259, page 78, line 2, after the word "fiber," to strike out "whether composed in part of" and to insert "or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value or of cotton or other vegetable fiber and," and in line 5, after the word "rubber," to strike out "or otherwise," so as to make the paragraph read:

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 260, page 78, line 7, after the word "section," to strike out "whether in the piece or otherwise and," and in line 8, after the word "unfinished," to insert "not hemmed, 25 per cent ad valorem; hemmed, or hemstitched," so as to make the paragraph read:

260. Handkerchiefs or mufflers composed of cotton, not specially provided for in this section, whether finished or unfinished, not hemmed, 25 per cent ad valorem; hemmed, or hemstitched, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hardly understand the reason of that change. Can the Senator from Georgia explain why that change was made?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator refer to striking out the words "whether in the piece or otherwise and"?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and inserting the words "not hemmed, 25 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The object was to make a difference in the duty between hemmed handkerchiefs and mufflers, which go into a higher class, and the ordinary handkerchiefs, which fall in the cheaper class. We thought that on the cheaper handkerchief 25 per cent was an ample duty, and that that difference should exist between the two.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true so far as the handkerchief is concerned, but my question to the Senator was in reference to the original paragraph which reads "whether in the piece or otherwise," while the paragraph as proposed to be amended reads:

260. Handkerchiefs or mufflers composed of cotton, not specially provided for in this section, whether finished or unfinished.

Does that mean that a dozen or more of handkerchiefs could not enter in the piece?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was to avoid any confusion in regard to cloth coming in in bolts of handkerchief cloth.

Mr. SMOOT. What I am trying to get at now is to ascertain whether you have not changed the law and allowed that very thing. Let me call the Senator's attention again to the language. It now reads:

Handkerchiefs or mufflers composed of cotton, not specially provided for in this section, whether finished or unfinished.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is the handkerchief itself, whether finished or unfinished.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the handkerchief or muffler whether it is finished or unfinished. Will not that allow the handkerchief to be imported in the bolt or piece—a piece of goods that could be cut up into handkerchiefs?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think so. I think that would fall under the ordinary cloth duty, and the words "finished or unfinished" refer to hemmed or not hemmed.

Mr. SMOOT. If that were the case, it would be an unfinished handkerchief.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The unhemmed handkerchief would be cut up into handkerchiefs.

Mr. SMOOT. Hemmed is another step in the progress of the finishing of the handkerchief. You provide "not hemmed, 25 per cent ad valorem"; and if the handkerchiefs are hemmed or hemstitched you provide a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Well, the paragraph applies to them finished or unfinished; but when not hemmed the duty is 25 per cent, and when hemmed it is 30 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I can see, Mr. President, what the original paragraph meant; that is, that handkerchiefs or mufflers coming into this country, whether in the piece or otherwise——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the piece or in the bolt.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly—whether they are in the piece or in the bolt or come in in any other form.

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. LIPPITT. The language "whether in the piece or otherwise" does not mean in the piece or in the bolt, but means in the piece or cut, or cut into small lengths. The term "length" is usually considered synonymous with "piece."

Mr. SMOOT. I understand the word "piece" to mean an individual handkerchief, one piece; but, in the broad sense, I suppose the Senator from Rhode Island is correct in saying that "piece" means "bolt," otherwise it might be construed to cover a bolt that might be cut into single handkerchiefs.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The paragraph as we have it, as I understand, applies to handkerchiefs cut.

Mr. SMOOT. In the way the paragraph stands, it will apply to them anyway; it will apply to handkerchiefs in the bolt or in the piece, and I do not believe it will make any difference in the meaning of the paragraph by making the proposed change.

While I am on this subject, Mr. President, I will ask, Does the Senator believe that the 5 per cent differential between the cloth itself and the hemstitched handkerchief is sufficient?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We found them just the same in the House bill, and we made a difference of 5 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. You found them?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; we found a duty of 30 per cent on each, and we reduced the unhemmed 5 per cent, so as to make a difference in the rate of duty between the hemmed and unhemmed handkerchiefs.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not talking about the unhemmed handkerchief. I am talking about the hemstitched handkerchief. The cloth which comes into this country, out of which hemstitched handkerchiefs are made, under the Senate amendment carries a rate of 25 per cent ad valorem. You have retained upon hemmed handkerchiefs the House duty. The most highly finished handkerchiefs, those hemstitched, you only provide 30 per cent on the handkerchiefs made from the same cloth.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We thought 5 per cent was a proper difference to be provided for in the bill, it having come to us from the House with no difference between them at all.

Mr. SMOOT. That evidently, as the Senator himself admits, was an error. There is not any question about that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If we had not thought we were improving the bill by the change we would not have made the change.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the committee have not increased the duty on the hemstitched handkerchief; they leave the hemstitched handkerchief just as it was provided for in the House bill, but they did on the unhemmed handkerchief reduce the duty from 30 to 25 per cent; or, in other words, the unhemmed handkerchief that is made from Irish linen—and the cloth is not made in this country—carries exactly the same rate as the cloth itself, while in the highly finished hemstitched handkerchiefs there is only a 5 per cent differential allowed, which every manufacturer of those goods in this country asserts is not sufficient to equalize the difference in cost between making the handkerchief in Ireland and making it in this country. The case would be a little different if the cloth were made in this country; but it is not made here, nor can it be made here. Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that we shall at least partially sacrifice this business upon the higher and the finer grades of hemstitched handkerchiefs.

I am not, however, going to offer an amendment. I simply call the attention of the Senator to these facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Finance in paragraph 260, which has been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 261, page 78, line 14, after the word "value," to insert "or of cotton or other vegetable fiber and india rubber."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 261, page 78, line 18, after the words "ad valorem," to insert:

All of the foregoing when composed of cotton in combination with flax, hemp, or ramie, or of cotton with flax, hemp, or ramie and india rubber, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to read that before we pass upon it to see if I understand it properly. I was wondering if the amendment will not conflict with another portion of the paragraph. The Senator will see that the paragraph begins:

Clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber—

Now note—

or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value.

That clothing may be made from a vegetable fiber of which cotton is the component material of chief value and the balance of the component part of that cloth may be rubber or hemp or ramie; and if so, under the first part of this paragraph it will carry a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

The committee proposes an amendment, beginning in line 18, after the words "ad valorem," reading:

All of the foregoing when composed of cotton in combination with flax, hemp, or ramie, or of cotton with flax, hemp, or ramie and india rubber, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Under the first part of the paragraph clothing made in combination with flax or made in combination with hemp or ramie or with india rubber would carry 30 per cent, whereas under the second part of the paragraph if the cloth is composed of cotton in combination with the enumerated articles it would carry a duty of 35 per cent.

When a raincoat, for instance, enters this country and the customhouse officer examines it and finds that the component material of chief value in it is cotton and, therefore, that it falls under paragraph 261, what is he going to do? Is he going to assess it at 30 per cent under the first provision in the paragraph or is he going to assess it at 35 per cent under the second provision?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It would bear the rate named—35 per cent—if made in combination with flax, hemp, or ramie.

Mr. SMOOT. But the first part of the paragraph is just as specific, because it provides that if—

composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, or of cotton or other vegetable fiber and india rubber—

It shall bear a duty of 30 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is so refreshing to find an increase of duty proposed in this bill that I hope the Senator from Utah will not make any trouble about it. For my part I am very glad to see the increased rate, and even though there may be a little conflict, why not let it go?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not worried about the increase, but I do not want the manufacturers of this country to think that they are going to get 35 per cent duty when they are not going to get it, because under the first provision of the paragraph the very items which it is subsequently provided shall carry 35 per cent will come in at 30 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah must know that there are pleasures in anticipation. Let the manufacturers imagine that they are going to get a little additional duty and learn afterwards that they are not.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We are now assured that there are fibers besides the three named that are used with cotton. The first portion applies to fibers other than those subsequently specifically named, and was so intended. It was left there because we were told by officers of the Government that there were a number of other fibers besides the three named which are united with cotton and come in in that way. Cotton in combination with the fibers specifically named will carry a duty of 35 per cent, and the first part of the paragraph providing a duty of 30 per cent will apply to other fibers.

Mr. SMOOT. The trouble with that is that in the first part of the paragraph there is a specific provision put there by an amendment of the Finance Committee of the Senate covering "cotton or other vegetable fiber and india rubber"; and in the second part of the paragraph is inserted the words, "or ramie and india rubber."

Mr. President, I only call attention to the fact, and am not going to make any further observation regarding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 261, page 78, line 22, after the word "section," to strike out "25" and insert "30," so as to read:

Shirt collars and cuffs of cotton, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 262, page 78, line 24, after the word "velvets," to insert "plush or velvet ribbons"; and in line 25, after the word "corduroys," to insert "chenilles," so as to read:

262. Plushes, velvets, plush or velvet ribbons, velveteens, corduroys, chenilles, and all pile fabrics, cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 262, page 79, line 2, after the word "composed," to insert "wholly or in chief value."

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether he does not think it would be wise to make the language of this bill uniform in regard to what is here proposed? So far in this schedule wherever the idea conveyed by the words "wholly or in chief value" is expressed, it has been expressed by saying, "composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value." I took occasion yesterday to point out that in the textile schedules there had been six different forms of language used to express the same idea.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. I only make the suggestion for the sake of avoiding litigation. There are several other places throughout the bill where I think it would be much improved by having the language uniform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire if the Senator from Rhode Island has offered an amendment?

Mr. LIPPITT. I did offer an amendment, and I understood the Senator from Georgia to accept it, that there should be sub-

stituted for the words "wholly or in chief value" the words "of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value."

Mr. HUGHES. The language should be "composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value."

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator from New Jersey is quite correct; that is the way in which it should be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the reason for the change in language there was to make clear the exception just following, "except flax, hemp, or ramie."

Mr. SMOOT. I take it for granted that the reason for excepting flax, hemp, or ramie was that they are provided for in paragraph 289.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; they are provided for elsewhere.

Mr. SMOOT. In paragraph 289?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that is the paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The SECRETARY. In place of the amendment proposed by the committee, in line 2, after the word "composed," it is proposed to insert the following words:

Of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will ask the Secretary to read the whole sentence, including the words "except flax, hemp, or ramie."

The Secretary read as follows:

Any of the foregoing composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, of cotton——

Mr. HUGHES. The words "of cotton or other vegetable fiber" should be stricken out and it should go on "except flax, hemp, or ramie."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am afraid the proposed amendment will not carry the meaning desired.

Mr. LIPPITT. I think, Mr. President, it would correctly carry the meaning if it were put in the proper form. If you say "composed of cotton or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber, except flax, hemp, or ramie, is the component material of chief value," I think that would cover it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then the words "except flax, hemp, or ramie" would not apply to the expression in the preceding part of the paragraph, "composed wholly or in chief value of cotton."

Mr. LIPPITT. Certainly if it is composed wholly of cotton it carries the duty, or if cotton is the component material of chief value it carries the duty, but otherwise it does not. I should think those words might be inserted there subject to further consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I do not object to the usual language. The change of the language in this paragraph as we have made it was to have the exception of flax, hemp, or ramie apply both to the article when cotton was the material of chief value and also to apply to it when cotton or other vegetable fiber was the material of chief value. I am inclined to think that we have expressed it better as it is than we would by adopting the change suggested. I believe if the Senator from Rhode Island will write out just what he suggests and will compare it with the language in the bill, he will see that we have it more clearly expressed here than we can express it by the usual language. That was why we deviated from the usual language; so that "flax, hemp, or ramie" would apply to the article composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber.

Mr. LIPPITT. Why is it necessary when you say "if the article is composed wholly of cotton" also to have a provision that the duty does not apply if the article contains flax, hemp, or ramie?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is not necessary. It is the next provision to which the exception applies—"or in chief value of cotton."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the situation, the amendment suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think we had better hold to the present language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the amendment has been withdrawn, and the question recurs on the amendment offered by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 262, page 79, line 3, after the word "flax," to insert "hemp, or ramie."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 262, page 79, line 6, after the word "corduroys," to insert "chenilles."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask for a division on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire asks for a division. Those in favor of the amendment proposed by the committee will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will withdraw my suggestion if the Senator from New Jersey withdraws his. I will add——

Mr. HUGHES. I withdraw my demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will add that it grieves me to see only two Senators on the other side of the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that in that case it is proper to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

Mr. HUGHES. I withdraw my demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Counting the Presiding Officer, there are three Senators on the other side present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The demand for the yeas and nays is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 262, page 79, line 8, after the word "flax," to insert "hemp, or ramie," so as to read:

Or other pile fabrics composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, except flax, hemp, or ramie, 40 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, to strike out all of paragraph 263, in the following words:

263. Curtains, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille, or of which cotton chenille is the component material of chief value, tapestries, and other Jacquard figured upholstery goods, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber; any of the foregoing, in the piece or otherwise, 35 per cent ad valorem; all other Jacquard figured manufactures of cotton or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 30 per cent ad valorem.

And to insert:

263. Tapestries, and other Jacquard figured upholstery goods weighing over 6 ounces per square yard, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, in the piece or otherwise, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am glad to see that there is an amendment to the House provision; but I wish to call the Senator's attention to one thing that I think would be an improvement to this paragraph.

The provision in the House bill for Jacquard figured manufactures of cotton is dropped, as the Senator knows. This leaves only the provision for tapestries and other Jacquard figured upholstery goods. To bring this provision into harmony with the corresponding provision in Schedule J, paragraph 293, and Schedule K, paragraph 318, the term "Jacquard figured" should be amended to read "woven-figured." This applies only to tapestry now. In order to harmonize the wording of the bill, both in Schedule J and in Schedule K, instead of "Jacquard figured" the words should be "woven-figured."

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator that I was chiefly responsible for the use of the words "woven-figured" in the other paragraph. I know something about textiles in a practical way, and it seemed to me that to describe a fabric as "Jacquard figured," and rely upon a description of that kind, would make several of the paragraphs extremely difficult of administration. That did not apply to tapestries. There is not the slightest objection, so far as I know, to the Senator's suggestion; but the application of the words "Jacquard figured" to tapestries, while it is out of harmony with the various other paragraphs, is sui generis in a way. So far as I know there are no figured tapestries that are not figured by a Jacquard machine. There are other figured textiles that are not figured by a Jacquard machine.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course I know that there are woven figured cloths of many kinds, woven upon attachments to a good many different kinds of looms. But it does seem to me that if we are going to be consistent we ought to be consistent clear through the different paragraphs. If in the future tapestries can be woven on any but a Jacquard loom, it seems to me they ought to fall in this paragraph; and if you are

going to use the words "woven figured" in one place, you ought to use them in another.

Mr. HUGHES. There is not much difficulty in determining whether or not the textiles made in the part of the country from which I come are Jacquard weave or not. There is great difficulty in determining that in other places. I did not appreciate it until we went into the investigation of the cotton schedule. As a matter of fact, as the Senator from Rhode Island knows, any kind of weave can be made on a Jacquard loom. You can weave absolutely plain cloth on it, and it is frequently done. So the word "Jacquard" is not descriptive of anything.

Mr. SMOOT. Plain cloth is never woven on a Jacquard loom.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; it is.

Mr. SMOOT. If it is done, it is done because they do not pay any attention whatever to cost. It is too expensive as a practical matter.

Mr. HUGHES. I will tell the Senator that it is done frequently, for this reason: Sometimes it is less expensive to run a short order through a Jacquard harness than it is to put up the harness and put in the shaft. For instance, an order might come in for 25, 50, or 100 yards of plain cloth, and the warp and the attachments already on the loom would be equal to turning it out. In such a case they might run that plain cloth through the Jacquard loom. I have frequently seen it done. There is a Jacquard-woven piece of cloth, absolutely plain, the same as if it were run through a shaft through which you could not weave anything but plain goods. Therefore I did not think the word was properly descriptive, and I suggested that the words "woven-figured" be substituted for "Jacquard figured," as being more descriptive. It is conceivable that in some instances it would be more difficult to weave in a figure by means of a shaft than it would be to weave in a figure by means of the Jacquard loom. So, as I say, the objection I had to it in the other paragraph did not apply to this particular paragraph, in my opinion. I can not see the slightest objection to making the change, though, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can not conceive of any condition in a mill where a plain piece of cloth would be woven on a Jacquard loom, unless it happened that the Jacquard loom stood idle when all of the other looms were in operation.

Mr. HUGHES. It would not necessarily follow that they would do it even then.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not care whether the warp is 600 yards or whether it is 20 yards. Before a piece of cloth can be woven the warp has to be drawn through the heddles, and it has to be drawn through the reed, and it has to be tied to the cloth roller to begin the weaving of it.

Mr. HUGHES. But that may have been done already.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, I say it would not have been done unless the Jacquard looms were lying idle and all the other looms in the room were busy.

Mr. HUGHES. No; the Jacquard loom might have been working on an order, and they might have come to the end of the particular order, and they might hand the weaver another order which instead of calling for a figure or a pattern simply called for a straight piece of cloth. It is true that it would not be done as a matter of practice, and the Senator is substantially right in saying that it would only be done on a loom for which they had not any use at that time. It would be an expensive proposition, too.

Mr. SMOOT. Very expensive indeed.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me for a minute, I only wish to say that I think he is quite correct in his general statement that ordinarily tapestry goods are of such a character of decoration that it requires the Jacquard loom to make them.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but while the Senator has been speaking it has occurred to me that there are occasionally certain fabrics that are made for portière purposes, and things of that kind, where the figures certainly could be made on what is ordinarily known as a dobby or a shaft loom. Having used the words "woven-figured" over in the other clause, I should think probably it would be more uniform to do it here.

Mr. HUGHES. I am inclined to agree with the Senator. I had some difficulty in explaining my reasons for wanting to substitute "woven-figured" for "Jacquard," and I got tired of it after a while. I am perfectly willing to accept that suggestion. I think it is more accurately descriptive of the method of making the cloth.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We really retained the word "Jacquard" here because we thought we were striking out the term "Jacquard" too much; and as it was claimed that the only way these goods were made was by means of the Jacquard loom, we were willing to recognize the term "Jacquard." But we are perfectly willing, as the Senator suggests, to put in "woven" in place of "Jacquard." With the approval of the Senator from New Jersey, we will change the word "Jacquard" to "woven."

Mr. JOHNSON. I think we had better consider that matter, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Maine, who is also upon our subcommittee, has just come in, and he suggests that he would like to have the committee consider the matter further before we determine upon the change.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the Senator will ask that it be passed over?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; we will pass over that paragraph.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, before passing over the paragraph I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia what becomes of curtains, table covers, and other articles that were in paragraph 263 before it was amended?

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator will see that chenilles are carried in paragraph 262.

Mr. WEEKS. I see that cotton chenilles are carried in paragraph 262; but I am not sure that table covers would come under that paragraph, and I am not sure that curtains would. A considerable industry has been developed in those articles.

Mr. HUGHES. They are covered as fully as I think they were covered in the other paragraph, which read:

Curtains, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille.

If they are manufactured of cotton chenille, they will be covered in the other paragraph. If they are not, they were intended to be covered in any event; and anything that is not specifically provided for, of course, will be classed as countable cotton.

Mr. WEEKS. Do I understand that this paragraph applies only to chenille curtains?

Mr. HUGHES. No. Paragraph 262 applies to "chenilles and all pile fabrics, cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface. Paragraph 263, as it came from the House, applied to "curtains, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille," meaning curtains of cotton chenille and table covers of cotton chenille, "and other Jacquard-figured upholstery goods."

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to make one more inquiry. Do bedspreads made on the Jacquard loom come under this paragraph, as the bill is now framed, or do they come under paragraph 257?

Mr. HUGHES. Bedspreads come under paragraph 257.

Mr. WEEKS. Is it the intention that they shall come under paragraph 257?

Mr. HUGHES. That was the intention; yes.

Mr. WEEKS. I desire to ask the Senator from New Jersey if he thinks they are given sufficient protection under that paragraph?

Mr. HUGHES. There is not the slightest reason in the world so far as I know for differentiating between bedspreads and other woven-figured goods. I do not know of any. If the Senator does, I shall be glad to have him state it.

Mr. WEEKS. I supposed bedspreads were woven, not in the piece, but as separate articles.

Mr. HUGHES. They are woven by the mile. [Laughter.] If they come in in the piece, they go into the basket clause and take a high rate of duty; but they are woven like every other kind of cotton cloth is woven. They are just ripped out in great quantities. While I do not wish to enter into the old controversy with the Senator as to the amount of protection necessary for American-made articles with reference to foreign importations, there is no reason that I know of for making a distinction between an ordinary piece of woven figured cotton cloth and a bedspread.

Mr. WEEKS. Is there not a material difference in the cost of bedspreads, depending on the figures that the piece contains?

Mr. HUGHES. We allow 2½ per cent for decorating other cotton cloth, weaving a figure into it, and the only thing they do out of the ordinary with reference to a bedspread is to weave a figure into it. It has been the custom hitherto, in the construction of tariff bills, to take some particular article and give it a special rate. It seems to me they must have done it for some particular man. In a great many cases those things persist throughout the various bills. Different tariff makers follow the old language, the old basis, the old method of construction. Occasionally Democrats fall into that error, too, I suppose in the interest of time and convenience. But just because you can designate this article eo nomine as a bedspread I never have been able to see why it should be given any different treatment than that accorded to any other piece of cotton cloth which is woven, figured, or jacquarded.

I am not taking issue with the Senator from Rhode Island, who says that all jacquarded cloths should be given a higher differential. That is not what we are discussing now. We are discussing whether or not bedspreads, because they can be conveniently named, should be treated differently.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey in what way he gives 2½ per cent differential in this particular case?

Mr. HUGHES. All cotton cloth which is woven or figured receives a differential of 2½ per cent over cotton cloth in the gray.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask, if it is bleached, whether it pays any more duty than a plain piece of cloth?

Mr. HUGHES. No.

Mr. LIPPITT. Then, I fail to see how the maker has any added duty for his product. He has in name, but in fact he has not.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator knows that bedspreads may come in with a figure woven into them with the fabric in the gray; and another piece of cloth coming in in that condition would pay a rate of duty of 2½ per cent less than a bedspread coming in in the gray. That is true, is it not?

Mr. LIPPITT. That is true; but it is also true that the provision is so arranged that, manifestly, anybody would bring in fancy cloth in the finished condition, in which case he would pay absolutely no additional duty for the fancy figures. Instead of carrying out what I think was the manifest intention of the committee to make some distinction between figured cloth and unfigured cloth, in practice I fail to see how they have done so at all.

Mr. HUGHES. That is a general criticism of the bill, which, of course, I was not discussing with the Senator. The Senator has discussed that. I was simply trying to show the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] that there was not any reason for treating bedspreads in any different manner from that in which we treated other fabrics.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if the department experts have advised the subcommittee that there is not an additional cost of manufacturing bedspreads, for instance, over the cost of other cotton cloth?

Mr. HUGHES. Oh, no; there could not be, in the nature of things. There could not be any greater cost in manufacturing bedspreads than certain characters of Jacquard goods, cotton goods. In fact, as the Senator from Rhode Island stated, I can think of a great many weaves which are far more entitled to consideration than mere Jacquard weaves.

Mr. WEEKS. Is not the cost greater than it would be in plain cloths, for instance?

Mr. HUGHES. Oh, yes; it costs more. I do not say that it does not cost more to make Jacquard cloth than it does to make plain cloth. I did not intend to convey that impression.

Mr. WEEKS. My question was whether the tariff experts on cotton advised the subcommittee that bedspreads would be sufficiently protected by being put in paragraph 257?

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know whom the Senator means by "the tariff experts."

Mr. WEEKS. I assume that the committee has had the benefit of the advice of experts connected with the department.

Mr. HUGHES. The examiners at the ports watching importations state that there is not any particular reason for differentiating this article from any other. It has only been separated from the great body of cotton fabrics by a tariff bill. There is not any other reason on earth for it. It stands on precisely the same footing as every other piece of figured cotton cloth in the world, except that it has been treated in the tariff bill eo nomine; it has been called a bedspread. That is the only different treatment. That is the only thing that differentiates it from anything else. If there should be a higher duty upon a bedspread because of the fact that it is Jacquard woven, there should be a higher duty upon all Jacquard-woven goods; and there are weaves and fabrics which, from the standpoint of the Senator, are entitled to a great deal more duty than an ordinary Jacquard-woven fabric.

Mr. WEEKS. Have they been given it in this bill?

Mr. HUGHES. They have been treated as Jacquard figured goods have been treated.

Mr. WEEKS. Just one more question. Why is it that they are not entitled to as much duty as tapestry or damask?

Mr. HUGHES. Speaking for myself, the reason I would urge for the duty that is put on damask is that it should produce some revenue. I do not think there is any need, from the protective standpoint, of levying a duty upon damask; but I think more revenue will be produced there, perhaps, than at any other point. This is another instance of the survival of the old, old habit of treating commodities eo nomine. They get separate treatment for that reason. So far as I am concerned, I think perhaps it would be better to let them all take their chances in the general classification.

Mr. SMOOT. You would get more revenue in that way.

Mr. HUGHES. Probably.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 263 will be passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 264 and paragraph 265 are also passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 266, page 80, line 14, after the word "underwear," to insert "and wearing apparel"; and, in the same line, after the word "description," to insert "not specially provided for in this section," so as to make the paragraph read:

266. Shirts and drawers, pants, vests, union suits, combination suits, tights, sweaters, corset covers, and all underwear and wearing apparel of every description, not specially provided for in this section, made wholly or in part on knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, finished or unfinished, not including such as are trimmed with lace, imitation lace or crochet or as are embroidered and not including stockings, hose and half hose, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, cotton manufacturing is one of the chief industries of the portion of the State of Connecticut in which I reside. I have here a great many communications from the owners and managers of the mills engaged in that industry. I wish to read, briefly, a few extracts from a portion of the communications I have received.

The Falls Co., of Norwich, Conn., write me, through their president, as follows:

As manufacturers of cotton goods, we wish to enter our protest against the passage of the tariff bill now before Congress.

We firmly believe that its enactment will paralyze the industry of cotton manufacturing for a long period.

How a set of intelligent men can believe for a moment that the country can stand such a radical change all at once and survive is beyond me.

I have been in hopes that the Senate might stem the tide, but fear it hasn't the strength.

A director of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, a resident of my State engaged in the business, telegraphs me:

I believe the passage of the present Underwood bill would work incalculable harm to the cotton manufacturing industry of this country and all who are dependent upon it, and I urge you to do all in your power to defeat it.

The warden and court of burgesses of the borough of Danielson, Conn., write me inclosing a resolution which they adopted, as follows:

Resolved, That we urgently request the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and the Senators and Congressmen from our district, that the cotton and woolen schedules in the proposed national tariff legislation be maintained substantially as at present.

The Lawton Mills Corporation, of Plainfield, Conn., writes:

I want to enter our vigorous protest against the passage of the Underwood bill in its present form. If enacted, it means a 30 per cent reduction of wages and a loss to capital until business revives. We who are on the job know what we are talking about. History will repeat itself unless many changes are made on the cotton schedule before its passage.

I am inclosing a copy of a letter which I wrote some time ago to Mr. Lewis W. Parker, and requested that he send a copy of same to Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do everything you can to impress upon your colleagues the serious menace of this bill if it goes into effect, and beg to remain,

Yours, truly, THE LAWTON MILLS CORPORATION.
H. LAWTON, *General Manager*.

I ask that the Secretary may read the letter which Mr. Lawton wrote to Mr. Parker, and a copy of which he inclosed to me, as it states very succinctly the position of these gentlemen upon this question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MARCH 24, 1913.

Mr. LEWIS W. PARKER,
Greenville, S. C.

DEAR SIR: You will recall the writer as being the gentleman who spoke to you in the Merchants' Club in New York two or three weeks ago as having in mind a few thoughts and views touching the tariff question with which the Democratic Party at the present time seem anxious to make history of, either for the betterment of the textile industry or for the setting back of same. It would seem strange to the writer that this question should be left for settlement in the hands of so many of our Congressmen and Senators who are so unfamiliar with the real facts and conditions pertaining to the best interests of the textile industries of this country. This question should not be left for settlement by any such body of men, but, rather, it should be left in the hands of a commission entirely unbiased politically, and this body of men should be composed of men who are familiar with the textile industries of this country and competent to take up such a broad question and to take sufficient time to come to a correct conclusion pertaining to every detail, and same should be settled in a businesslike way once and for all time.

Our people have been educated up to a certain standard of living, and if this standard is to be maintained, any interference by tariff changes

is going to work toward the setting back and not the uplifting of the American workingman.

The scale of wages which is now paid in the textile industries of New England is so far in excess of that paid in any other country that protection for the working people, as well as for the capital invested in the textile industries, is absolutely necessary to the extent that the scale of wages now paid can be maintained and capital can receive a fair return and a liberal depreciation can be allowed, and the industry can be settled down to a fixed and steady condition, so that capital and labor may be allowed to prosper, which is their just right, without interference, politically or otherwise.

Why should we legislate in the interests of countries across the sea? Why should we travel so close to the precipice when the road is broad enough so that all may travel safely and comfortably and not be in fear of hardships from time to time as the political barometer may travel from one extreme to the other? In no other country under the sun does the political barometer vary from one extreme to the other at the expense of business, only in the United States. The textile industry in this country has been a football long enough, and this sort of condition should cease and the industry should be allowed to thrive without any further political interference.

The Democratic administration and party, which have just come into power, have a great opportunity before them. Never has a party had such an opportunity; but the opportunity will be thrown away unless just and intelligent action is taken in the many questions that seem to be up for adjustment at the present time, and the adjustments can be made in many of these questions if intelligent and judicious procedure is the watchword of the Democratic Party. They can become a great steadying factor in the political situation of the future. During the past 50 years there is very little to the credit of the Democratic Party, and I trust that the opportunity which lies before them now will be so plain that they will not, as in the past, let history repeat itself.

How can it be expected that industries which have grown up with the country during the past hundred years or more should be left to the mercy of an incoming administration which shall fix duties pertaining to same without intelligent investigation by a commission with all the data necessary to adjust same intelligently? No! The Democratic Party stands for the downward revision of the tariff, whether or no, intelligence or no intelligence, suicide or no suicide. Better go slow, gentlemen. Your great and last opportunity is before you. How can we pay 60 per cent to 80 per cent more wages in this country than in England, France, and Germany and at the same time let down the bars of protection without crippling our textile and mechanical industries, lowering the wages of our workingmen, and giving capital no return? This condition can not be. The people will not stand for this sort of legislation any length of time. Just stop for a moment and consider the prices which are being obtained for all kinds of crops which are raised by the farmer in the West and the cotton grower in the South. Never in the history of the Nation has such conditions prevailed. These conditions can not last very long if business is upset to any great extent. We have already had two years of bad trade, and at the present time it is growing steadily worse on account of tariff agitations and other agitations and investigations. The country is entitled to a period of rest and prosperity. Labor aggressions in all lines of trade are largely the result of keeping the pot boiling. Capital as well as labor is entitled to good returns. One can not get along without the other, and both must be fair and reasonable.

Every man is worthy of his hire—no more and no less. Just so sure as the "Underwood bill" goes through in its present form just so sure will serious trouble result in the textile and other mechanical industries, and just so sure will the Democratic Party loose its great opportunity to become a great steadying factor in the future. The people in this country want peace in all mechanical and industrial pursuits.

I do not know as I have made myself plain, but I am speaking as a practical man who has been connected with the textile industry during a period of 40 years as a practical worker and who knows something of the real conditions, thus adding what little I can in bringing about a condition of industrial peace, and beg to remain,

Yours, truly, H. LAWTON.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I do not intend to read or to ask the Secretary to read the communications I have here. I have communications from the Briggs Manufacturing Co., of Voluntown, Conn.; the Shetucket Co., of Norwich, Conn.; and many telegrams from commercial bodies in my State to the same general effect.

I know that it is useless to offer any amendments to this schedule. The Senator from Rhode Island has offered some and has some pending. Other Senators have offered amendments. I have voted for those amendments wherever they tended to mitigate the asperities of the bill. They are promptly voted down. I shall content myself with voting against the provisions of the bill, the committee amendments, and the schedules from time to time as best I may. That is all I have to say.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 267, page 80, line 22, after the word "garters," to strike out "ribbons"; in line 23, after the word "braces," to strike out "tapes, tubing, and webs or webbing" and insert "and fabrics with fast edges not exceeding 12 inches in width"; and, in line 25, to strike out "any" and insert "all," so as to read:

Bandings, beltings, bindings, bone casings, cords, garters, tire fabric or fabric suitable for use in pneumatic tires, suspenders and braces, and fabrics with fast edges not exceeding 12 inches in width, all of the foregoing made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, or of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and india rubber.

Mr. GALLINGER. I made an inquiry a little while ago concerning that paragraph, and the Senator from Maine suggested that it was to be further considered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have two amendments which I wish to propose to it. After the word "belting," in the first line of the paragraph, I move to insert "belts," and after the word "cords," at the end of the line, to insert "and tassels."

Mr. GALLINGER. Are those the only amendments that he has to offer, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think it ought to read "cords and tassels." I think we ought to insert just "tassels" and a comma, so that it will take in both, whether it be a cord or whether it be a tassel.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is "cord, tassels." We wish to add the word "tassels."

Mr. HUGHES. Before the Senator finally accepts that, I wish to call his attention to the possibility of the article coming in as both cord and tassel.

Mr. SMOOT. If both are enumerated in the paragraph there is no question that they would both carry the duty. They are both at the same rate. So there would be no question about it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Tassels have the same rate.

Mr. SMOOT. Tassels have a rate. There would be a conflict if each had a different rate, but they have not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 21, after the word "beltings" and the comma, insert the word "belts" and a comma, and in the same line, after the word "cords," insert "tassels" and a comma, so as to read:

Bandings, beltings, belts, bindings, bone casings, cords, tassels, garters, tire fabric, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment proposes to strike out the word "ribbons." Where has the Senator taken care of ribbons?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is taken care of.

Mr. SMOOT. In some other paragraph?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is in the same paragraph.

Mr. SMOOT. The suggestion of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] brings to me what I was going to say. I might as well say it now. I suppose the Senate committee in making the amendment striking out "ribbons, tapes, tubing, and webs or webbing" and inserting the words "and fabrics with fast edges not exceeding 12 inches in width" intends that the last provision is to cover all those items.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; I think so.

Mr. SMOOT. That has never been done, of course, in any previous tariff act. These very items have been litigated on for years and years and decisions have been rendered time and time again.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will say to the Senator that the representatives of the Government in New York advise that they are still the subject of litigation and still unsettled, and we made these changes because they said, as a matter of administration, it would stop the litigation. What I know about it is what I gather from that source.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator had not interrupted me, I would have come to the point I intended to make. It is true, as the Senator has stated, and as I stated beforehand, that they have had continued litigation over these items. In fact, the appraisers have had to rely entirely upon the testimony of the importers.

The importers have proven that tapes were not tapes; they have proven that trimmings did not come under this paragraph; they have proven that webbing was not intended under the law to be what we commonly know to be webbing. I was going to ask the Senator if he thought those simple words would cover all that and in the future do away with the litigation which has been so prolific in the past.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My opinion on the subject is based upon what I am advised by the Government representatives at the customhouse in New York. They suggested this language as language which would stop litigation, cover the subject, and simplify the future administration.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator the difficulty I find with it is not that it fails to include various articles, but that it fails to include something that will be necessary——

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to come to that.

Mr. HUGHES. It will be necessary later on in another paragraph to take note of the fact that this language has been inserted. The Senator will notice that the specifications are very general, indeed; that anything with two fast edges under a certain width——

Mr. SMOOT. Under 12 inches. It does not make any difference whether it is silk; it does not make any difference what it is, of course, providing it is the component material of chief value.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; the component material of chief value.

Mr. SMOOT. Then it comes in under this paragraph and falls under this rate. I thought that if all the rates were the same there would be no conflict at all and it would make no differ-

ence; but if some importation comes into this country with two fast edges and happens to be 11 inches wide it would fall under this paragraph, no matter what provisions it may fall under ordinarily.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The amendment we will offer a little later in this paragraph will be, in line 16, page 81, to insert "not specifically provided for in this section." The purpose was to specifically provide for them in the other portions of the section.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that amendment will help somewhat, but it does seem to me if we would enumerate the items we have already there, and then specifically state that it applies to the enumerated articles and that they shall not exceed 12 inches in width, and must have two fast edges, there could not be a question about what the law meant, and no importer or any other person could misconstrue its meaning.

Mr. HUGHES. My understanding of it is that, so far as bandings, belting, bindings, bone casings, cords, garters, tire fabrics, and the articles that we have enumerated here are concerned, there is not much difficulty, but there are a number of fabrics which it is claimed do not belong in those classes, and which give the Treasury Department a great deal of trouble, will be caught by this language. The only trouble is that some other fabrics would also be caught by it unless they are specifically provided for, and we propose to attempt to specifically provide for them.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the result will be a little better than I anticipate, but if not I think I have simply done my duty by calling attention to this matter. If Senators will take it into consideration and in the meantime become convinced that the wording would be a little plainer if it were worded something as I suggested, of course the amendment can be made when the bill gets into the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator from Georgia where he proposes to insert the words "not specially provided for in this section"?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. After the word "lace," in line 16, on page 81.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if the committee has considered the matter of amending paragraph 368 in any way?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator be kind enough to state the amendment which may be suggested to that paragraph? It may save some time. I will say to the Senator I have no desire to consume time unnecessarily.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We have not prepared the wording of that paragraph which we will recommend, but we have in view, I am satisfied, what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator, of course, knows what I have in mind.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We are simply preparing to reach that paragraph later on.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have samples, but I will not even perhaps exhibit them. They are very beautiful samples of classes of goods made in a little town in New Hampshire, and they propose to extend the industry to other towns. They were introduced by an Austrian.

Mr. HUGHES. That is one class which, strictly speaking, is lace, but it falls within this broad and general classification of fabrics. Being under a certain width and having two fast edges it is one of the things included in the dragnet which were not intended to be included. It will make necessary other language later on. I will say to the Senator that I have seen the samples.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presumed the committee had seen them.

Mr. HUGHES. I think there is not any doubt but that this language will include them, and it was not intended that it should do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had hoped that the committee did not intend to include these fabrics with some others that are named; as an instance, tire fabric; the fabric suitable for use in pneumatic tires.

Mr. HUGHES. That is a lace.

Mr. GALLINGER. It would seem absurd to me. These are very beautiful goods manufactured, as I suggested, by a gentleman from Austria who established a little industry in Barnstead, N. H., a little interior town. I am going to read his letter; it is brief.

BARNSTEAD, N. H., *July 1, 1913.*

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please help us to keep the tariff for featherstitched braid, edgings, and corset trimmings like samples we inclose at 60 per cent duty, which we are manufacturing in Barnstead, N. H.

We have been the first in America who started to manufacture these goods nine years ago in Barnstead, N. H.

We have worked very hard, paid no dividends the first eight years, left the little profit we made in the company to develop the business, and now the tariff on these goods we manufacture shall be reduced from 60 per cent to 35 per cent and less, which can not be done without injury to our industry to such an extent that our very existence will be a question in future.

It is said that under a 60 per cent duty 90 per cent of these goods used in this country is imported to the United States from Europe; and we, the domestic manufacturer, can not compete with the foreign manufacturers.

They undersell us right and left now under a 60 per cent duty.

Note that these goods contain only from 35 to 40 per cent of material, 40 to 45 per cent labor, and 15 to 20 per cent overhead expenses.

The manufacturers in Europe get the material from 15 to 20 per cent cheaper; they pay only one-third to one-fifth as much wages as we pay, and their overhead expenses are only about one-half as much as ours.

How shall we be able to compete with the European manufacturers and make both ends meet when we have to pay from 15 to 20 per cent more for the material, from 65 to 80 per cent more wages, after we had to invest more than twice as much for the plant and machinery as the same factory and machinery would cost in Europe?

If the tariff is reduced to 35 per cent, then we will have to reduce the wages accordingly or go out of business.

I am born and brought up in Austria, and have since I am in America been in Europe twice, where I made a special study of our business, so that I know exactly what I am talking about.

Yours, very truly,

NEW HAMPSHIRE ARTISTIC WEB CO.
F. ZECHA.

It will take but a few moments, and I want to put in the RECORD two more letters and then I will be done. Here is a letter from the secretary of the Keene Commercial Club. Keene is a city of 10,000 or 12,000 inhabitants.

The writer says:

KEENE COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Keene, N. H., July 9, 1913.

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I realize the seeming absurdity of expecting a tariff measure to be changed for the benefit of a New Hampshire industry, but there is one phase of the pending bill to which I would fain call attention in the hope that you may see your way to try to obtain at all events a partial modification, which will still effect a considerable reduction on the existing rate.

Recently there was incorporated the Keene Artistic Narrow Web Co., the term narrow web being applied to embroideries for corsets and other articles of ladies' underclothing. Manufacturers in this line are not numerous, as I am informed that 95 per cent of the total amount consumed comes from Austria and Germany, where the wages of operatives are so low that the existing protection has enabled American manufacturers to realize only a legitimate profit, while some of them have failed to achieve any substantial success. The existing tariff is 60 per cent, and it is proposed to reduce it to 35 per cent, the effect of which on an industry manufacturing 5 per cent of the total product sold in this country will be obvious. Either the industry must suffer very seriously or there will have to be a substantial readjustment of wages. Granted that 60 per cent may be too high a tariff, is not an abrupt drop to almost half too drastic a change? In the eastern part of the State, as well as in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, there are factories whose business will be seriously interfered with, and as regards our new local enterprise plans have been held in abeyance until it can be decided whether it is possible to operate at a profit. Personally I feel the necessity of tariff reform; but surely this is an instance of reform going too far, and I have been requested by the directors of the Commercial Club to ask you to use your best efforts to secure a modification of this schedule, on which it is felt that a reduction of 10 per cent would be a substantial change, while 15 per cent, or a duty of 45 per cent, would necessitate the very closest figuring to make ends meet. The raw material is mercerized cotton yarn and silk, so that labor constitutes the chief differential between this country and Europe.

Assuring you that we shall appreciate whatever you may be able to accomplish toward aiding existing industries in the State and helping us establish a new one by preserving a reasonable measure of protection and preventing such a revolutionary change in a tariff rate, I am,

Yours, very truly,

WM. LITTLER, *Secretary.*

I answered that letter asking for certain information, and the same gentleman writes me as follows:

KEENE COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Keene, N. H., August 9, 1913.

Hon. J. H. GALLINGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I appreciate the courtesy of your letter of the 8th. As a result of what is undoubtedly an error of classification, the fabrics which it is proposed to manufacture in the projected new industry come under section 267. In order to post myself I took up the matter at the appraiser's office in New York and learned that in consequence of expensive litigation with importers in the past the words "fabrics with fast edges, not exceeding 12 inches in width," had been used, so that the 30 per cent duty provided applies equally to a plain tape, such as is used for an apron string, as well as fancy ornamented fabrics, like the inclosed samples. By reference to section 368 you will see that 60 per cent provision is made for "braids made by hand or on any braid machine, knitting machine, or lace machine," though it so happens that the fabrics in which we are interested are not made on any of these machines, but on an elaborate loom with various attachments, although they are as elaborate as embroideries taking a higher duty and require highly skilled operatives.

As explained in my former letter, only 5 per cent of these goods are manufactured in the United States—at Pawtucket, R. I., Epsom and Barnstead, N. H.—so that the oversight to which I am calling attention will only benefit foreign manufacturers and importers. Not to bother you with technical details, I may state that the plain braids are made on machines running 120 to 200 picks to the minute, where one operator can attend to four to eight machines, while the looms making these fancy fabrics only run 40 to 120 picks to the minute, and one operator can not attend to more than two machines and sometimes only

one. The wages in the former case are from $8 to $12 per week; in the other, $12 to $25. The 30 per cent duty will not cover the labor differential between Germany and the United States.

The matter is a very serious one for Keene. The Barnstead concern proposes to establish a branch of their business here. A large sum of money has been deposited, land purchased, plans drawn, and proposals received, but unless a change is made in the bill the project will have to be abandoned, as otherwise it can not exist. This industry has been developed by some brothers of Austrian birth in the face of the greatest odds, and it seems tough that a promising industry should be throttled merely by reason of a question of grammatical construction or technical description.

These goods are known as fancy braids and trimmings, but in section 368 you will see the words "trimmings not specially provided for," and the appraiser holds that they are provided for in section 267 in the words "fabrics with fast edges not exceeding 12 inches in width," although I believe I am not violating any confidence in saying he agrees that these goods ought to be differently classified. I have talked with a large importer in New York, who feels that the ambiguity of this clause will lead to expensive litigation, and it is believed that a satisfactory adjustment would be reached by the insertion of the words interlined in the inclosed copies of sections 267 and 368. This would leave the former clause, as originally intended, to apply to plain fabrics, while these fancy articles, which are luxuries, would be covered by section 368 as amended. These words have been approved by experts in the New York appraiser's office, and men handling imports of this class of goods agree that they are adequately described as "braids loom woven and ornamented in process of weaving." Please note that this description is narrowed down to "braids," so that it could not possibly cause confusion.

My appeal is absolutely nonpartisan. The Keene Development Co., which proposed to erect this new factory, is made up of leading business men of various political beliefs, and they are a unit in feeling that the bill as it stands will work an undeserved injury to a promising project, though it is also felt that the error is one of omission and not of commission.

Telephoning a few minutes ago to the president of the Barnstead concern I learned that he mailed you samples of his product some weeks ago, and I respectfully suggest that you refer to them. Then compare with a plain piece of braid and ask your colleagues whether it is equitable that they should have the same classification in view of the accepted facts as to the cost of production. The existing duty is 60 per cent. It is obvious what the effect will be if it is reduced to 30 per cent at one fell swoop.

Assuring you that we shall heartily appreciate your cooperation in this matter, I am,

Yours, very truly, WM. LITTLER, *Secretary.*

That gentleman proposed two amendments, which I will read, to the section under consideration. He asks that the words "not specially provided for in this section" should be inserted, which I understand has been done. He suggested that in paragraph 368, Schedule N, after the word "braids," there should be inserted "loom woven and ornamented in process of weaving or." I will ask the committee if that proposed amendment has been called to their attention?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That language, I think, was furnished to him by the Government experts whom we had assisting us in the matter. That was the language which we were considering to be sure that it covered these goods.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very likely that will go in?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I thank the Senator. That is all I have to say.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is our present purpose to put it in, if we are sure that the language covers the case. We are considering that question, the object being to cover it. We thought it should be in the other paragraph.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is exceedingly satisfactory to me, and I will not waste a moment more of time on the subject.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Do I understand that the paragraph is recommitted or passed over?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; we are undertaking to perfect it as we go on. We have only one other change to propose in the paragraph, and that is to insert, after the word "lace," in line 16, page 81, "and not specially provided for in this section."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If that is the case, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senator a communication which I have received from the American Mills Co., in Waterbury, Conn.:

This company manufactures elastic webbing (used for belts, suspenders, garters, etc.), which under this bill would be admitted at 25 per cent duty (Schedule I, par. 267).

I suppose that was the House provision.

The duty under the present law is 60 per cent (Schedule J, par. 349). Our foreign competition is principally from England and Germany, in both of which countries the labor cost is one-fourth to one-third of what it is here, not only in the actual manufacture of the goods themselves, but in all other items, which are incidental; and also those which go to make up the so-called overhead.

In behalf of this entire industry I beg you to exercise all the power you can to have this bill so modified as to make the reduction more reasonable. I think a duty of 40 to 45 per cent would be reasonable.

I will move that on page 81, line 16——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is compelled to announce to the Senator that we have not reached that point.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Which committee amendment is now pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The one on line 22, page 80, and lines 23, 24, and 25, on the same page.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 267, page 81, line 2, after the word "rubber," to strike out the following:

And not embroidered by hand or machinery; spindle banding, woven, braided, or twisted lamp, stove, or candle wicking made of cotton or other vegetable fiber; loom harness, healds, or collets made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value; boot, shoe, and corset lacings made of cotton or other vegetable fiber; and labels for garments or other articles, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 25 per cent ad valorem; belting for machinery made of cotton or other vegetable fiber and india rubber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, 15 per cent ad valorem.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Not embroidered by hand or machinery, or wholly or in part of lace or imitation lace, 30 per cent ad valorem; spindle banding, woven, braided, or twisted lamp, stove, or candle wicking; loom harness, healds, or collets, boot, shoe, and corset lacings; labels for garments or other articles, all of the foregoing composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, 25 per cent ad valorem; belting for machinery made of cotton or other vegetable fiber and india rubber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Now, I move to insert "not specially provided for in this section," after the word "lace," in line 16.

Mr. GALLINGER. Should it not read "in this paragraph"?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Not in this paragraph, because the paragraph referred to is another paragraph of the schedule.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I move to amend the amendment as amended, on page 81, line 16, by striking out "30," before "ad valorem," and inserting "40," so as to read:

Not embroidered by hand or machinery, or wholly or in part of lace or imitation lace, not specially provided for in this section, 40 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Paragraph 268 we desire to pass over.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have an amendment to offer in substitution for that paragraph.

Mr. HUGHES. I should be glad to have it reported.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would be glad to have it read now.

Mr. LIPPITT. I ask that the Secretary may read my amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We do not wish to go on with the paragraph at present, but we would prefer to hear the proposed substitute read before we bring in our amendment to the paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out, in paragraph 257, the words "woven figured"——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This is paragraph 268.

Mr. LIPPITT. The two amendments go together.

The SECRETARY. And strike out paragraph 268 and in lieu thereof insert:

268. Figured or fancy cotty cloth woven by means of jacquard, dobby, drop box, lappet, leno, swivel, or other similar attachments, or containing novelty yarns in whole or in part other than the ordinary ply or cable-laid yarn or thread, there shall be paid a duty of 10 per cent in addition to the duty or duties imposed upon such cotton cloth by the various provisions of this section, the intent of this proviso being to add this duty or duties to those to which such cotton cloth would be liable if the provisions of this proviso did not exist.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not suppose that the Senator from Rhode Island desires to have his amendment acted on now, and the proposed substitute will go over with the paragraph.

Mr. LIPPITT. I presume it is the Senator's intention to report his substitute within a few days?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes. If we can, we will report it to-morrow morning, but certainly we will present it within two or three days.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 82, after line 4, to strike out paragraph 269, in the following words:

269. Towels, bath mats, quilts, blankets, polishing cloths, mop cloths, wash rags or cloths, sheets, pillowcases, and batting, any of the foregoing made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, whether in the piece or otherwise, not embroidered nor in part of lace and not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent ad valorem.

And to insert:

269. Towels, quilts composed of two fabrics quilted, blankets, polishing cloths, mop cloths, wash rags or cloths, sheets, pillowcases, finished

or unfinished and not in the piece, batting, or cloth composed wholly or in part of looped threads lying on the surface, such as are known as terry cloth, whether in the piece or otherwise; any of the foregoing made of cotton or of which cotton is the component material of chief value and not embroidered nor in part of lace and not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. This paragraph, Mr. President, is a new statutory provision for certain specified articles such as towels, wash rags, wash cloths, mop cloths, sheets, pillowcases, and so forth. In connection with those items the committee have inserted these words: "Such as are known as terry cloth, whether in the piece or otherwise." Terry cloth is a fabric from which bath robes, bath-robe blankets, and Turkish towels are made. It is also used in the making of dresses and even in the making of ladies' hats; it contains sometimes the most elaborate figures, and necessarily it must be woven on a Jacquard loom. To classify that kind of cloth with mop cloths and wash rags seems to me to be rather an incongruity.

Another thing to which I desire to call attention is that the rate provided for in this paragraph is 25 per cent ad valorem, whereas in paragraph 263, on woven-figured tapestry and upholstery goods the words "woven-figured goods" are used, and they are also used in the different paragraphs of this schedule, which will certainly conflict with this paragraph. The rates are different, and I doubt very much whether terry cloth will enter under the classification in this paragraph at 25 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we have an amendment prepared for that particular part of the paragraph, which strikes out the words "whether in the piece or otherwise" and inserts after the words "terry cloth" the words "and articles made therefrom, not including wearing apparel."

Mr. SMOOT. That will help a great deal, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I intend to present that amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I was not aware of the Senator's intentions; and I did not want the matter to pass over to-day without some action being taken.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I had not observed my memorandum on the subject at the time the Senator mentioned it.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator intend to now offer the amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; I now offer the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the amendment be stated, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the committee amendment, in paragraph 269, page 82, line 17, I move to strike out the words "whether in the piece or otherwise" and to add after the word "cloth" in line 16 the words "and articles made therefrom, not including wearing apparel." I offer for the committee this amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 269, page 82, after the word "cloth," at the end of line 16, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out the words "whether in the piece or otherwise" and to insert "and articles made therefrom, not including wearing apparel."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if that amendment is to be seriously considered, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Georgia that I think it would be very much better not to have terry cloth in the paragraph in any way, and to let it fall under the provision that it will naturally fall under. If it is plain terry cloth, let it fall under the provision of plain cloth; if it is finished woven terry cloth, let it fall there; and if the manufactured articles or wearing apparel are made from terry cloth, let it fall under that paragraph. Then there will be no conflict. It does, however, seem to me that if you allow the term "terry cloth" to be inserted in this paragraph with a rate different from the rates named in the other paragraphs there will surely be a conflict.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not true also that terry cloth is more like pile cloth and has some of the characteristics of pile cloth?

Mr. SMOOT. The only difference between terry cloth and pile cloth is that pile cloth is woven, and is a hard woven cloth. Then the pile is clipped and cut or pressed down and the figures are made by pressing the pile. Terry cloth is, however, a very coarse yarn woven loosely. As I say, it is used for bath robes, bath-robe blankets, and similar purposes.

Mr. LIPPITT. It is also made in very elaborate figures.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Rhode Island suggests that it is also made in very elaborate figures, as I before suggested.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator that the examiners at New York were very anxious to have terry cloth named in this paragraph as, in their opinion, it would help wonderfully in the administration of the law. It was inserted in the paragraph at their suggestion. My notion of it was—I do not know whether or not the Senator's information is to the contrary—that terry cloth is largely used for towels.

Mr. SMOOT. For bath towels, bath robes, and so forth.

Mr. HUGHES. For polishing cloths and cloths that are intended to take up moisture. The loose-thread terry cloth, which is attempted to be described here, is much more used for those purposes than for the decorative purposes for which the Senator thinks it is used.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am quite sure the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me that terry cloth is used for bath robes, for bath-robe blankets, for towels, and there is not any question but that it is used for ladies' dresses. It is also used in the manufacture of ladies' hats. As I have said, I have seen terry cloth with the most elaborate figures woven into it upon the Jacquard loom, and it could not be made upon any other loom.

Mr. HUGHES. But does the Senator think that it should have a higher rate or a lower rate than it is proposed to give it here?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not complaining of the rate. I am calling attention to the fact that it carries a rate of 25 per cent. It is made, as I have said, upon the Jacquard loom.

Mr. HUGHES. Not necessarily, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. I mean some of it is so made; that is, the elaborate figures are made upon a Jacquard loom. There is a plain terry cloth that can be made upon any kind of a loom, which is carrying a rate of 25 per cent now. There will be a conflict as to the rates in different paragraphs, because if you turn to the tapestry paragraph or the woven figured paragraph you will find that the rate of duty is 35 per cent. What I am trying to get at is that, whatever we do agree upon, there shall be no conflict hereafter upon entering the goods at the customhouse. I am not objecting at all to the rates, and am not discussing them in any way. I am simply bringing the attention of the committee to the facts of the case as I see them.

Mr. HUGHES. Of course the Senator from Utah knows how difficult it is to realize the effect of suggested language upon the floor of the Senate when engaged in attempting to pass the bill. I will say that the members of the subcommittee and of the full committee gave a great deal of consideration to just what the Senator from Utah has said, and we arrived at the conclusion that this was the best treatment of which the proposition was capable. In arriving at that conclusion we had the benefit of the advice and judgment of the officials in the appraisers' stores in New York, who are constantly handling these fabrics. It may be possible that the Senator is correct. If we had treated it as countable cotton, very expensive, fancy stuff might have come in at a very low rate of duty.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the only question that has been in my mind. If plain terry cloth should fall in a countable paragraph, it would bear a very low rate of duty.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator will pardon me, I can not think that the contention of the Senator from Utah is very well taken. I am very much inclined to think that the description that has been given here of terry cloth is so manifestly different from tapestries that the Senator's very natural fear that it might perhaps fall under that paragraph and come in conflict with it is justified.

Mr. HUGHES. Besides, we have a weight provision in the tapestry paragraph which was intended to guard against that.

Mr. LIPPITT. As a matter of fact, the terry-cloth weave is entirely distinct from any other known weave. It consists, in essence, in having a loop of yarn on top of the fabric It is distinct from what is called a pile fabric—that is, a velvet or a plush—for in the pile fabric the thread is not looped on top, and in the terry cloth it is looped on top. So it seems to me the distinction is sufficiently clear.

Mr. SMOOT. I called attention to the tapestry paragraph, because the words "Jacquard figured" appear there, as they do in two other paragraphs. Certainly in terry cloth we have woven figures, and I thought that a conflict might arise. If the Senator from New Jersey is satisfied that with the amendment which has been proposed by the committee it will be covered, well and good. My object in calling attention to it was as I have stated. If there is to be a change, it ought to be made now, so that there can be no conflict hereafter.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Utah is correct about that. I think, however, we have done as well as we could do in view of the information we had. So far as I can see, I think we treated the fabric as we intended to treat it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read paragraph 270, as follows:

270. Lace window curtains, nets, nettings, pillow shams, and bed sets, finished or unfinished, made on the Nottingham lace-curtain machine, and composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, when counting not more than 6 points or spaces between the warp threads to the inch, 35 per cent ad valorem; when counting more than 6 and not more than 8 points or spaces to the inch, 40 per cent ad valorem; when counting 9 or more points or spaces to the inch, 45 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I move to strike out the words "nets, nettings," in the first line of the paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 270, page 82, line 21, after the word "curtains," it is proposed to strike out the words "nets, nettings."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suppose that amendment is moved because of nets and nettings being enumerated in another place, and the Senator from Georgia intends that the rate in paragraph 270 shall not apply to the rate in the paragraph before named, where nets and nettings are included, so that there will be no conflict.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We shall also probably offer an amendment to the other paragraph putting a lower rate of duty on certain other cheap nettings, specifically naming them.

Mr. LIPPITT. What paragraph is that?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Paragraph 368.

Mr. HUGHES. Paragraph 368 in the sundries schedule.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is one class of nettings that is very cheap and is entirely to be distinguished from the general class. They are covered by a paragraph which we will reach later. I refer to mosquito netting. We intend to qualify that paragraph——

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator refers to the lace paragraph?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The lace paragraph. We intend to qualify that paragraph by making a distinction between the netting which falls under the lace class and mosquito netting.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 271, page 83, line 7, after the word "cotton," to strike out "or of which cotton is the component material of chief value," so as to make the paragraph read:

271. All articles made from cotton cloth, whether finished or unfinished, and all manufactures of cotton, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the committee has determined to withdraw the suggested amendment striking out that language and will leave the paragraph as the House adopted it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have prepared some amendments to the schedule which the Senate has just been considering. I have not offered any of them, but have reserved them to be offered in the Senate when we shall complete the cotton schedule in the Senate. I expect then to offer them in the form of a substitute and to submit briefly my reasons for proposing the substitute.

The Secretary proceeded to read Schedule J, flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] requested me some time ago when the flax schedule came up to ask for him that paragraphs 272, 273, 274, 275, and 276 be passed over. I do not know when the Senator will be here, but I would not have performed my duty if I had not made the request.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have the very highest regard and friendship for the Senator from Kentucky, but I do not really see why five paragraphs of a bill which 90,000,000 people are waiting on should be passed over because some Senator happens to be absent, unless there is some very peculiar reason for it.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator from Kentucky made the request, and he is not here on account of ill health. I am unprepared to say when he will be here, and I have only made the request for him. If the paragraphs to which I have referred can be reserved in some way until after the bill comes into the Senate, I think the purpose which the Senator from Kentucky has in mind may be subserved.

Mr. SIMMONS. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that if the Senator from Kentucky is not satisfied with the action as in Committee of the Whole he may offer any amendments he may desire when the bill is reported to the Senate.

Mr. KENYON. I simply felt that it was my duty to make the wishes of the Senator from Kentucky known. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, every one of the paragraphs mentioned contains an amendment carrying some article to the free list. They can be dealt with just as well when we reach the free list, provided we deal with the Senate committee amendments now. If we adopt the Senate committee amendments, we merely strike the items from the dutiable list, and later on, in paragraph 492, they are all repeated and distinctly put upon the free list; so that the Senator from Kentucky, if he has any amendments to offer, can offer them to paragraph 492 just as well as here. It seems to me it will be better to get through with these paragraphs, and then, when we reach the free list, in connection with paragraph 492, let the Senator from Kentucky, or any other Senator, offer such amendments as he may desire.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi knows that if an amendment to place flax on the dutiable list carries, then of course all of the rates in the paragraphs following must be somewhat changed. That is the only thing that I see at the present time to prevent the immediate consideration of the paragraphs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They would not be changed by this body; they might be changed in conference.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, well, the bill would hardly be balanced if a duty should be placed on flax and the other paragraphs should remain as they are.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we succeeded in taking these things off the free list, we would have to balance it in conference, I imagine. We will not undertake to balance it now.

Mr. SMOOT. It could not be balanced in conference, then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes, it could, because there is a difference between the Senate rate and the House rate on every paragraph in the flax and hemp schedule.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course it could be balanced so far as those rates were concerned; I am perfectly aware of that; but only between the rates provided by the Senate and those provided by the House. The rates could not be made lower or higher than prescribed by either House.

Mr. SIMMONS. For the very reason the Senator from Utah has given we want at the outset these paragraphs passed upon before we go to the remainder of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what I say. That is the position I take—that we ought to pass upon these paragraphs.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is necessary to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The discussion is taking up more time than anything else. I will agree to pass over temporarily the paragraphs indicated. I am informed the Senator from Kentucky is quite sick. That fact I did not know.

Mr. HUGHES. Then we can not go on with the remainder of the schedule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why not? Let us show some common sense.

Mr. KENYON. I will communicate with the Senator from Kentucky this afternoon or to-morrow morning and advise him of the suggestions in the debate and that his rights will be protected, and I will inform the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have agreed that those paragraphs be passed over until we finish this schedule. I should like to have the remainder of the schedule read and acted upon.

SENATOR FROM ALABAMA.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to present the certificate of appointment from the governor of Alabama of Hon. HENRY D. CLAYTON to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator JOHNSTON. Inasmuch as there is some difference of opinion in the Senate as to the governor's authority to make this appoinment I move that the credentials or the certificate of appointment be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I should like, however, to have the certificate read and printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States of America:

A vacancy having happened in the Senate of the United States of America by reason of the death of JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON, a Senator of the United States of America from the State of Alabama, and the legislature of said State being now in recess;

Now, therefore, I, Emmet O'Neal, as governor of the State of Alabama, have this day appointed, and do by these presents appoint and commission, HENRY D. CLAYTON a Senator of the United States of America from the State of Alabama to fill the vacancy which happened by the death of JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON, said HENRY D. CLAYTON possessing all of the qualifications required by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America and the constitution and laws of the State of Alabama.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand as governor of the State of Alabama and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed at the capitol in the city of Montgomery this 12th day of August, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] EMMET O'NEAL, *Governor.*

By the governor:

CYRUS B. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the certificate be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

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 Secretary proceeded to read paragraph 277.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I desire to say that I think it would be very much better if we could consider the first five paragraphs of the flax and hemp schedule before taking up the remainder of it. I do not think the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] would be in any way prejudiced, because he could move his amendments and his arguments when we reach the free list; and if not satisfied to do that, he would have the right to offer amendments in the Senate. I trust the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] will withdraw his objection to our proceeding regularly with this schedule.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I merely wanted to make known to the Senate the wishes of the Senator from Kentucky. I think the course suggested will be entirely satisfactory to and will protect the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Meanwhile, Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has gone to have a talk over the telephone with the Senator from Kentucky, and if he objects to what we have done I will then ask that the paragraphs be passed over.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, may I ask if the Senator from Kentucky should want the paragraphs reconsidered for the purpose of offering amendments, would the Senator from Mississippi be willing that they should be reconsidered in order that the Senator from Kentucky may present the matter which he desires to present?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Kentucky chooses to put his motion in that way, yes; but that would be totally unnecessary. When we reach the free list, the Senator from Kentucky can merely move to transfer a certain article from that place to a previous place in the bill with a certain tax, or he can offer his amendment to the free list itself.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if he has determined to go on with Schedule J this afternoon?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; we desire to go on with Schedule J this afternoon.

Mr. McCUMBER. I desire to offer some amendments to that schedule, commencing almost at the very beginning, with paragraph 272. I have not prepared the amendments, but I suppose, if the Senator insists on going on with this schedule, that I can offer them as we reach each paragraph. I should prefer, however, that it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. SIMMONS. The difficulty about that is that there has been some arrangement that the other schedules would not be taken up this afternoon, and we should have nothing to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from North Dakota can offer any amendment he desires.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. I have not had time to run through the bill since I returned, but I notice paragraph 272 is stricken out entirely. I presume, therefore, that the item covered by that paragraph is placed on the free list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is covered by paragraph 492 in the free list.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is transferred to the free list. Then the parliamentary inquiry—I do not know under what rule we have been proceeding up to this time—is whether or not committee amendments are first to be considered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That depends upon what amendment the Senator from North Dakota desires to propose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The rule we have been following is this: If the committee amendment was to strike out an entire paragraph, then an amendment to the bill as it came from the House would have precedence, of course, so as to perfect the paragraph in that way if the Senate chose to do so; but where the committee amendment was in itself merely a change, instead of a substitution or an elimination, then the committee amendment has preference. If the Senator has an amendment to the House provision changing a rate of duty, or something of that kind, it would have precedence of the committee amendment which strikes out the entire paragraph.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I will offer my amendment at the present time, and that will bring the question to the point.

I move to amend paragraph 272, so that it will read:

Flax, not hackled or dressed, 1 cent per pound.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 272, page 83, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the fraction "½" and the word "of," so that if amended it will read:

Flax, not hackled or dressed, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course the Senator knows that flax is not raised anywhere in this country except for flaxseed.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is mistaken. We are raising flax in this country the fiber of which is being used, and used quite extensively. It is not used for the finer fabrics; but this covers everything in the nature of a flax fiber.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is it used for?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is used for packing in refrigerator cars; it is used for making paper.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not decorticated and sold as flax anywhere in the United States?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is sold as flax, not hackled or dressed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator means the stalk is sold?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Mississippi understands what the hackling is, and the dressing?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course it is shipped into this country under all of these conditions; and without any duty flax straw, flax, not hackled or dressed, from foreign countries, will come into competition with the same character of flax straw produced in this country.

I think I can better indicate to the Senator just what there is in this whole flax question if I submit to the Senate certain letters written by Mr. Blehdon, who is a manufacturer of this product in several of the States of the United States. They are addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Finance, and also addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. Mr. Blehdon goes quite thoroughly into the question; and while the language he uses is not that which I would naturally adopt myself, there is nothing in the language that would make any of it at all objectionable.

With the permission of the Senate, I ask the Secretary to read the marked portions of the letter which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. McCUMBER. The first letter that I will send up is one addressed to Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

The Secretary read as follows:

(Schedule J, flax, etc. No. 333, flax straw, $5 per ton. No. 336, tow of flax, $20 per ton.)

BUFFALO, N. Y., *March 21, 1913.*

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: On the 25th day of January I appeared before your committee, as per record page 3503 to 3507, inclusive.

I appeared as the chosen representative of 32 towns in North Dakota and Minnesota, their commercial clubs, manufacturers of tow, and the farmers as sellers of flax straw or owners of small tow mills.

I then submitted a lot of petitions, with many signatures, and since that time there has been submitted direct from the farmers and myself a very large number of petitions and signatures, all praying that in order that they may sell their flax straw the present duty on the same may be continued, to wit, $5 a ton of 2,000 pounds on flax straw, and that the present duty of $20 per ton on tow, which is made out of flax straw, be sustained and continued, for if no tow can be made in this country the flax straw can not be sold.

Tow is used for upholstering furniture and lining of refrigerator cars, and thousands and thousands of tons of straw are bought of the farmers at from $3 to $9 a ton.

Canada raises as much straw as the United States, and Russia raises many times more; and as the wages in Canada are only one-half and in Russia about one-sixth what they are in America, and as flax straw can be bought over there at one-half the price, the farmers could not sell their straw, and thereby would be deprived of many hundreds of thousands of dollars, some farmers having 10 tons for sale, some a few thousand tons.

The selling of flax straw is an absolute necessity to the farmers in order to make the raising of flax, as it is called by them, profitable, and the United States Agricultural Department has for the last few years made great efforts to encourage the raising of flax.

Of course, were the duty taken off or in any considerable way lowered the farmers could not compete, for they have to pay to hired men during seeding and harvesting from $3 to $5 a day, whereas the same labor can be had in foreign countries for from one-sixth to one-fifth the price.

In good years about 3,000,000 tons of flax straw is raised in the United States, for which there was no market in the past until tow mills were built about 30 years ago, and about 5 years ago the car-lining factories were started to line refrigerator cars with tow, and by this the icing of railroad fruit cars between California and the East has been reduced to one icing where formerly, when charcoal, cattle hair, and cork were used, three icings were necessary.

The farmers in the Northwest are very much concerned that the duty should remain.

The price of tow ranges from $25 to $60 and even $80 per ton for best qualities; for the making of flax straw into tow it takes from 3 to 6 tons of straw to make 1 ton of coarse or fine tow, some of the straw having to run from two to five times through brakes, pickers, shakers, all driven by steam or electricity, and from 12 to 50 men are employed in tow mills.

Two concerns at St. Paul, Minn., and Port Huron, Mich., and several others, make binder twine out of American flax straw.

The said flax straw is raised in the States of North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio, and in some of the States large sums are now invested to manufacture wrapping and writing paper out of American flax straw.

Now, therefore, the raising of flax, or flax straw as it should be technically called, should certainly be protected in order to make a great industry out of it, as it will be in time.

Some of the witnesses before you on the 24th and 25th of January—those connected with the Barbour Co., at Allentown and Paterson, and several other concerns who manufacture thread—had the temerity to say that no good flax for spinning is raised in the United States; whereas, as a matter of fact, the States of Michigan and Ohio, and some parts of Wisconsin, and even in Minnesota, raise flax straw which is perfectly fit for spinning; but it is not encouraged by these big firms who manufacture and make prices on thread, and they prefer for some reason to import European flax, because it is cheaper than it could be produced here under American labor wages.

The Barbour Co. has imported many, many cars of finished flax from Canada, which was imported as not hackled, and experts had to be called in to relieve the minds of the United States collectors—in preference to importing it from Europe—when they and their friends talk of Belgium and Russian spinning flax being the best.

One man by the name of Mr. Loughlin (p. 3484) states that Canadian flax is the poorest he has ever seen, and no good; whereas the Barbour Co., who make some of the finest articles, use it by the carload, importing it via Suspension Bridge.

I never heard of "flax dressers" in this country, unless they were employed by some of these million-dollar concerns who make prices.

These tremendous monopolies or corporations do not care what happens to the farmer as long as they get their tremendous profits, and not for the world would they want to have a reduction on finished thread, or their goods, but they want what they call flax straw and tow on the free list.

As a matter of fact, tow can not be used for spinning, for it is used only for upholstering, refrigerator-car linings, wrapping and writing paper.

Flax for spinning is not a raw material at all, for it takes great labor and large expense to make long spinning flax out of flax straw; for, as I said, flax straw is worth from $3 to $9 a ton, whereas long spinning flax is worth from $250 to $350 a ton.

Now, look at the statement of the United States Linen Co., Chicago, who came before you and told you honestly that it is false that no spinning flax can be raised in this country. (See p. 3490.) They declare these statements as false and unfounded; and I, with great respect for your committee, and with truth and honesty, do declare these statements false, and I say:

Gentlemen of the committee, give the farmers of the United States a chance to raise the same flax straw as they do in Europe, and they can raise it, and they will raise it, as the United States Linen Co. tells you, and as the International Flax Twine Co., of Chicago, who make binder twine, could tell you; but the farmers must be given a chance, that with the high wages they have to pay in this country the duty will remain to protect them and not open the country to these millionaire thread and twine manufacturers.

Less than 40 years ago all the flax straw raised in the United States was burned; now the Amenia & Sharon Land Co., of Amenia, N. Dak., and others, have imported thousands of bushels of Russian and Irish flaxseed to this country and have sold it to the farmers, and are now raising flax straw, some of it a yard long and as good as they do in foreign countries; and they will do more, and the United States will raise flax straw and flax as good as others; and the farmers therefore pray for protection that the duty remain as it is.

I have the honor to be,

Yours, very respectfully,

V. R. BLEHDON,

Representing the flax-raising States in the Northwest, as per petitions and thousands of signatures turned over to the clerk of your committee, Mr. Daniel C. Rover.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to call the attention of the Senators in charge of this part of the bill to paragraph 492 of the free list and to the alleged reproduction of the present law.

Paragraph 334, which deals with this particular item in the present law, reads, as given in the handbook:

Flax, not hackled or dressed, ½ of 1 cent per pound.

The present law really reads:

Flax, not hackled or dressed, 1 cent per pound.

So, in attempting to reproduce the present law they have simply cut the duty in two, while it is alleged to be the present law. Does the Senator observe that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. BRISTOW. That is a clerical error, is it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Undoubtedly. It is either an error of the clerk or an error of the printer, or of somebody.

Mr. BRISTOW. Again, if the Senator will notice bracket 2, which relates to the duties collected on this particular item, it gives the equivalent ad valorem for 1905 as 8.59 per cent, for 1910 as 7.97 per cent, for 1912 as 7.21 per cent, and then estimates 3.67 per cent as the duty to be collected under this bill. That estimate is based upon the bill as it came from the House, is it, and not as it came from the Senate committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Undoubtedly. Of course, there will be no revenue the way it comes from the Senate committee. Nothing in the shape of revenue could come from an article on the free list.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, under the old law a duty of $5 per ton, I believe, was levied upon flax straw. A duty of $20 per ton, or 1 cent per pound, was levied upon hackled flax; that is, flax broken and partly stripped so that it might be advanced to a stage necessary to separate the fiber from the pulp.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the old law there was a tax on the tow of flax of $20 per ton. The tax upon hackled flax, known as "dressed line," was 3 cents a pound.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not the figures here; but it must be remembered that as the first process applied to the flax if it is to be used for spinning purposes, I presume it would have to be pulled. That is not done in this country at all. We are not attempting to raise flax to any great extent, at least, for the purpose of spinning into yarn for making the finer fabrics. Whether we shall ever be able to do so or not I can not say.

I have in my office several samples of a new process whereby instead of retting or rotting the flax there is a machine used that will take the ordinary flax straw which has passed through a separator and will break the woody pulp so that it can be released from the fiber; and it is said that flax fiber from a foot to 18 inches long may be produced from it, and that fiber might be used for ordinary spinning. But I have not as yet received any samples or any information that would justify me in the assumption that that can be made a success in this country. The great expense in the preparation of the flax straw and converting it into the fiber is in the retting process, in which it must be laid out in the sun and rain until the woody pulp is rotted and may be easily removed. The sections of the United States where flax is produced in the greatest abundance are the drier sections of the country, where this could not be done successfully. The cost of labor in this country is so high that it could not be successfully conducted.

What I am principally interested in is the flax straw and the flax which is converted into a kind of tow in all of the small mills, many of them owned by the farmers themselves, scattered throughout the two Dakotas and Minnesota and some in Michigan, whereby the flax straw, after the seed itself has been separated, has a marketable value. It passes through the separator; then these little mills take that product, and while they do not do any retting they at least have a process whereby they separate the woody pulp from the fiber and produce a very short fibered product, a product that is wholly unfit for the higher grades of spinning, and yet is fitted for the purposes for which it is used—to some extent for the manufacture of twine or rope and to a great extent for packing in refrigerator cars, the making of paper, and like purposes.

The farmer ordinarily receives about $3 a ton for his flax. He is at least furnished a market for his product wherever there is a mill in the vicinity and near enough at hand to justify the trouble and expense of hauling it to market. It is well said to be "the poor man's money." Ordinarily if the farmer is doing reasonably well he can find better employment than hauling flax to market at $3 per ton. But in cases of drought, when his crops fail him, when his flax does not fill well, he may make up to a certain extent by hauling this product to market and receiving a little sum of money for it—probably at least enough to take care of his taxes.

I want a protection—I will call it a protection, if you see fit—if not upon the straw itself, at least upon the product which comes from the straw. This process converts it into tow. As is shown in the letter of Mr. Blehdon, who is a manufacturer, that tow is worth from $18 to $20 per ton, I think. It is worth that for the purposes for which it is to be used. It is worth nothing for spinning purposes. Therefore nobody can be benefited in the matter of cheaper linen fabrics by reason of a reduction of the duty on this class of tow.

If you could so amend your bill as to make the duty applicable to the character of low-priced tow, which is unfitted for the manufacture of linen fabrics, I should not seriously oppose the other portions of the paragraph. But certainly there ought to be a protection for that.

Will these mills run without it? The protection on tow, I believe, as given by the House, is $10 per ton—one-half what it

was before. From the very best information I can obtain the mills may yet run and produce and will be able to do so with that protection. From the same very best information, unless they have that protection they will be compelled to close, on account of the introduction into this country of the same material from Russia and from Canada.

I wish to save that much out of this bill for the benefit of the farmers of my State and the two adjoining States. North Dakota produces perhaps half of all the flax produced in the United States, while Minnesota and South Dakota produce practically the other half.

I desire also to present and have read another letter, written by Mr. Bolley, dean of and botanist in the Agricultural College of North Dakota. I had marked only certain sections, as he referred in one of the sections to his own political affiliations; but I do not know but that it may be proper to insert all of the letter. So I will ask that the entire letter may be read, prefacing the reading with the statement that there is perhaps no man in the United States who is better acquainted with the flax conditions of the country than is Mr. Bolley, of the Agricultural College of North Dakota, and he speaks as an expert upon the question.

It has been claimed here that we can not produce the long-fibered flax in this country. We can produce it, but under present conditions we can not afford to produce it. That is the real answer to that proposition. Were the protection sufficient to justify the employment of labor, we could furnish in this country all of the fiber that would be needed for all of the products of flax fiber in the United States. I am well aware that as a Republican Congress has not given us sufficient protection to do that I can hardly expect a Democratic Congress to go beyond a Republican Congress and give us that protection. But I do ask—and I think I am justified in asking—that they will so amend this schedule that all of the lower priced short-fibered flax may be protected to the extent of $10 per ton.

I will now ask to have read the letter from Mr. Bolley.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say to the Secretary that he may read it all.

The Secretary read as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE AND
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT EXPERIMENT STATION,
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY,
Agricultural College, N. Dak., April 8, 1913.

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will pardon me, an experiment-station worker, for a short letter as to the interests of the flax and hemp industry.

That you may not think of me as a high protectionist, let me say I cast my first vote for Grover Cleveland the first term, but have not seen fit to vote for high protection any time since. However, our country seems to have adopted the system of raising a part of its revenues by tariffs rather than by direct legislation. Just in so far as it places a tariff upon one part of an industry while it leaves the other on the free list just that far our Government militates against the latter industry or part.

As an experiment-station worker I have spent a large portion of 20 years of my life in studying the best interests of the flax crop, with a view to helping our farmers retain that crop as a permanent one. I have visited every flax-cropping region in Europe and studied their methods.

In the interests of the farmers of the Northwest who have now learned how to do this line of work in agriculture, I hope you will not grant the wishes of the thread manufacturers and linen manufacturers of this country—that is, the right of retaining the duty on their manufactured products and at the same time grant their request to place the farmers' products—flax straw and flax tow, and hackled and unhackled flax—on the free list, or anything like near it. If the manufacturers are to retain their present protection, it is hardly fair to say to the American farmer: "On everything you have to wear and all the tools you have to work with in raising the flax crop we will tax you," and at the same time say to him, "If you succeed in raising anything we will give your product to the manufacturer free of tariff tax."

I have read the tariff hearings on Schedule J with a great deal of interest and find that most of the arguments by Messrs. Barbour, Starling, Loughlin, and others, so far as they indicate or say that flax for fiber purposes can not be grown in America in as good quality as in any country in the world, that they are either mistaken, do not know what they are talking about, or, which is more likely, are willfully perverting the truth.

Whenever the farmers of the northern portions of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and many parts of Oregon, Washington, and Maine, or any of the wetter regions of the Central States, wish to raise fiber flax for fiber purposes they produce a quality as good as any produced anywhere in Europe.

My hope is that in whatever way you change the present tariff conditions with reference to Schedule J you will give the farmer his just share of the protection, if there is to be any.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy for men who would like to have products which they work upon brought in free of duty to call the products which the American farmer is able to produce "rubbish," to make assertions that such products are "worthless," to say that "nothing can be grown," etc.

I am sure you take such assertions for what they are worth when you remember that the American soil and climate produce in rather high perfection any of those products for which the American market gives a fair remuneration.

Under other cover I send you copies of certain bulletins and pamphlets, which I hope may in part indicate to you my interest in this subject.

Hoping you will pardon me for writing to you uninvited, I am,
Yours, respectfully,

HENRY L. BOLLEY, *Dean and Botanist.*

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there are some pertinent questions asked in that letter of the majority side of the Senate. There are important questions asked, and I would be greatly pleased if the chairman of the Committee on Finance would inform us why, while giving at least some protection, while levying a certain tariff upon the products of the mills, there should be at the same time free material given to the mills. Any Senator on the other side can answer. I ask my question, of course, of the chairman, but if the Senator from Mississippi will do me the honor of answering the question I shall be pleased to have an answer to it from that source.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hesitated about replying, because I doubted that the Senator was seriously asking the question at this part of the debate. That question has been asked in one form or another five, six, or seven times, and it has been answered five, six, or seven times. We have chosen to put the textile raw material upon the free list, because thereby we were enabled to make still greater deductions than we otherwise could have made in the finished product.

Mr. McCUMBER. For whose benefit?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If you count the amount of dollars we have taken off the raw material instead of the mere percentage and the amount of dollars we have taken off the finished product, the Senator will find we have not discriminated in favor of the latter as against the former. Of course, from the Senator's standpoint as a protectionist it is not worth the snap of a finger, but from our standpoint it is worth a great deal to us. At any rate, it justifies us, in our opinion.

Now, take this question of flax. As the Senator has well said, we could raise all the Irish flax for the world in the United States if we wanted to. Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky can raise it as well as South and North Dakota and Minnesota. I remember, when I was a boy, seeing long Irish flax growing. As a matter of curiosity my father planted it to see whether he could grow it or not. But when it comes to the question of decorticating it it is utterly impossible to do it in the United States and get a flax fiber fit for spinning. We can raise flax fit for spinning, but we can not get flax fiber to spin without costing us a great deal more than it would be justifiable, even from a protectionist's standpoint, to levy a duty.

The Senator himself just a moment ago confessed that to be true, because he says that the high protection party in this country, going as high as they ever dared, have never yet dared to put a duty high enough to enable the American farmer to compete in the question of decorticating or retting the flax with India and with a great many other parts of the world.

Now that I am about it, because I do not want to occupy any time and I wish to give the Senator the conclusion of the discussion, if every statement made by the writer of the first letter he had read were a reliable one, I think he must be a very reckless man when he makes that statement. He says that labor is twice as high as in the countries near us which will compete with us in flax, and that is in connection with straw of flax and tow of flax. Of course, the writer of that letter knew that labor in America was not twice as high as it was in Canada. Of course, he knew that a product that was worth only from $3 to $3.75 a ton can not be hauled either by rail or by road or by water any long distance without consuming its entire value in the market. So much for that.

The letter writer confesses that we made about 3,000,000 tons last year of this flax—straw and tow. We imported about 170 tons of one and not much of the other; I have forgotten how much of the other.

Mr. President, once for all I will state the reason why we have put the raw materials of the textile industry on the free list. The Senator must remember that cotton was already there and jute was already there. We have placed hemp and flax and wool there that we might have an opportunity of cheapening the finished product to the consumer of the finished product. The difference between reducing the duty upon a finished product and upon the raw material is this: If I reduce the duty upon the finished product such and such a percentage, amounting to so many cents, say 3 cents in the yard, I have reduced the price to the consumer only 3 cents in the yard. But if I take off the duty upon the raw material I have taken off all the intermediate profit of from 15 to 25 per cent at each stage of the process. I have taken off all the compensating duties which are piled on plus something or other at each

stage of the manufacture. So if the part of the final cost which the raw material would make were 5 cents a yard, of course, when I have taken the tax off the raw material I have reduced the tax upon the finished material 20 to 25 cents a yard. That is just as an illustration.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think I have the position of the Senator pretty will in mind. It is this as applied to the particular subject which I am discussing: He reduces the tariff 100 per cent on the farmer's finished product for the benefit of the manufacturer and then gives a reasonable protection to the manufacturer to the end that the farmer may get the thing that the manufacturer has produced from it somewhat cheaper. In other words, the farmer's protection is taken away from the tow that comes from his flax and from the flax, so that the farmer will be able to buy his refrigerator cars at a less rate, because the principal purpose for which the product I am speaking of is used is for upholstering and for the packing of refrigerating cars.

Now, just how the farmer is going to get any benefit out of that and just how the public is going to get any benefit out of it I do not know.

I will admit that the manufacturer of refrigerating cars will undoubtedly receive a benefit. The upholsterer of car seats will undoubtedly reap some benefit. But I fail yet to see—as I have failed to see anywhere in this bill—where the farmer will get a special benefit from placing everything that he produces practically on the free list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, does the Senator from North Dakota pretend that flax straw, about which he is talking, could possibly come here from any country in the world except Canada?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; I take it——

Mr. WILLIAMS. You contend, then, that an article worth $3 to $6 a ton could bear transportation from India to somewhere else?

Mr. McCUMBER. From Russia; yes. A great deal of it from Siberia and Russia could be baled and used for ballast in many of the Pacific ships, as is shown by the letter of Mr. Blehdon and by experts who speak upon the subject. I assume that they know whereof they are speaking.

Now, I am not dealing here with the long-fiber flax straw. If the Senator believes that the American public will buy their linen clothing and their linen fabrics, their tablecloths, their towels, and so forth, any cheaper because of the reduction in what he calls the raw material, I can see some reason why in that case he might favor it. I do not believe they will get any benefit whatever, because of the fact that the tax upon what he calls the raw material is such a mere bagatelle that it will not be taken into consideration and will form no part of the retail price of the article into which it enters. It is the retail price that the public must always deal with. But admitting the argument that they will get some benefit in that respect—which I do not believe—no one will get any benefit of the reduction of the duty upon this short-fiber straw that I am seeking to perpetuate the old duty upon, and which is not used for any of these fabrics. I am asking that this and this only may be placed upon the old condition for the benefit of that farming element, every shred of whose protection you have taken away by this bill under the assumption that the thing that he produces is somebody else's raw material. Yes, it is; but it is his finished product, and he is just as much entitled to proper protection upon his finished product as is the manufacturer upon his finished product. It is the height of injustice to say to him "You shall have no protection, whereas the manufacturer shall have protection," when you take into consideration the further fact that his profits are a mere bagatelle in the operation of his business as compared with the profits of the manufacturer. The labor that produces his articles is not paid one-quarter, hour for hour, what the labor is paid that produces the other articles. If there is any man upon the face of the earth who deserves a protection for his labor, it is the farmer. If there is any woman upon the face of the earth who deserves a protection for her labor, it is the farmer's wife and daughter. When you take their product and cast it to the winds as mere rubbish of raw material that must be taken possession of, and immediately it becomes gold the moment city labor handles it, then you do rank injustice to that farmer.

First, he must purchase his land. He has got to purchase that land with a mortgage upon four-fifths of his working life before he will ever become the owner of it. He must then plow and break and grub out and care for that land. He must pay his taxes upon it. In the spring he must seed and harrow and care for it. In the harvest he must cut his grain and thrash it and plow up the land for another season. If the bushels which he produces, if the straw which he produces are not a finished product, then I fail to understand what on earth is a finished product, and I fail to understand why he should not have the same consideration as any other American citizen.

I picked up to-day, Mr. President, a copy of the Modern Miller, and in the Modern Miller I found a quotation from the Department of Agriculture, in which it gave the average farm earnings in the United States. It gave the method by which it was arrived at, and it was ascertained, without going into the particulars, that the average farmer and his family earn net $318 a year. Net $318 a year divided up among the family, which would generally represent at least five adult persons, would mean about $62 a year each, which, reduced down to months would be something over $4 per month. Now, you take that man and take that family; you take that character of American labor, and you say they are not worth any consideration whatever; that what God made them for is to produce something for the manufacturer to make, that their products are simply raw material to be utilized by the intelligent labor of the city.

I protest against that form of reasoning. I have but one desire, and that desire is to make the earning capacity of the farmer, with a given amount of labor, equal the earning capacity of the best paid labor in the United States, and until it reaches that point the farmer is the last man upon the face of the earth to be discriminated against.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If under the protective system the average farmer makes only $318 a year, have you not delivered a most unanswerable indictment against the system?

Mr. McCUMBER. If under the protective system he gets but $318 a year, under a free-trade system, which is to take up his markets and divide the only markets he has with the entire world, is he to be benefited and get more?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why not leave it to the future and to the operation of this bill to show that it will benefit the farmer, to show that it will increase his earnings because it will increase his markets and the volume of his business?

Mr. McCUMBER. If it will benefit the farmer and increase the value of his products, your bill is a deception to the general public, because you are going to give them cheaper bread, cheaper fruit, cheaper clothing, cheaper everything else that is manufactured from the products of the farm, and how on earth you are going to give cheaper products and at the same time increase the value of the farm products is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It will make the purchaser of the farm products in this country so much more able to buy them, to buy so much more of these articles, that we will have a relative decrease in the cost of living.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is answering somewhat around in a circle. You will make the laborer's wages better than they were before. If you make the laborer's wages so much better than they were before, I assume that you have got to maintain the present prices of the products.

I can scarcely conceive of a condition whereby you are about to raise the value of labor and at the same time decrease the value of the product. If you raise the value of the product which the farmer must buy, I still fail to see how he is going to be greatly benefited by it when you at the same time cheapen the product which he sells.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In every great American enterprise success depends on lowering the price on the individual sale and increasing the volume of business. You can take, for instance, the rate of carriage on a railroad per person or per ton of freight. It is smaller than it was when the road was first established, but the profits of the carrier are much larger than they were before, because the volume of business has increased and in greater proportion than the profit per individual transaction.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes, Mr. President. Then if the human stomach to-day will digest a barrel and a quarter of flour, next year, when flour is cheaper, it will digest two barrels.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are willing to be judged by the results that this bill will develop.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But perhaps a man who does not now get enough flour may get some then. The Senator generally seems to forget that the man who has not had an opportunity to digest a barrel and a quarter, may get half of a barrel.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, I can see some philosophy in that, because when you were applying the same rule somewhere about 16 or 17 years ago, when one-third of the labor of the country was out of employment, I found that the American public per capita really ate the product of only about 3.43 bushels of wheat. You are now pursuing the same policy, which reduced

the consumption from 6 bushels to 3.43 bushels—as I now remember during the worst season of that time—and contending that the same rule which decreased it 18 years ago will suddenly increase it now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And all that under the beneficent operation of the McKinley law.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; that did not occur under the beneficent operation of the McKinley law; it did not occur until about the year 1895. The smallest per capita consumption of wheat in the United States there had ever been was, I think, in that year. I may be mistaken as to one or two of the years; but it was during that time. The consumption of wheat fell off very materially from 1893.

Let us remember that while the bill itself which lowered the duties did not go into effect until the middle of the year the conditions which would naturally precede the bill, with a knowledge of its provisions, came into existence as soon as that was made certain.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why are not those conditions preceding the passage of this bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. They are.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the same sort of bill. This country was never so prosperous in its history as it is to-day.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am very glad that question has been raised to-day. There is no reason on earth but the present conditions that will wholly account for the lower price of cereals throughout the Northwest. They are lower to-day, as a rule, than they have been for many years, and they have been lower during the last year than they have been at any time since the Cleveland administration. Why is it? To be fair, I will answer a part of it——

Mr. WILLIAMS. At what time last year were they lower?

Mr. McCUMBER. A part of it is due to the fact that we raised a very abundant crop of cereals in the Northwest last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A part of it is due to the fact that you are predicting upon the crop of this year.

Mr. McCUMBER. The other part of it is due to the fact of the lack of confidence throughout the country and the fear of what will follow as the result of your tariff legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When was this wheat price which you state was lower than it had been since Cleveland's administration?

Mr. McCUMBER. It has been lower on all of the 1912 crop. I refer to the price of cereals as a whole.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The 1912 crop?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; the 1912 crop.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And who was President then?

Mr. McCUMBER. In the 1912 crop?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, the crop is here yet.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The crop is here yet.

Mr. McCUMBER. The crop is being now sold.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I thought the Senator referred to the prices in 1912.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have a vivid recollection of who is President now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought the Senator said the prices in 1912 were lower.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I said the prices of the 1912 crop.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You meant the prices now, then?

Mr. McCUMBER. The prices that have taken effect since the production of the 1912 crop, commencing along, we will say, in December of 1912.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In December, 1912?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, how much lower have the prices been than they were in the preceding year?

Mr. McCUMBER. The preceding crop?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I mean, how much have the prices been lower?

Mr. McCUMBER. For the same grades they have been really about 25 cents a bushel lower on wheat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the estimated increase of the production—what percentage?

Mr. McCUMBER. The estimated increase in the United States was about 100,000,000 bushels.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What percentage would that have constituted?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is on a basis of 600,000,000 bushels. I am giving the round numbers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A little over 16 per cent.

Mr. McCUMBER. The average crop, we will say, is about 650,000,000 bushels.

But the real question that I am asking the Senator is, Why not maintain the present rates upon that character of flax fiber which is fitted only for the purposes mentioned in the letters which have been read to you? Will the Senator give me a reason for not doing so?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought I had given it to the Senator. The Senator says that it is useful for some purpose or other. It does not make any difference to me; whatever it is useful for, it will make that cheaper.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, in the Senator's opinion, it will make refrigerator cars cheaper and it will make car seats cheaper, and the farmer, who suffers, will get an equivalent benefit in lower rates of freight and in lower passenger rates.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, now, I do not think the Senator from North Dakota will undertake to make the statement that if you enable a man to fit up a refrigerator car for less money in the long run, if not in the short run, the man who ships products in refrigerator cars would not get the benefit of that any more than the Senator would take the opposite course and assert that you might make the price of refrigerating as high as you please, and the only man to suffer would be the man with the refrigerator car. The Senator knows as well as I do that in the long run the users of a thing, whether they are farmers shipping wheat and flax or what not, pay for the thing which they use to transport their products.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish I could entirely agree with that; it would ease my fears upon a great many subjects; but I have seen Congress take 20 per cent off sugar as it came in from Cuba, and I have seen the refiners put millions of dollars into their pockets without benefiting the public at all. The refiners bought their sugar cheaper, undoubtedly, in Cuba, because we had thrown off 20 per cent; but I did not see the dear American people getting any especial benefit from it. So where refrigerating cars are manufactured only by a very few concerns, always acting in conjunction and asking practically the same price, I am not looking for a reduction in the price of those articles owing to the fact that you have taken off the farmer's tariff upon a load of flax straw.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCUMBER. In just a moment. Again, it was said that if we would take off the duty on hides, something from which the farmer undoubtedly got a little benefit, the dear American people would all have cheaper shoes. We took off the duty under very strong pressure from the administration and with the assistance of the Democratic Party, and the result was that shoes and leather went up about 10 per cent. So, I am skeptical either in the short run or in the long run of the farmers of my State getting a benefit that will be commensurate with their losses following the destruction and closing up of the tow mills.

I now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. I am interested in the Senator's discussion of this subject, because my State stands next to his own in the production of flax, a fact which the Senator seems to have overlooked, having accorded that honor to the State of South Dakota. Accordingly, I am interested to learn from the Senator just exactly where the competition is which he so much dreads in the matter of flax straw.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there will not be so much competition in the raw straw. The reason for that is, as already suggested by the Senator from Mississippi, that it would scarcely pay to haul the straw any great distance; it will scarcely pay to ship it any great distance by rail; but that which is produced from the straw can be hauled and used for ballast for almost nominal rates; and paragraph 273 deals with the hackled flax, with that partly manufactured. It will pay to ship the manufactured article. It is now being brought in from Canada, and we have had some very close legal questions as to what constituted hackled straw and what constituted broken straw. Some of the Canadian firms were simply shipping in their hackled straw and calling it by another name, such as "broken flax," so as to escape the $20 per ton charge. If you continue the flax straw to still another degree of manufacture, you will easily see that you will then have placed enough value upon it so that it will be profitable to ship it here from any place in Canada or from Russia, and if you destroy our home mills, so that they will not be kept running, then the foreigners will have, of course, a monopoly of the market, and without the protection of an adequate duty they will ship it in in a hackled form.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, that is a very lengthy answer to a simple question as to where the competition is to come from.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator's question was deserving, I thought, of an answer that would sufficiently explain the conditions so as to make the matter clear.

Mr. WALSH. I have been an earnest student of this question, and I am seeking further light now. I apprehend that the Senator is not contending at all that factories across the line in the Canadian Provinces afford any burdensome competition to the mills on this side in the manufacture of flax tow from flax straw.

Mr. McCUMBER. In one section of the country there is very little competition, so far as the straw is concerned, but the Canadians will become great competitors, and, in my opinion, will obtain a monopoly of the production of the hackled straw for use in the American market.

Mr. WALSH. Could the Senator tell me, then, of some mill in the Provinces adjacent to his State or to my own State that will come into competition with either the flax straw or the tow produced in those States?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, those States are not the only States that are in competition with the Canadian Provinces. The larger amount of flax straw imported into the United States is not from northwestern Canada.

Mr. WALSH. Evidently not.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is from the eastern section of Canada. Therefore it would not come into direct competition with the product of the States to which the Senator has referred; but if it should come in free, without taking into consideration the freight that will be necessary to bring the product from the Dakotas to the eastern market, they could drive us out of the market. I do not understand that there are any tow mills in northwestern Canada at all. There may be some, but I am not informed of it if there are.

Mr. WALSH. Then, is the Senator able to advise us just what the difference is between the cost of flax straw which comes into this country from anywhere in the Canadian Provinces and the price of flax straw in the Dakotas and in Montana?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the flax straw produced in Canada that comes in competition with the flax straw and the hackled flax produced in the United States is produced in the eastern section of Canada, contiguous to the mills where it is manufactured into tow. Without the duty the Canadian product would obtain possession of the American market, and we could not compete with them.

Mr. WALSH. Well, what are the facts about the matter, and where are the figures in relation to the price of flax tow or flax straw, we will say, in the Province of Quebec?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have been giving them in the letters which have been read from a manufacturer of flax tow. If the Senator will read the two letters, he will find considerable information in them.

Mr. WALSH. I have read the letters with care, and I had a duplicate of the last letter presented by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator asks me what it costs to produce flax straw in any place in the United States or in Canada, he is asking me a question that is not susceptible of an answer.

Mr. WALSH. Then, upon what basis does the Senator ask for the protective tariff, for which he is pleading?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have here another letter from Mr. Blehdon. He seems to have been persistent in the presentation of this case to the committees of the House and of the Senate, because the action proposed strikes to the death a business which he has built up through long years of labor. He would not use the language that he does use in the letters unless he felt it was a serious matter to his business. I now offer another letter, dated April 12, written to Hon. OSCAR UNDERWOOD by Mr. Blehdon, and I will simply ask the Secretary to read the marked portions, leaving out that part which I have indicated to be omitted.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like to ask the Senator one question before that letter is read.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. The letter, as I understand, is from the same gentleman whose letters the Senator had read a little while ago. In one of those letters he stated, as I caught it, that the labor cost of reducing flax straw in Canada was one-half of what it is in this country. I want to ask the Senator if he believes that statement?

Mr. McCUMBER. I believe that that is practically true in eastern Canada. Remember that in this letter Mr. Blehdon is dealing with the straw which comes in competition with the American straw which he receives. If I were speaking of what we call the Canadian northwest, I would say frankly that I think there is practically little or no difference in the cost of labor. As to the eastern section of Canada I am not so well informed; but from the best information I can obtain, the cost of labor on the Canadian side is considerably less—I can not say whether it is half as much, but it is considerably less than upon the American side.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, in the discussions we have had on this bill up to this time I think no Senator has contended that there is any material difference between the labor cost in this country and in Canada. I am very much surprised to hear the statement that the labor cost here is twice what it is in Canada. I have frequently heard the statement that the labor cost here was twice what it was in Europe; but this is the first time I have heard it stated in these discussions that there was any material difference in the wage cost along the border as between this country and Canada.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator has forgotten that when we were discussing the reciprocity proposition a couple of years ago an extended argument was made on the floor of the Senate concerning the comparative cost of labor in the Province of Ontario and in New York.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think it was clearly established that the price of farm labor in Ontario and all of the eastern Provinces of Canada was very much lower than in the contiguous territory in the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. In certain sections of Canada, where they employed foreign labor—Chinese labor, Japanese labor, or Hindu labor; I think that was stated at that time. I did not suppose they employed that character of labor in the sections of Canada adjoining North Dakota and Montana.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am asking simply for information.

Mr. McCUMBER. The character of labor of which the Senator speaks is only employed out on the Pacific coast. I think there is very little of that, and it is lower in price simply because it is worth less.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. Out on the Pacific coast, in British Columbia, which is not much of an agricultural country, they employ that kind of labor, but they raise no flax out there. Flax is raised mainly either in the three Provinces of the Northwest or in Ontario. Ontario and Quebec are the great flax Provinces, and there they do not employ any of that kind of labor.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is exactly the point I was making. I supposed that in the sections of Canada where they grew flax the labor was very much of the same character as in this country. They are Caucasians, white people.

Mr. NELSON. Mainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mainly white people.

Mr. NELSON. Yes; but the wages in eastern Canada—in Ontario and Quebec—are much smaller than with us.

Mr. SIMMONS. I had not supposed the labor cost was very different just across the line from Montana and South Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. No.

Mr. SIMMONS. But this writer said the cost was twice as great here.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have said again and again in all of those debates that the labor in northwestern Canada and in the Dakotas differs very little in price; but farm labor in eastern Canada and the eastern United States shows a very wide difference in favor of the American side. While I would not attempt to speak definitely and accurately on the subject, my remembrance is, from the testimony that was given at the time, that our labor averaged nearly 50 per cent higher in New York State, for instance, than in Ontario. I am speaking now of farm labor.

Mr. JAMES. Can the Senator state what was the price of corn in the Northwest last year?

Mr. McCUMBER. I can not, for the reason that in my section of the country very little corn is raised for sale; and not being interested in that particular crop, I have not kept very close track of it.

Mr. JAMES. Did the Senator include corn in his statement as one of the products that is now lower than it was last year?

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not have it in mind. I had reference to our cereal crop of the Northwest. Corn is raised in the Central States.

Mr. JAMES. I will state to the Senator that it is true that corn is selling now in St. Louis and Kansas City at 80 cents a bushel, and it does not appear to be one of the products that has been driven down by the attempted revision of the tariff.

Mr. McCUMBER. But there is always a cause for every effect, and the Senator from Kentucky certainly understands the present cause. When the corn crop has been burned up in

Oklahoma and Kansas and Nebraska, and when it is very much shorter than usual in other sections of the country, necessarily the price will be very much higher.

Mr. JAMES. The same character of argument would apply to the reason why wheat should be so much lower.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly; and if I only dealt with two conditions—an excessive crop one year and a very short crop the next year—I should scarcely be dealing fairly with the Senate. But in my remarks I covered the 15 years preceding 1912, and properly and justly gave credit for the lower prices through the excessive crop that was raised in the Northwest in 1912.

Mr. JAMES. I agree with the Senator—I do not know whether the Senator will go that far or not—that the law of supply and demand controls the price of corn, just as it controls the price of wheat; that a failure of the crop one year will cause the price of the product to rise and a greater supply next year will cause it to fall.

Mr. McCUMBER. To be sure; the Senator is absolutely right. But the law of demand also depends upon the ability to purchase. When money is scarce, owing to lack of confidence, stagnation naturally follows, and with it a slackening of business that prevents or decreases the ability to purchase.

If the Secretary will now read the second letter——

Mr. SIMMONS. Just one word, Mr. President. I do not desire to enter into any extended discussion, but I do desire to ascertain exactly the position of the Senator with reference to this matter. I do not understand the Senator to be expressing any apprehension that flax straw of the quality and character that his State produces will come into competition with any straw that is now imported into this country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; it comes into competition with Canadian straw, which is already being imported; and my position is that without any protection it will come into competition with straw raised in Russia.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the unit value of the straw imported into this country last year, I think, was $40 a ton, and I understood the Senator from North Dakota to say that this was straw that sold for only about $3 a ton. I do not see how straw that sells for $3 a ton could possibly come into competition with straw that sells for $40 a ton.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator will find that the straw which comes in at $40 per ton is the hackled straw.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the only kind that appears to have come in.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know; some of it has come in under the head of broken straw; but the hackled straw of longer fiber is worth probably $40 a ton. It has to go through a milling process, and that is a very different proposition from the raw product as it comes from the farm.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator's State does not produce any of that kind of straw, as I understand.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Any of the long-staple straw?

Mr. McCUMBER. The $40-per-ton straw is not the long-fibered straw that enters into the composition of fabrics. It is used for the same purpose. The hackled fiber that would come in, fit for the purposes to which the Senator refers, would be worth from $240 to $260 a ton.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; but what I am trying to ascertain is whether the Senator's State produces any straw that would come into competition with the straw that is imported here, valued at $40 per ton?

Mr. McGUMBER. Yes; but under the present law we have not imported the straw, because the duty on the straw itself is practically prohibitive.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, there has been no importation of this character of straw up to this time?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly not, under a protection of $5 per ton, when the straw itself will sell for from $3 to $6 per ton.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I thought. The Senator's position is that his State produces a straw that is worth only $3 per ton. The Senator stated, earlier in his speech, that where the mill is not too far from the farm it is profitable to haul this straw to the mill and sell it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I assume from that statement that it would not be profitable to haul it any considerable distance.

Mr. McCUMBER. It would not. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. Not even to the mill?

Mr. McCUMBER. No.

Mr. SIMMONS. The only straw that could come into competition with the straw raised here is that produced in Canada and that produced in Russia, as I understand the Senator?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think any great quantity of the straw itself would come into competition with ours. It would be the hackled straw. I am speaking of the raw straw. It would be that which is partly manufactured.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator is discussing this $3-a-ton straw, and I am trying to find out whether there is any danger of any competition with that from abroad.

Mr. McCUMBER. There is great danger of competition.

Mr. SIMMONS. And I am trying to find out whether there is any danger of that straw in its raw state—not in its hackled condition, but in its raw state—coming over here. Straw, while very light, is exceedingly bulky, and in transportation a bulky product, though light, is necessarily charged a very high rate. In my section of the country we sometimes buy hay from the West when we do not make enough, but because of the bulky character and the light weight of hay the freight rate is always as much again, and sometimes nearly twice as much, as the cost of the hay itself. If this straw has to be hauled any considerable distance, it seems to me the farmers of the Senator's State would not be in any possible danger of competition, because of the freight rates.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is correct, provided the mills will keep running. But if you take away the protection to the tow mill—that is what we are dealing with here—which hackles the straw, so that it closes, the farmer can not haul his straw anywhere. You destroy his market, because, as you say, he can not ship it any material distance. The vice of this proposed action lies in the fact that you close the mill, and that is what I am trying to keep open.

Let me make that clear to you. You will close the mills in the Dakotas and in Minnesota, because the flax of Ontario, which is very much nearer the point of manufacture, can reach it with a very small freight rate, while ours could not reach it without a very high freight rate. Therefore our mills would close and there would be held open only those, perhaps, in New York for the manufacture of the Canadian straw, because New York does not produce any.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will assume that the hackled product of this $3-a-ton straw would be of very little value.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the hackled product was of much value, I should think that of itself would advance the price of the raw straw beyond $3 a ton.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, after it is hackled it brings its value up to about $18 a ton; but the freight rates from North Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota to New York are such that with free hackled straw they could not compete with the Canadian product, that would not have the same freight rate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one word, if the Senator will pardon me. This straw which is worth $3 a ton is carried to a mill, where it is hackled, is it not?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Could the straw which sells for $3 a ton be carried to any mill which was so far away that the transportation rate would be more than $3 a ton?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly not. The Senator is right as to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. My own experience as a farmer is that I can not afford to haul anything over 12 miles that is not worth over $3 a ton, even upon a dirt road. How far by rail or by water do you suppose this $3-a-ton stuff will stand transportation?

Mr. McCUMBER. Remember that in no instance are we transporting straw in its raw state. The Senator is mistaken if he understands that we transport the straw itself by freight.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; the Senator is not talking about straw. He dwelt upon it as "the poor man's crop" and all that sort of thing, and said that we were taking it away from the farmer. What I am trying to show is that nothing could come into competition with this product that had to come more than 12 miles by a dirt road.

Mr. McCUMBER. All right. We will assume that to be absolutely true, and undoubtedly it is true. But that which has to come 5 or 6 miles I do not think our farmers will haul 12 miles for $3 a ton. That which has to come from 5 or 6 miles comes to a mill to be hackled and partially manufactured. Then it is in a condition where it will stand the freight to the place of manufacture. If you produce the product so cheaply in eastern Canada that we can not afford to pay the freight from that mill upon the product, the mill closes, and of course the farmer gets nothing. It is not competition at his door; it is competition at the ultimate place of manufacture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The hackled flax is worth $18 a ton, I understand.

Mr. McCUMBER. I believe that is it. One of these letters gives the exact figures. I think it is worth from $18 to $20 a ton.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, like every other product in the world, it varies in price. The Senator has stated that a Canadian mill can take the straw at $3 a ton and turn it into hackled flax which is to sell at $18 a ton, and beat us in doing it. That is his argument—that they can turn the $3 stuff into the $18 stuff more cheaply than we can. If that be true, it must be due to one of several reasons, or all of them. Either they have cheaper labor working in their mills—remember, now, not on the farm, but in the mills—or they have better mill machinery or they have better mill management or they have a climate better adapted to the process of manufacture.

Mr. McCUMBER. Or better freight rates.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Or better freight rates; one or the other. I can understand how, at one place along this great 3,000-mile line, the freight rates should be in favor of the Canadian, and how at another place they would be favorable to the American.

Mr. McCUMBER. At every place.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I can not understand how they would be in favor of the Canadian all along the 3,000-mile line; neither can the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is just what I have been trying to explain to the Senator. There will be no 3,000-mile freight rates for the Canadian, because his product, as I have stated over and over again, is produced in Ontario, very close to the place of manufacture in New York. Therefore he has a very small freight rate as compared with our very large freight rates.

M. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, I understand that; but that flax straw has to reach the Canadian mill, has it not, before it is turned into hackled straw and before it is shipped to this country or anywhere else? The Senator will admit that it can not be carried to a mill at the present price of $3 a ton farther than about 12 miles over a dirt road, and I should say about 50 miles over a railroad, without eating up the entire price. Therefore none of the straw will ever go to a mill farther than 50 miles away, whether on the Canadian side or the American side. In other words, the consequence of the entire thing is that the straw to be hackled must be carried to a mill that is within $3 freight-rate distance of the mill in which it is hackled. So the idea of the straw in Canada going to any except very few American mills very close to the border is out of the question, and the idea of any of our flax straw going to any mill in Canada, unless very close to the border, is also out of the question. In other words, it is one of the things that must be done by little country establishments close to the flax straw or else the mill will close because it can not get the straw.

Mr. McCUMBER. The force of the Senator's argument always seems to exhaust itself at the first mill—that is, at what I may call the hackling mill—whereas the governing proposition is the cost of putting it into the mill that manufactures it into tow.

Now, let me make that clear to the Senator, if it is possible. Let us suppose that in North Dakota the raw straw will yield three and a half to five dollars a ton, dependent upon the condition of the straw. It will bring the value of that up to $18 to $20 a ton to pass it through the first process in the little local mill. Now, it is 1,500 miles from the place to which it must be consigned to manufacture it into tow. We will say that it will cost $9 a ton—it may be more than that, but I am giving that as an illustration—to send that hackled straw to New York where it is to be manufactured. We will admit, for this argument, that it will cost the same in Ontario, Canada, to haul it to the mill and get it hackled, and then it may cost $2 a ton to get it from there over to the mills in New York to be manufactured. The Senator can easily see that under that condition, with a difference of $7 in freight rates, we could scarcely compete with the product in Canada.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I see after you got it hackled the difference of $7 freight rate would be an immense item, but I can also see that the fellow who did the hackling could not get the straw to hackle unless he got it within a distance of $3 a ton freight rate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course he must get it within a short distance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Therefore, no matter what it is, the amount he can get is very limited, indeed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose it is true that it is very limited; that depends on the number of mills, and the mills do not cost very much. Some of the little hackling mills cost, I think, not over $800 to $1,000, and from that up to two or three thousand dollars. If the business would justify it, the number would very much increase. We have some of them in our State; I do not know how many, but enough so that they use a considerable of the straw when the times are particularly close. If the conditions will justify it, there will be enough of those little mills to reach most of the American farmers. The consumption in the United States at the present time, of course, will not justify enough mills to take care of all the straw; but because it will not take care of all is no reason why we should not give the northwestern farmer the benefit of what the American market can hold and can consume as against the world; and especially so as no one will reap a benefit from placing this product on the free list except the manufacturer of the refrigerator cars and upholstered seats, and so forth; and the proportionate part of the cost that would be represented in the tow that is used in them is so very small that I doubt if the public itself, either immediately or remotely, would get any appreciable benefit. But it means a great deal to the farmer of the Northwest during hard times, and especially this year in my State, where in the western half of the State, perhaps, not more than from a third to half a crop will be harvested.

I now ask for the reading of the letter I have sent to the desk. desk.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, before we dispose of this matter I desire to remind the Senate that in the course of some remarks which I made here about two weeks ago I had read a letter from a banker at Fessenden, in the State of the Senator, addressed to a lady who is engaged in the business of raising flax in Wells County, in his State. She thought she ought to get something for the flax straw, but she was answered that the people burned their flax straw in the State of North Dakota and do not get anything for it; that they had communicated with the Union Fiber Co., of Winona, Minn., and had endeavored to sell the flax straw there, but the transportation rates were so great that they consumed all the profit there was in the enterprise, making it impossible to market the straw.

Accordingly I communicated by wire with the Union Fiber Co., of Winona, Minn. I understand the Senator to say that he does not claim anything for a duty upon flax straw, but he is solicitous about a duty on tow. The Union Fiber Co. wired me, under date of July 28—

> Answering telegram this date, duty on flax tow has only nominal effect on our business.

That it has only a nominal effect is disclosed in another letter which I got from a professor of the agricultural college of North Dakota, who favored me with a copy of the letter read by the Senator and addressed to Hon. OSCAR UNDERWOOD. I read from that letter, written by Mr. Henry L. Bolley, as follows:

> Practically all the flax straw which has been raised in the State has been run through the thrashing machine, and either has been burned or used for feed. However, there are, perhaps, a dozen tow mills within the boundaries of Minnesota and North Dakota which consume considerable straw, each within its own reasonable shipping or handling distance.

Which, I suppose, means that they can only get the straw from a distance of 10, 15, or 20 miles, as suggested by the Senator from Mississippi, as it is impossible to transport it a greater distance than that and likewise that they can not transport their product to any considerable distance, and certainly in all reasonable probability not so as to come in competition with anything that is manufactured upon the Atlantic seaboard at all. He continues:

> The farmers get from $2 to $2.50 per ton for the straw. You are probably also aware that there are several new uses being made of flax straw as grown from seed flax. A reasonably good binder twine is being made in Minneapolis. The Union Fiber Mills at Winona—

The same company—

> are making some very splendid insulating boards and other types of fiber products which are used in electrical work, refrigerator work, etc. A large amount of fiber is also used in making straight paper board, and the board or paper which takes the place of back plaster in houses. It is also used to some extent for mixing in cements used for plasters. Paper pulp products are also being experimented with in one or more mills in this region.

This man is advocating a duty upon flax tow. He says:

> Free introduction of noils or waste fiber from Russia or of flax straw as packing or ballast, without other compensating features, would likely—

Would likely—

> destroy the present activities of the tow mills, which now produce a very large amount of this product in the Northwest.
>
> The flax crop is struggling against many odds, but I believe that eventually it will prove to be one of the permanent and valuable staple crops of the Northwest.
>
> Very truly, yours, HENRY L. BOLLEY.

The explanation is one that is perfectly simple and perfectly easy. The freight rates absolutely preclude the farmers of the State of the Senator or the farmers of my State from getting any benefit whatever from a duty upon either flax tow or flax straw.

Before I take my seat, Mr. President, because the esteemed Senator referred the prevailing low price of wheat to apprehension about legislation that may be enacted by this Congress and to the fact that there was an extremely large crop produced

last year, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the farm price of wheat last year was lower than it has been in any year since 1906, and by examining the figures the reason is perfectly obvious.

In 1906 we produced 735,261,000 bushels in this country as against 692,000,000 the year before and 634,000,000 bushels the year thereafter, and the price went down to 72 cents. I do not apprehend that in the year 1906 there was any particular apprehension troubling the minds of the country in relation to tariff legislation. In 1912 we again had a bumper crop, the total production being 730,260,000 bushels, as against 621,000,000 bushels in 1911; that is, 109,000,000 bushels more than we had the year before, an increase in the neighborhood of 15 per cent. But the price went down to only 85 cents as against 72§, the farm price in 1906.

Of course there was only one cause which produced the fall in 1906—the bumper crop of that year—but when the fall was only half as great this year, it was not due to the bumper crop we had last year but to some prevailing apprehension.

Mr. McCUMBER. I would just as soon go back again if the Senator from Montana wants to revert to it. He would find some explanation of the 1906 crop not only as a bumper crop in the United States, but as a pretty good bumper crop in the world, which, of course, had its effect on the prices in the United States. He would perhaps have to take into consideration several things in determining what influenced the price. Our prices, of course, are governed in the first instance by the home demand, that being the principal place of consumption. That home demand is influenced though not governed by the general level of the world's prices, which is governed by the general world's supply. I could not answer at this time the Senator's proposition without going a little further and finding out what the world's supply is. So I will have to deviate from that and get back to the question at issue.

The Senator says that the farmers can not send their product to the mills any appreciable distance. For a number of years we have been shipping this hackled flax, or, as we call it, partially manufactured tow, from the Dakotas and Minnesota to the State of New York—to Buffalo, I think—where it is manufactured into tow. That very fact itself destroys the Senator's theory. We have been doing it right along. We have been doing it up to the present time, and that is pretty good evidence that with a continuation of the present conditions we will probably continue doing the same thing.

No one has claimed that you can afford to ship the straw itself any great distance. No attempt is ever made to do so. We can only get the straw within a limited distance from the little hackling or tow mill, as it is called; but after we have hackled the straw, after we have partially manufactured it, under present conditions we then can ship the product almost to any portion of the United States in competition with the Canadian product.

Without that protection these little mills will be compelled to close, and then, of course, the farmer will receive no price whatever for his product; and if at Buffalo or Rochester or wherever else the manufacturing center is in the State of New York they can not get this material from the State of New York they will naturally get it over from Canada, and that will be a splendid market for all the straw practically raised in Ontario, while it will entirely destroy our own market.

We have had $20 per ton protection on this hackled straw. I believe that these mills could still run in the Northwest if the bill were left exactly as it was passed by the House, namely, at $10 per ton; but I believe without fair consideration the majority of the Senate committee did not take into account the uses for which this hackled straw or short-fiber tow is used, but assumed that they were benefiting the general public by a reduction in the cost of the raw material which would be reflected in a reduction in the retail price of the manufactured product. But inasmuch as it does not go into any manufactured product your reason fails, your purpose is destroyed, and therefore I ask you to reconsider that one proposition of the short-fiber flax, which is not fitted for the manufacture of fabrics.

If the Secretary will read the letter or make another attempt to do it, I shall be pleased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

BUFFALO, N. Y., *April 12, 1913.*

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have before me the proposed tariff bill, dated April 7, and in the interest of the Committee on Ways and Means, and in the interest of Congress in general, which I am sure wants to do the right by both sides, the Government and the people, and finally in the interest of the hundreds of thousands of farmers in the States of Maine, Ohio, Michigan, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North and South Dakota, I respectfully call to your attention what this communication addresed to you does contain.

First. Duty on "tow of flax straw," as it should be, and not "tow of flax," as it is called erroneously under the Payne tariff and copied in the proposed tariff.

I say the duty on "tow of flax straw" has been reduced from $20 per ton to $10 per ton, and the tow manufacturers and farmers whom I represented and do represent have no intention of criticizing or complaining of your decision in that matter, and $10 a ton on tow of flax straw shall stand, as far as we are concerned.

Second. On the free list, page 111, section 497, line 21, of the proposed tariff you have flax straw.

To the tow manufacturers individually it would not make much difference, for if we would we could simply import flax straw from Canada, Russia, and Ireland fifty times more than we could use, for such flax straw from European countries would be imported as ballast in all kinds of sailing vessels, the same as African fiber and foreign fibers are imported, and we could even buy some of that straw, delivered at our mills, at the same price as we pay to the farmers of the United States, to wit, from $3 to $9 a ton, according to the States where it is raised and to length and fiber-containing qualities.

But, honorable sir, have you and your committee for a moment considered that that will interfere with several hundred thousand farmers who annually receive from twenty-five to several hundred dollars each for their straw, and which in most cases goes to the farmers' wives and is called "straw money," and with which they buy the clothes and necessities for the whole family?

In spite of the fact that great efforts have been made for the last few years to use the flax straw for paper making and for linen, so far the bulk has been used for making upholstering tow, refrigerator-car linings, but just now some paper and linen mills are being started.

Yet only less than one-half of the flax straw raised in the United States is salable for all these purposes so far, and therefore one-half is reluctantly burned by the farmers.

Now comes the new tariff and puts flax straw on the free list when the United States Agricultural Department is making and offering all kinds of inducements to raise the flax industry.

I have received letters and telegrams for the last few days showing that all the farming communities are under great excitement, and some of the letters read that never a Democratic Member will be elected to Congress. Some of these letters are so highly exaggerated or threatening that I have wired the several commercial clubs from where they originated "to keep cool and wait until the bill is passed."

I have had dealings with these farmers for the last 20 years, and I know, sir, that flax straw on the free list will have a tremendous influence upon future elections. * * *

The thread manufacturers, the twine manufacturers, the manufacturers of all kinds of stuff from flax straw and flax have come before your honorable committee and have told some truth, but untruth enough to hide any truth, for they even went so far as to propose hackled and scutched European flax be put on the free list, when it takes tremendous and very expensive work to make scutched and hackled flax out of flax straw ready for finer spinning, for it takes machinery worth thousands of dollars and up to 6 tons of flax straw to make 1 ton of good tow, not counting the thousands of dollars of labor we pay out in each mill.

These manufacturers and the lying importers have conjured up a veritable lying hell, for they themselves and their million-dollar trusts asked to be higher and higher protected.

Third. The farmers are imposed upon and wronged in other ways.

Just look at page 96, section 387, where it says, "sea grass and sea weeds, if manufactured, 10 per cent ad valorem"; and that was the same under the Payne tariff, and yet some of these great combinations in eastern large cities import free from Africa a fiber they call African fiber, of which I, under special cover by registered mail, send you a sample.

Hundreds of thousands of tons were imported from Africa as ballast, most of it through New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, and some through Fall River. This fiber, or sea grass—it grows in places near the sea—is first washed and cleaned and then spun by heavy machinery in order to give it a curl just like curled cattle or horse hair, then it is untwisted again just like curled hair and used for mattresses and upholstering of couches.

Formerly the importers put their heads together and made the appraisers doubtless believe that the cleaning and the spinning into rope of this fiber and sea grass was done by the heat of the sun—yes, some of these appraisers are very wise men.

So, therefore, as I said, hundreds of thousands of tons of that stuff are used for upholstering and for bedding, and the farmers are cut out of their sales of flax straw and the tow manufacturers of tow.

Fourth. Therefore a new paragraph ought to be inserted, reading: "African fiber, spun in rope, 10 per cent ad valorem," or $10 a ton, as it was in previous tariffs.

* * * * * * *

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have taken great pains to explain to you facts, true facts, and nothing but facts, biased by nothing, but justice to everybody all around, and the same statements have been made and are being made to Senators and Congressmen of the flax-raising States.

The matter is in your hands, and from you the farmers and the people connected with the lines in question expect justice, and I surely and we all have no doubt if you can do justice you will do it.

I have the honor to be,
Yours, very respectfully,

V. R. BLEHDON,
For himself and those manufacturers and farmers as per signatures, petitions, and powers of attorney submitted to the honorable committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. I especially call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that immense quantities, hundreds of thousands of tons, of somewhat similar fibers have been shipped from South Africa merely as ballast, and the same writer calls attention to the fact that the flax hackled could be shipped as ballast both from India and from Russia with very little or no freight rates, and, therefore, secure a market in this country. It is to protect ourselves not only as against the Canadian product, but also as against the product of other countries that an adequate duty is desirable.

I omitted to answer that portion of the argument of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] relating to the establish-

ment of a tow mill at Winona, Minn., and its business. One can scarcely present a letter and draw an intelligent conclusion from it unless he understands the business of the institution writing the letter. I think if the Senator would make close inquiry into the case he would find that the mill in Winona does not use the flax straw after it has been thrashed at all, through it may use some of it; but I understand that for part of its processes it uses green flax straw.

Then the Senator must also take into consideration the fact that it is located near Minneapolis, a manufacturing center, where it can ship its product. It may get enough straw for all its purposes in its vicinity, and it may have customers for the articles it produces right in Winona itself, which is quite a large city, or it may ship its product to Minneapolis, which, I think, is only about 50 or 60 miles away. That would present a case entirely different from the cases I have been discussing.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to his colleague?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] that anyone who manufactures fiber ware is not a customer for the ripened flax straw. Fiber ware, such as pails, washtubs, and washbasins, is made out of the green straw. The straw which my colleague has been talking about is straw left in the farmer's field after it has been thrashed and the seed has been taken from it. In no way could that kind of straw be used for the purpose to which I have referred.

It is true, as my colleague has said, that flax straw is being hauled, though, of course, only a short distance, to what we call tow mills. We have had tow mills in my own county. It brings only a small price, as the Senator from Montana and my colleague have said; but if the duty is entirely taken off, flax straw will be bought in the East instead of in the West. After the straw has been hackled it is reduced in weight. It is then baled and can be shipped quite a distance, in view of the prices which the manufactured article brings to-day. So it is hardly fair to compare the product of the Winona concern with the product about which my colleague has been speaking.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, lest any possible misconception may arise about the character of the business done by the Union Fiber Co., I refer you to the fact mentioned in the letter of Prof. Bolley. Likewise, I simply read from a letter written by a banker in the city of Fessenden, Wells County, to his client, the lady who was trying to dispose of her flax straw. I suppose that probably a man engaged in the banking business in Fessenden would be thoroughly well informed about the possibility of disposing of such flax straw as passes through the thrashing machine in that county. He is evidently a very intelligent man and recites the fact that the lady had endeavored to make disposition not only of that flax straw, but of other flax straw which he had, and the only place that he could find a market for it, as he thought, was at Winona. They quoted him a price, and he proceeded to figure the thing out and found that it was impossible to ship it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield to me again, I will say that I am not disputing the statement made by the Senator from Montana that a great deal of flax straw is being burned and a great deal of it is being fed to stock; I am not disputing the statement that hackled straw might be used at Winona; but I have simply made the statement that for fiber ware green flax must be used; it must be pulled by hand the same as flax is pulled for linen in the countries of Europe where linen is manufactured.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it did not need a bank president nor anyone else to tell this lady that flax straw itself could not be shipped from Fessenden to Winona and sold to advantage. She would have to ship the straw itself about 500 miles; but suppose there was a little mill at Fessenden——

Mr. WALSH. That is not the question. That was the only place he knew of where she could dispose of it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, possibly there might not have been a place very much nearer where she could afford to dispose of it. You can not ship flax straw any distance at all. Let us admit that it will not pay to freight such straw any great distance. I have tried to make that clear; but it does pay to ship the fiber. Remember that four-fifths or five-sixths of the weight and bulk is taken away after the flax straw goes through the hackling process. If there was a little tow mill in the vicinity of her farm, she could undoubtedly afford to haul straw that distance, and then the tow mill could afford to ship the fiber itself clear on to the State of New York to have it manufactured into the various articles for which the fiber is used. That is a complete answer to that proposition. If, however, you make it impossible for her ever to have a tow mill in the immediate vicinity—and I mean by a tow mill a mill that first puts the straw through the hackling process—of course she will never have a market.

Mr. President, I have another letter written by the same man, Mr. Blehdon, dated June 21, to the chairman of the Committee on Finance. It may be that he repeats himself to some extent in these letters, but each letter contains new propositions which I consider very important to a proper understanding of the question, and, though it may duplicate to some extent some of his former statements, I can scarcely take the time now to segregate the several parts and so will ask for the reading of the entire letter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would not the Senator just as soon have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of his remarks?

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to have the letter read. As I have said, I have just returned to the Senate after an enforced absence of nearly a month, and it is somewhat necessary for me to refresh my mind as I go over these letters in order to present the case fairly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

In re Schedule J—Flax, hemp, etc.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 21, 1913.*

Hon. F. McL. SIMMONS,
Chairman Committee on Finance, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I respectfully submit to your consideration this letter containing facts of greatest importance to millions of farmers of the Middle and Western States of the United States, because part of their financial welfare does depend, and will depend, upon the result and outcome of the tariff, so far as their raising of flax is concerned.

The product, just as it is raised by the farmer, is called by them "flax"; the boll at the top of the plant contains the flaxseed, and the stalk is called "flax straw." The seed is used for the manufacture of oil, and so forth. The straw, after it is thrashed, is sold by the farmer to the tow mills for the manufacture of tow for upholstering furniture and all kinds of filling, and some for the lining of railroad refrigerator cars, where formerly charcoal or cork or pressed cattle hair was used. Tow is made in four or five different grades, from the coarse to the very finest grade, for which purpose from 2½ tons of flax straw for a ton of coarse tow up to 6 tons of flax straw for 1 ton of the finest tow is used, and which latter grade can be used for all kinds of spinning. The flax straw is brought by the farmers to the tow mills, which are distributed all over the Western and Northwestern States, from Ohio to North Dakota. Ohio and Michigan produce the finest flax straw, and so does Wisconsin; and most flax straw is made into spinning flax.

The United States raise about 3,000,000 tons of flax, which means flax straw with the seed on, and there is only a market to the farmers for about 800,000 tons, and which they team direct to the tow mills and receive cash for the thrashed flax straw of from $3 to $9 per ton. Farmers farther away from the mills bale the thrashed flax straw and ship it to the mill and receive from $3 to $9 a ton for it, according to the quality and length of the flax straw. There are some farmers who receive as much as $6,000 a season for their flax straw, and, of course, down to about $50 or $100. In other words, the sale of the flax straw to the tow mills and to the mills manufacturing refrigerator-car lining is a great income to the farmer, and has been for many years back.

When a new tariff bill was before the House of Representatives the farmers of the West and Northwest, especially North and South Dakota, Minnesota, and Michigan, held excited meetings, and it was decided that Congress should be petitioned and explain the conditions of the flax crop in the United States, and that the duty then prevailing on flax straw, $5 a ton, and on tow made out of flax straw, or, rather, out of the fiber of flax straw, should be left at $20 a ton, the same duty as before.

I have been in the business of buying flax straw and manufacturing tow for about 25 years, and I am known in every place in the Middle, Western, and Northwestern States where flax is raised, for I either bought for my tow mills or for others; and I then received from agricultural departments, business men, and farmers all over the West and Northwest an invitation to represent them before Congress.

I accepted, provided that I will make no charge; and I did it simply and solely in the interest of the farmers, with whom I have been doing business and lived in peace and harmony for so many years. The commercial clubs and farmers and business men signed petitions and sent them to their Senators and Representatives, and I myself appeared before the Ways and Means Committee with powers of attorney from business men, commercial clubs, farmers, tow manufacturers, and presented a large number of petitions the commercial clubs and farmers had gotten up among themselves, all addressed to the Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD or to his committee.

I appeared before the committee on the 25th of January and submitted briefs, and the committee, after duly considering all matters, examining petitions, and going into the facts, reduced and took off the duty on flax straw, under the general principle that it was a raw product, and made the duty on "tow of flax," as it is called, $10 a ton instead of $20, as it was before. Here I will say that the price of tow ranges from $25 up to $80 a ton.

Now it is officially stated that the Finance Committee of the Senate has put tow of flax on the free list, and that means that Russia and Canada and Germany will flood the country and destroy the farmers' income, and make it impossible for tow manufacturers to buy their straw, for Russia raises as much or more flax than America, and so does Canada; so do other countries, more or less. Russia only pays one-fourth the wages we pay and Canada only about one-half, and these countries are, therefore, well able to undersell us American tow manufacturers, and the farmers with their tow and with their flax straw.

In fact, Canada has exported many cars of tow, which they, under the present tariff, fraudulently billed as flax straw, and have sold it, and could sell it, for much less than we could produce it, when it is considered that we have to pay from $3 to $9 a ton for the straw, when it can be bought over there at $2, and even some less.

Now, therefore, tow of flax being on the free list, the tow manufacturers will buy no more flax straw, for they will need none; and the many mills which are half in the hands of farmers themselves will have to close entirely; and you will hear soon that a great uproar and general outcry will be made when it is found that not only flax straw but flax tow you have put on the free list, and therefore destroyed a large income of the farmers and destroyed the manufacture of tow, wherefrom the farmers receive partly their income. Why should flax straw and tow of flax straw be on the free list when the United States raises 3,000,000 tons a year and can sell only about 800,000 tons, and the farmers have to burn the balance? Hemp and hemp product is a different thing, because there is very little raised in the United States, and the United States product is scarcely to be considered; but you will see this is a different matter with flax straw and flax.

Here please note that tow mills are small concerns, worth a mill from four to five thousand dollars upward. These, compared with the millionaire thread, twine, and rope manufacturers, who petition flax straw and tow on the free list—your favors in justice should certainly fall upon the poor farmers. The combination of thread and twine manufacturers, who have millions invested, care very little what happens to the farmer, nor will thread or twine be cheaper, flax straw or tow being on the free list. But, on the contrary, whereas the United States Agricultural Department is trying to encourage the farmers to raise the best straw only, and whereas these farmers, many of them, have imported foreign best flax seed—these thread manufacturers never have encouraged anything of that kind, but, on the contrary, told the Ways and Means Committee that American flax straw is no good.

Now, in the name of the tow manufacturers, of commercial clubs, and the farmers of the Middle and Western States, from whom I have submitted powers of attorney and thousands of signatures to the Ways and Means Committee, and who have addressed some direct to their Senators, I respectfully pray that the duty on tow of flax, or, as it should be, manufactured from the fiber of flax straw, should be restored as the Ways and Means Committee made it, to wit, $10 a ton, that we may be able to continue our lawful business and buy the flax straw from the farmers, as we have done in the past, and not allow the foreigners, who pay no taxes, to take the bread away from hundreds of thousands of worthy farmers and the small tow mills.

Think of the farmers who now believe that they are the scapegoats, almost everything they produce being on the free list, when labor is from two to four times as much in this country as it is in Canada, Russia, and other foreign countries.

For years the poor farmers and the middle-class farmers have paid for their clothing and the clothing of their wives and children out of the money they receive for their flax straw, and by putting tow on the free list, together with flax straw, that will all be done away with, and the many tow mills in Ohio, Michigan, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Dakotas will have to go out of business absolutely.

Mr. Senator, this is no trust or trust combination who are praying for just redress and for duty on flax tow of $10, as the Ways and Means Committee made it, and, if possible, a duty on flax straw as it was in the previous tariff, but it is the hundreds of thousands of farmers who need the income on the sale of flax straw and the making of tow, for, as I said, most of the tow mills are owned by farmers themselves, and are small matters, and the best is not worth more than about $8,000.

Be just, gentlemen; be just to the farmers; for if the farmer is suppressed the whole country will suffer.

Yours, very truly,

N. R. BLEHDON.

For himself, and representing by powers of attorney and free of charge the tow manufacturers of the United States, commercial clubs, and thousands of farmers, as per evidence submitted to the Ways and Means Committee January 24 and 25, 1913.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, this letter, I believe, was addressed to the chairman of the Finance Committee. It asks a very candid question of the chairman. I think another letter, a subsequent one, which I have from Mr. Blehdon, indicates that the chairman of the Finance Committee failed to answer that question, undoubtedly because he was overworked at the time, or perhaps because he desired to reserve his answer until he would be able to make it in the Senate.

The question which is asked is this: If there are about 3,000,000 tons of flax straw produced in the United States, and only about 800,000 tons used, and the balance of it is burned and destroyed because it is valueless, why does the Senator desire to put flax straw itself upon the free list?

I presume the question has in mind this proposition: If flax straw is so cheap that it hardly pays the American farmer to haul it to the mills, so that he must burn two-thirds of his product, why should the Senator ask that we have cheaper flax straw?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, of course I do not recall this particular letter. I suppose I had many thousand letters of that sort; and I could not undertake to answer all the questions about the tariff that might be asked me by correspondents.

Mr. McCUMBER. I appreciate that.

Mr. SIMMONS. If I understand the Senator, he says that because we have more straw in this country than we have any use for, and have to burn it, therefore there ought to be a duty on straw. Let me tell the Senator, in the first place, that I have examined both the Statistical Abstract of the United States and the Yearbook. I find from both of them that while they give a statement as to the amount of flaxseed produced in this country and the amount of flax straw produced in other countries, they do not give any statement as to the amount of flax straw produced in this country. I suppose that is because flax straw in this country, as a rule, is about like rice straw and wheat straw and oat straw; it has practically no value.

Mr. McCUMBER. I assume, however, that those who are engaged in the manufacture of this article have made a computation in this way: Knowing about how many tons it would take to produce a given number of bushels, they can therefore arrive approximately at the amount.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think, as a matter of fact, to be very frank—and I think the Senator will agree with me about this—flax is produced in this country not for the straw but for the seed. All of the reports give the amount of flaxseed produced in this country and none the amount of flax straw produced in this country.

Mr. President, I can not think the Senator from North Dakota really believes there is any necessity for a duty upon flax straw produced in this country, for purposes of protection, from his own standpoint. Surely up to this time, if the records of the department are worth anything at all, there has been no importation of this kind of flax straw.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the Senator must remember the reason for it.

Mr. SIMMONS. There has been no importation of hackled flax made from this kind of straw. A little while ago I suggested to the Senator that on account of the light character of this straw it could not be profitably imported into this country from any foreign country; that the freight rates made that impossible, and prohibited its importation here. The Senator answered me by saying that it was not the straw about which he was talking so much, but it was the hackled straw about which he was talking; and he suggested that while the straw itself was worth only about $3 or $3.50 a ton, the hackled straw was worth $18 a ton, and that that was of sufficient value to justify the payment of the freight rates from a foreign country into this country.

I think the Senator is mistaken about that. But, however that may be, the records show conclusively that neither has any part of this particular straw been imported into this country, nor has any hackled flax made from that straw been imported into this country.

Let me read to the Senator from the official record of imports entered for consumption during the year 1912, under the head of "Flax straw." The unit value of the straw imported into this country in that year was $40.98, and only 170 tons were imported; so that none of this straw worth $3 a ton was imported. Now let us see if any of the hackled product of flax made of this straw was imported. The Senator says it is worth $18 a ton. The unit value of the tow of flax imported into this country in that year was $180; so it could not have been the tow made of this straw. The unit value of the hackled flax imported into this country in that year was $606.56; so it could not have been the $18 product which he says is produced from this $3 straw. The unit value of the flax not hackled imported into this country in that year was $310.71. So it is demonstrated by these figures that there has not been imported into this country up to this time any of this straw, nor any of the hackled flax produced from this straw.

Mr. McCUMBER. What does the Senator conclude from that?

Mr. SIMMONS. My conclusion is that it does not need any protection, because none is being imported; and because, as I have argued before, the freight rates upon the straw itself worth only $3 a ton are prohibitive, and the freight rates upon the hackled product worth $18 a ton are likewise prohibitive.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has forgotten to mention the fact that there has been practically a prohibitive tariff, and that is the reason it has not been imported. If the straw itself is worth only $3 to $3.50 a ton, and there is a duty of $5 a ton, it naturally follows that there would not be any imported. If the hackled straw is worth only about $18 to $20 a ton, and there is a duty of $20 per ton, it naturally follows that there would not be any imported. But if you take off the $5 a ton on the straw and take off the $20 a ton on the hackled straw you will find then that it will come in, and it will supplant our product in the American market. That is all there is to that argument.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator can make that argument if he wishes, but I doubt very much whether the Senator believes that would follow.

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not quite understand the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I say the Senator can make that argument if he desires; but as I have read, a part of this very product imported last year bore a duty of $22.40 and another part bore a duty of $67.20.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am assuming that there have been no importations whatever of any particular value.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is making the argument, then, that while there have been no imports of this $3 product and no imports of this $18 product, when we put it on the free list there will be imports of it?

Mr. McCUMBER. Why, certainly. When there is a prohibitive duty there will not be any importation.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is talking about a product when he knows the freight rate upon that product is as high as the freight rate upon hay or the freight rate upon any of the very bulky products.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is certainly mistaken about that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator believe for a moment that a product that a farmer can not afford to haul with his mules and his team for 12 miles on account of its small value, worth hardly as much as a cord of wood in my country, could, if we put it on the free list, be brought to this country from Russia, occupying in the ship upon which it is brought a space probably equal to that which would be occupied by a product worth ten or twenty times as much?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly not, and I never have claimed anything so ridiculous as that. But the Senator will insist upon ignoring the fact that we may bring in from Russia the product of the tow itself. Nobody claims that you can afford to bring straw from Russia. The very fact that you can not ship across the country a carload of potatoes does not establish the fact that you can not ship across the country the starch that would be produced from those potatoes. There is no danger of shipping any straw from the Canadian Northwest to New York any more than there is danger of our shipping straw from the Dakotas to New York. But we can ship the hackled product to advantage.

Mr. SIMMONS. But you have not done so.

Mr. McCUMBER. If I stated that it was $18 or $20 a ton, I probably should have said that it costs from $18 to $20 a ton for the hackling process, and therefore it would make the value, we will say, from $21 to $23 a ton. They can afford to ship that, because it is very heavy, because it is baled, and because it occupies but a small space as compared with the straw itself. But destroy the mill and you have no market for it.

So there is no necessity whatever, when you get right down to your real argument, for taking the tariff off the straw. The only argument you can make at all is that it does not make any difference whether you have a tariff on it or not; but when you come to the hackling process, you can not even make that excuse. You have simply got to make the excuse that you want to reduce the price of the hackled product of this short-fibered straw for the benefit of some one and to the detriment of the American farmer. When we ask who that some one is who is to receive a benefit from it, we are led directly up to the manufacturer of refrigerating cars and upholstered car seats. They are the only ones who are to receive a benefit.

Mr. President, Mr. Blehdon has been very insistent, and undoubtedly feels—and I feel he is correct in it—that his business is being entirely destroyed. He has an interest in and represents mills all over the Northwest. He declares that those mills will close upon a free hackled product. I submit the last letter from him upon that subject, and I ask that it may be read.

Mr. STONE. How long is it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unless the Senator has some particular reason for having it read, would he not just as soon let it go into the RECORD?

Mr. McCUMBER. This is the last one, and I have a particular reason for having it read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is nearly 6 o'clock, and we have spent the whole day practically on hackled straw. An executive session will be desired in a few minutes. Unless there is some particular reason why——

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say to the Senator it can be read in the morning, if they want to go into executive session now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let it be read now, if the Senator is not willing to let it go into the RECORD without having been read.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; let it be read now.

Mr. STONE. What particular reason has the Senator for desiring that the time of the Senate shall be taken up by the reading of the letter?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not an argument. It is a——

Mr. McCUMBER. I will read it myself if the Senator desires me to do so, but I thought the Secretary had better read it.

Mr. STONE. No, not that; but why does the Senator wish to take the time of the Senate in having a letter of that kind read that nobody will listen to?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am sorry, but I have not seen the Senator listening to any argument. I do not see that that makes much difference.

Mr. STONE. We have had the argument made by this same man presented by the Senator two or three times here this afternoon.

Mr. McCUMBER. This is a new argument. It will be very instructive to the Senate.

Mr. STONE. Does the writer of the letter change his argument from day to day?

Mr. McCUMBER. This is a very good letter. I think the Senator ought to listen to this one.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator merely wishes to kill time, all right.

Mr. McCUMBER. Not by any means. I have not taken much time in the last four weeks.

Mr. STONE. No; the Senator has not been here. He is making up now for lost time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then the Senator must excuse me for taking a little time in a matter that so affects my own constituents.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not want the Senator to feel that we object to the time he has taken; we are delighted to listen to any argument from the Senator, but these are not arguments from the Senator or from any Senator. These are letters from somebody never elected to this body, and we could get the enlightenment in them just as well from the RECORD. I would be willing to sit here six hours and listen to the Senator from North Dakota—I like to hear him—but it did strike me that these other people who were getting before the Senate might be willing to have their statements go into the RECORD without reading.

Mr. McCUMBER. I try not to abuse the courtesy of the Senate in taking too much time in the presentation of any matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not object to any time the Senator himself takes.

Mr. McCUMBER. I feel, however, that this letter is quite instructive upon several points. I am perfectly willing to allow the matter to go over until to-morrow, because I will not complete what I have to say to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would rather, if the letter is to be read, that it should be read to-day; and I would rather that this paragraph should be finished to-day.

Mr. McCUMBER. It will take some time to finish it.

Mr. STONE. I think it ought to be read. Evidently it is from a very great and wise man, who has been piling his letters one on top of another into the RECORD. I can not for one moment make the least objection to having the Senator from North Dakota not only put into the RECORD but read for the information of the Senate communications from a man upon whose judgment he so implicitly relies. Let us have the letter read.

Mr. PENROSE. We can not finish this schedule to-day. It is just a question whether it shall be read now or to-morrow.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Missouri has grown very generous in the last minute.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will agree that the letter may be read now.

Mr. PENROSE. Let us have an executive session.

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall not ask to keep the bill before the Senate any longer to-day after the letter has been read.

Mr. McCUMBER. The reading of the letter could have been completed while we have been arguing whether it should be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 24, 1913.*

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would have come down to Washington were it not that I have been suffering very much from one of my ancient attacks of neuritis, for I would have liked to have a personal talk or interview with you, who were kind enough to grant one to me when I was in Washington in January, introduced to you by Mr. CHARLES BENNETT SMITH.

I then appeared before your committee with signatures and credentials from thousands of farmers as the representative, without pay and without any remuneration whatsoever, of all the tow manufacturers except one:

The Union Fiber Co., at Winona, Minn.; Atwood-Stone Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Brady Tow Co., Wheaton, Minn.; J. W. Keogh & Co., Chicago, Ill., and St. Paul, Minn.; Andrew Thompson, Kensal, N. Dak.; Davis & Co., Reynolds, N. Dak.; Western Textile Co., Decorah, Iowa; G. W. W. Harden, Le Roy, Minn.; Wm. Salen & Co., West Salem, Ohio; Ashland Flax Mill Co., Ashland, Ohio; New London Tow Mill, New London, Ohio; Naperville Lounge Co., Naperville, Ill.; and many other tow mills distributed in Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, wherever flax is raised, for the product is called by the farmers throughout the United States "flax."

I respectfully refer you to the Payne tariff, Schedule J. The duty on flax straw then was $5 a ton, and on flax tow, or tow of flax, or tow of flax straw, as it is called, the duty was $20 a ton.

Your committee transferred flax straw onto the free list and flax tow you cut 50 per cent and made it $10 a ton.

Under this duty the tow manufacturers would be able to buy the farmers' flax straw, the farmers receiving from $3 to $9 a ton for their straw, according to quality in the different States where it is raised.

It needs from 2½ to 6 tons of flax straw to make a ton of common tow up to the finest tow, and of which there is used in the United States several hundred thousand tons for upholstering of all kinds of furniture, and it is furthermore used, after being thoroughly broken and the woody part of the stalk worked out, and after it is chemically prepared so that it will not rot, for lining refrigerator cars instead of cork or cattle hair, which in time rots and smells badly in the cars.

In order to make the tow the farmers bring the flax straw to the mill, where it is stacked, and then it goes through corrugated steel brakes, steel pickers, steel shakers, and the mills are run by steam and electricity. To make a ton of the better and best grades of tow costs up to $20.

The mills themselves are not expensive concerns, none of them costing more than about from $5,000 to the highest, $10,000, and are, to a large extent, owned by some farmers themselves.

Some farmers have 25 tons of straw for sale, some 50, some 100, and up to 500 tons a season, and every farmer in the Northwest raises flax straw, and when they bring it to the mills, or bale and ship the flax straw to the mills, after the flax straw has been thrashed, which means to have the seed thrashed out—and which is sold to oil manufacturers—they receive cash for.

Now, the money the farmers derive and have derived for years back from the sale of flax straw goes in ninety cases out of a hundred to the wife of the farmer, who buys the clothing and every family necessity out of that money.

If, therefore, the tow manufacturers and the refrigerator car-lining manufacturers were unable to buy the hundreds of thousands of tons of straw from the farmers it would be a tremendous loss to hundreds of thousands of farmers in the Middle States, West, and Northwest, and, Mr. UNDERWOOD, if the party you so ably represent and in whom the business people of the United States confided and set a tremendous trust—and this is no flattery, but fact—would deprive the farmers of the sale of their flax straw, the farmers, I am sure, would believe themselves deeply and justly injured in the loss of their lawful income.

The farmers in general believe that they have been treated very hard or harsh, most everything they produce being on the free list.

If tow for upholstering and for refrigerator-car linings and for the production of wrapping and other paper, which enterprise was just started a short time ago, encouraged by the United States Agricultural Department, was put on the free list Canada, which pays half the wages we do, and Russia, which pays one-fourth the wages we do, would flood this country with tow, for the freight is very cheap, and I swear to you upon my honor that not a tow mill could exist and the farmers would lose one of their best incomes.

Your committee has done fair and straight and have doubtless considered that the poor hard working farmers do not combine and have million-dollar trusts, as the twine manufacturers and the thread manufacturers. For instance, the Barbour or similar concerns who petitioned your honorable committee to free flax straw and free flax, unhackled and hackled, but you did justice all around, because you and your committee understood the conditions and saved the farmers, and let me tell you that the United States raises some splendid flax for spinning, after retted, hackled, and scutched, but this will all have to go up if the flax product remains on the free list.

What does the Barbour company or these millionaire concerns, who make binder twine, rope, and twine, care for the farmer as long as they reap their millions, and I assure you they will not pay more wages to the laboring men or poor little women who work in their factories with their hair tied up in kerchiefs that they do not fall victims of the machine and get their tremendous wages of about $4 or $5 a week, and mostly less, as the girls in other spinning factories and collar factories receive—starvation wages—when the owners themselves live in royal-like palaces.

The farmers can not believe, and we tow manufacturers can not believe, that the Senate Finance Committee and the caucus are posted about the flax business and the manufacture of flax and flax straw or they would certainly not take the bread of life away from the farmers and those connected with them by putting manufactured tow and flax on the free list.

Do not say, Mr. UNDERWOOD, honorable sir, that the matter is out of your hands, for it is still in your hands, even should it come to the time when the final Senate and House committee will meet for final arrangements.

I received within the last three days up to this writing 46 telegrams from the farmers in the West and Northwest, and the commercial clubs have taken action themselves, and I have written a letter to the Hon. F. McL. SIMMONS, chairman Committee on Finance.

The farmers can not send expensive lawyers to appear before your committees, and I have found out during my two weeks' stay in Washington at the time of the Ways and Means Committee hearing that paid lawyers will do no good, for we were all convinced that if the matter is brought before the committee justice will be done, and that is all we pray for and expect.

Again I say, honorable sir, do not say that the matter is out of your hands, for it will come back to your hands, and as you understand the conditions I, as the unpaid representative of the West and Northwestern farmers and tow manufacturers, lay the matter most respectfully before you.

I have the honor to be,

Yours, very truly, V. R. BLEHDON.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask that the bill be laid aside for the day.

OKANOGAN RIVER BRIDGE, WASHINGTON.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1353) to authorize the board of county commissioners of Okanogan County, Wash., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Okanogan River at or near the town of Malott, which were, on page 1, line 9, after "Reservation," to strike out the period and insert a comma; on page 1, line 9, after "Reservation," to strike out "Said bridge shall be constructed"; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the board of county commissioners of Okanogan County, Wash., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Okanogan River at or near the town of Malott."

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

JOINT COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914," approved June 30, 1913, the Chair appoints Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. LANE, and Mr. TOWNSEND members on the part of the Senate of the joint commission to investigate Indian affairs.

COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE TUBERCULOSIS AMONG INDIANS.

Mr. STONE. In accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914," approved June 30, 1913, the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs appoints Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. TOWNSEND as members on the part of the Senate of the commission to investigate the question of tuberculosis among the Indians in connection with an inquiry into the necessity and feasibility of establishing, equipping, and maintaining a tuberculosis sanitarium in New Mexco, and to inquire into the necessity and feasibility of procuring impounded waters for the Yakima Indian Reservation.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1681. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Red Lake River in township 153 north, range 40 west, in Red Lake County, Minn.;

H. R. 1985. An act to authorize the county of Aitkin, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in Aitkin County, Minn.;

H. R. 3406. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River at Orange, Tex.;

H. R. 5891. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across White River at Newport, Ark.;

H. R. 6378. An act to authorize Robert W. Buskirk, of Matewan, W. Va., to bridge the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River, where the same forms the boundary line between the States of West Virginia and Kentucky; and

H. R. 6582. An act to authorize the city of Fairmont to construct and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, in the State of West Virginia.

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 5 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, August 21, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 20, 1913.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

Edward Bell, of New York, now on duty in the Department of State, to be second secretary of the Embassy of the United States of America at London, England, vice William P. Cresson, appointed secretary of the legation at Quito.

GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Francis Burton Harrison, of New York, to be Governor General of the Philippine Islands, vice W. Cameron Forbes, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 20, 1913.

MINISTER.

William J. Price to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Panama.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

First Lieut. Russell H. Davis to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of captain.

Lieut. Wilfred E. Clarke to be a lieutenant.

Lieut. Robert V. Lowe to be a lieutenant.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Claude A. Bonvillian to be a lieutenant.
The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):
Edwin Guthrie.
Frederic T. Van Auken.
William A. Hodgman.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Thomas J. Sullivan, Baltic.

INDIANA.

Lloyd W. Dunlap, Mentone.

NEW JERSEY.

Thomas C. Birtwhistle, Englewood.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James H. Alcorn, Waterford.
Oscar E. Letteer, Berwick.

VIRGINIA.

W. R. Rogers, Crewe.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *August 21, 1913.*

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

Prayer by Rev. Zed H. Copp, of the city of Philadelphia.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I really believe we ought to have a quorum in the Senate to-day, and I suggest the absence of a quorum at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	Hitchcock	Norris	Smoot
Bankhead	Hollis	Overman	Sterling
Bradley	Hughes	Page	Stone
Brady	James	Penrose	Sutherland
Brandegee	Jones	Perkins	Swanson
Bristow	Kenyon	Pittman	Thomas
Bryan	Kern	Pomerene	Thompson
Catron	La Follette	Robinson	Thornton
Chamberlain	Lane	Saulsbury	Townsend
Chilton	Lea	Shafroth	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Sheppard	Walsh
Colt	Lodge	Sherman	Warren
Fall	McCumber	Simmons	Williams
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. SHEPPARD. My colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will take occasion to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] on account of illness.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] are absent from the city on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I present a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Democratic county central committee of Cuming County, Nebr., remonstrating against the Owen-Glass currency bill. The resolution is short, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a currency measure known as the Glass-Owen currency bill—

Now, therefore, we, the Democratic county central committee of Cuming County, Nebr., believing that such currency bill is in many of its features undemocratic and undesirable, do hereby resolve that we deem it for the best interests of the country that such bill be rejected, and we do hereby request our Representatives in Congress to use all honorable means to defeat the bill; be it further

Resolved, That in the opinion of this committee the proposed measure, instead of providing for an expanding and flexible currency adequate to care for the business demands of the whole country at all times, unwarrantably reduces the power and limits the ability of the banks in the agricultural communities of the country to furnish the credit needed during the period of crop moving; be it further

Resolved, That in our opinion the money question is paramount to all others at all times, and we believe that legislation touching so vital a subject should have the most careful consideration; and be it further

Resolved, That we affirm it to be our belief that Congress alone should have the power to coin and issue money. We declare our adherence to the doctrine laid down by President Jackson, who said that this power could not be delegated to corporations or to individuals. The Democratic Party has always recognized this policy and it has often made the demand that all paper which is made a legal tender for public and private debts or which is receivable for dues to the United States should be issued by the United States Government. We are therefore opposed to the enactment of any currency measure which aims to discredit the sovereign right of the National Government to issue all money, whether of coin or paper, and to delegate this power to a Federal reserve board as is contemplated by the Glass-Owen currency bill.

At a meeting of the Democratic county central committee of Cuming County, Nebr., held on the 7th day of August, 1913, the above resolution was adopted by a motion duly made, seconded, and carried.

WILLIAM A. SMITH,
Chairman of the Committee.
HUGO M. NICHOLSON,
Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions signed by sundry citizens of Norwalk, Anaheim, Artesia, Santa Ana, Whittier, and Compton, all in the State of California, praying for the adoption of the proposed tariff referendum, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented sundry petitions of citizens of Poughkeepsie, Nyack, Saratoga Springs, and Ithaca; of the Woman Suffrage Study Club of New York City, the Political Equality Club of Warsaw, the Woman's Political Union of Nyack, and of the Cornell Equal Suffrage Club, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

LANDS FOR RESERVOIR PURPOSES.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1784) restoring to the public domain certain lands heretofore reserved for reservoir purposes at the headwaters of the Mississippi River and tributaries, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 104) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3017) designating certain lands as an addition to the Capitol Grounds, and establishing the Capitol Park; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3018) for the relief of Elizabeth B. Sarson; and

A bill (S. 3019) for the relief of the estate of James H. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 3020) for the relief of the estate of John H. Wisdom, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) providing for a second edition of the Congressional Directory for the first session of the Sixty-third Congress (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) appropriating $150,000 for the improvement of the Tennessee River (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. CATRON 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.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I offer a resolution which I should like to have read and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania submits a resolution, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 167), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes that it has been the policy of the United States to maintain the Monroe doctrine throughout the Western Hemisphere, and that the United States acknowledges its responsibility under the Monroe doctrine; that there exists in the Republic of Mexico a condition of internal warfare and lawlessness, and that a continuation of these present conditions, accompanied by the destruction of property, may involve international complications and intervention by European nations.

Resolved, That it is believed by the Senate that it is the first duty of the Government of the United States to protect the lives and property of its citizens at home and abroad, and that such protection in the Republic of Mexico will lessen the prevailing lawlessness and destruction of lives and property, and the danger and complications that might arise from European intervention in the Republic of Mexico.

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate it is not the policy of the Government of the United States to recognize, aid, or assist any faction or factions in the Republic of Mexico.