By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: A bill (H. R. 12961) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hartwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 12962) for the relief of the Federal Real Estate & Storage Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 12963) for the relief of George A. Dobbs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

7558. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of employees of Boston regional office of United States Veterans' Bureau, in favor of Saturday afternoon half-holiday bill for Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7559. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of F. A. Ramig Co., New York City, protesting the injustice of an increase in duty on embroidered handkerchiefs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7560. By Mr. YATES: Petition of L. J. Fleming, president Plate Printers Die Stampers Union of North America, 3353 Clifton Avenue, Chicago, urging the passage of House bill 6603; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7561. Also, petition of Jones & Winter Co., 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., urging the defeat of House bill 11096; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7562. Also, petition of California Vineyards Co., 213–219 East Illinois Street, Chicago, protesting the passage of House bill 11096; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7563. Also, petition of C. L. Neil, president of the Physicians Record Co., 161 West Harrison Street, Chicago, Ill., requesting the defeat of House bill 11096; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7564. Also, petition of Walter G. Pietsch, vice president Goll & Pietsch (Inc.), 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging defeat of House bill 11096, stating it is foreign to the spirit of this country and its postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7565. Also, petition of Mother Hubbard Products Co., 556 West Congress Street, Chicago, Ill., protesting the passage of House bill 11096; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7566. Also, petition of Walton & Spencer Co., 1241–1249 South State Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the defeat of House bill 11096, stating it is not feasible and should be defeated; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, *June 14, 1930*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Look down upon us, O God, and see if we are making the most of our privilege and position. O let us not forget our estate and thus make dim the outlines of our daily conduct. Give us power to see our way and move. May we see the beauty of earth and love the common things of life—the common sky, the common landscape, the common flower, and, above all, the common heart, which has no wealth or power save common love. O may we breathe the breath of all, for they are ever new and sweet and rare. Help us to appreciate the common man with great qualities all along the highway of life. In the name of the Savior, whom the poor heard gladly. Amen.

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

CERTAIN WAR DEPARTMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing under the rule a conference report on the bill (S. 4017) to amend the act of May 29, 1928, pertaining to certain War Department contracts by repealing the expiration date of that act.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas presents a conference report on the bill S. 4017. Ordered printed.

Following is the conference report and accompanying statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4017) to amend the act of May 29, 1928, pertaining to certain War Department contracts by repealing the expiration date of that act, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment, and agree to the same.

HARRY C. RANSLEY,
HARRY M. WURZBACH,
PERCY E. QUIN,
Managers on the part of the House.

DAVID A. REED,
FRANK L. GREENE,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

This measure, S. 4017, when considered on the floor of the House was amended on motion of Mr. TABER so as to limit the extension of time called for in the act to one year. This amendment was offered and accepted by the members of the Military Affairs Committee, which had reported the Senate measure unanimously without amendment, because one of the provisions of a House bill, namely, H. R. 5568, when it becomes a law will automatically rescind S. 4017. However, as the next session of Congress is the short one it may be impossible to secure final enactment of H. R. 5568. This would make necessary a further extension of time, a difficult thing to do in the limited time available. Inasmuch as the whole purpose of S. 4017 is to give a necessary extension of authority to the War Department until the provisions of H. R. 5568 become law, your conferees deemed it to the best interest of the Government to have the language of the Senate bill finally enacted, and accordingly recommend that the House recede.

HARRY C. RANSLEY,
HARRY M. WURZBACH,
PERCY E. QUIN,
Managers on the part of the House.

BORDER PATROL IN THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MICHENER, by direction of the Committee on Rules, presented for printing under the rule the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 254), which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 254

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11204, a bill to regulate the entry of persons into the United States, to establish a border patrol in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF HILL *v.* PALMISANO

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I present a report of the contested-election case of John Philip Hill against Vincent L. Palmisano from the third congressional district of Maryland.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the report, and make a point of order against its reception on the ground that it was not authorized by the Committee on Elections No. 2; and I would like to state the grounds on which I make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that the proper way would be for the gentleman to reserve his point of order until the report is called up.

Mr. GARNER. I suggest to the gentleman that he waive it at this time and then make his point of order when the case is called up.

Mr. TARVER. I would like to state at this time, if I may be permitted to do so, the basis of the point of order. This seems to me, Mr. Speaker, a point of order that might be submitted now.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Georgia is not in order at this time.

Mr. CRISP. I make the point of order that it is in order. This is a matter of constitutional privilege, dealing with one of the highest privileges of the House, the right of a Member of this body to his seat.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. SNELL. The House is not considering the report at this time. The report has simply been filed.

Mr. CRISP. The point of order is on the filing of the report.

Mr. TARVER. The report has not been authorized.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to go on, I will state that on June 6, 1930, the Committee on Elections No. 2 held the last meeting it has held, and on that day voted 5 to 3 against seating contestant, John Philip Hill, and it voted 5 to 3 against throwing out the returns from the fourth precinct of the third ward in the city of Baltimore. The copy of the report that I hold in my hand is directly at variance with the action taken by the committee, in that the report finds that the returns from the fourth precinct in the third ward should be thrown out, when the committee voted that they should not be, and further finds that the contestant, if this is done, would be entitled to his seat in the House, whereas the committee voted to the contrary.

There has been no meeting of the committee since then, and no resolution approved by the committee, although I presume that one that has been reported by the gentleman who is acting for the committee, except that the first portion of a resolution dealing with the rights of the contestant was approved by the committee by a vote of 5 to 3, finding that he was not entitled to his seat and had not been elected.

The second part of the resolution was never placed before the committee, but the members of the committee were unable to agree upon its verbiage, and the statement was made that another meeting of the committee would be held in order that its verbiage might be agreed upon. Notwithstanding that, the gentleman purports to report to the House this morning a report which includes, I presume, a resolution which was not acted upon by the committee as to the rights of the contestee.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman can not base a point of order on a statement of fact.

Mr. TARVER. Is there any question about these facts? The acting chairman of the committee gave out a statement to the newspapers immediately after the executive meeting to which I have referred, in which he stated these facts at that time, and I want to know if he contradicts them now.

Mr. PERKINS. I will state that I do not agree with the statements made by the gentleman from Georgia. I do not think the report contains what the gentleman says it contains, but that the report is in accordance with the majority vote of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. Under the circumstances the Chair thinks the fair thing to do, he not being apprised of all the facts in connection with the matter, is to permit the report now to be printed, and the gentleman from Georgia may reserve his point of order, and if the case is called up the Chair will give the matter consideration.

Mr. TARVER. I will reserve the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I ask unanimous consent, in view of the fact that the report is so at variance with the findings of the committee, that the minority members of the committee may have until midnight Tuesday night in which to file additional minority views.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia. The statements made by the gentleman are absolutely not founded on fact. [Applause.]

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will point out to me what portion of my statement is not founded on fact, I will answer him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will permit the report to be received and printed at this time, but the gentleman from Georgia will have his full rights in the matter in case the report is called up.

Mr. TARVER. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to know what is to be done with my request to file additional minority views?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that he may have until midnight on Tuesday in which to file minority views?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not give my consent to the gentleman's request unless I also have an opportunity to file an additional report. I do not believe it is fair to the majority members of the committee to have the minority members file an additional report after seeing the facts contained in the majority report.

Mr. TARVER. There is no objection in the world to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, with the reservation that any further documents in the way of reports or documents purporting to be reports shall not in any way interfere with any consideration of the matter that may properly come before the House, I will not object.

The SPEAKER. They will not interfere. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] asks unanimous consent that he be given permission to file additional views on the matter. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the report that it has not complied with paragraph 726 (a) of the rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] reserves a point of order.

THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the tariff.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, for 14 months the Congress has been considering tariff legislation, and another general revision has been made.

In 1922, when the Fordney-McCumber Act was being considered, the farmer and the laborer had begun to see rather clearly that a tariff was not in their interest, and the only way the farmer vote was secured to a sufficient extent to insure the passage of the bill was by putting in it a tariff on corn and wheat.

Those who realized that we import no corn, and have an exportable surplus of wheat attempted to explain that a tariff on these commodities would be of no benefit to either the wheat or corn grower. But a tariff on farm products was then a comparatively new idea, and most of the Representatives from agricultural States did not understand that a tariff on wheat and corn would be of no benefit to the farmer, so the bill was passed with a result that for nine years agriculture has sold in a world market and bought in a protected market, whereas other industry has had the benefit of a tariff. In other words, the farmer has been at a very great economic disadvantage.

Shortly after President Hoover took office he suggested that some sort of legislation be passed to place the farmer on equality with other industry, instead of which a general tariff revision was undertaken by the majority party.

Although the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922 also had generally higher duties than any previous legislation, the present act is much higher, and agriculture has not been substantially helped, so that instead of this legislation being in the interest of the farmer, there is a wider gap than ever between the legislative assistance given to farming and to other industry.

In some respects, of course, agriculture will be assisted in so far as a tariff can be of assistance. The tariff on canned and raw tomatoes, which I did everything I possibly could to help, will assist the tomato growers and laboring men and women, as well as the canner, in sections of the country where this product is grown; but, of course, every farmer and laboring man is a consumer, and the price of what he has to buy will be greatly increased by this tariff bill taken as a whole.

There has been so much discussion of the tariff in this country, due to the fact that New England has attempted to show a policy of protection to be best for the country as a whole, that it is very difficult to picture the real situation in the course of a short address. Maybe it will help to illustrate a little:

Let us assume that the Constitution of the United States had never been adopted, and that it were possible for each State to enact tariff laws against every other State. Let us assume that manufacturing New England had a tariff wall against the agricultural parts of the country in order to protect agriculture in New England. Let us suppose the agricultural sections of the country had a tariff against the New England States in order to protect the manufacturer of shoes and other manufactured articles in agricultural districts. Suppose the borders of each State had to be patrolled by police forces to prevent the importation of articles from any other State without the payment of duty.

Suppose you couldn't take a calf, or a basket of eggs, or a crate of strawberries, or a load of hay, from Maryland into Delaware or Pennsylvania or from Delaware or Pennsylvania into Maryland, without paying a duty. Is it not perfectly evident the country could not have its present prosperity, and is not it evident also that the bad feeling engendered between the States would result in war? One of the things which has made this country great and prosperous is the fact of free commerce between the States. The ideal system is to produce articles where they can be produced with a minimum of human labor, and there is no argument at all in favor of a general protective system as a principle in the richest country in the world where, because of labor-saving devices, mass production,

and working people of high mental caliber, we can in general produce more cheaply than any other country in the world.

Of course, I would not abolish all tariff immediately, because that would frighten business and unsettle things, but I would advocate a tariff reduction of 5 per cent a year for 20 years, and get rid of a thing which wastes a lot of American thought that should be utilized in matters of general welfare, which increases the price of food and clothing and other articles of general consumption, the burden of which increase rests upon those who are least able to bear it (for instance, the farmer or laboring man will use practically as much sugar and cotton goods as the family of the man who is worth millions) and which reduces the wages of labor because it is impossible to expect foreign countries not to build tariff walls against our products if we are going to build tariff walls against theirs.

Finally, tariffs are the cause of more international bad feeling than anything I know of. One of the principal things which has kept Europe at war for hundreds of years has been the erection of tariff walls, and the new tariff legislation is causing the bitterest feeling against us by other countries.

Is it not right clear that without trade there would be no civilization, and the reason people want to deal with each other is because of the mutual advantage of the transaction?

I know of no defense of protection as a principle. The policy of the country should be gradual reduction of tariffs rather than a constant increase in tariffs.

Of course, in the last analysis, the whole thing boils down to the fact that the same rule applies to a country as to an individual. The farther a country or an individual gets away from narrow selfishness in business matters the greater the prosperity of the country or of the individual.

A short time before the passage of the tariff bill, but at a time when the provisions it would contain were substantially fixed, a striking editorial on this question appeared in the New York World, as follows:

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

When the House passed the tariff bill nearly a year ago, the World undertook to show in some detail how this measure would affect the great body of American consumers while ostensibly aiding the farmers. Since then the Senate, after many months of debate, has also adopted a tariff bill, and a conference committee has smoothed out most of the differences between the two measures. A controversy over the rates on five commodities and over two administrative provisions of the bill still divides the two Houses. The House of Representatives, however, has accepted the bill so far as it has been agreed upon by the conference committee, and if any tariff legislation is enacted at the present session this draft of the measure will form the substance of the law.

By comparing the rates upon which the conference committee has agreed with those in the existing law it is possible to show how closely the new tariff, if finally adopted, will touch the daily life of the average consumer. This can best be done, perhaps, by citing some of the intimate details of an ordinary morning of his working day. His day begins when he is aroused by an alarm clock, and the duty upon this useful device has been increased 50 per cent. He throws down the bed covers, on which the duty has been advanced 20 per cent, steps from the bed to a rag rug (duty up 114 per cent), dons a bath robe (duty up 10 per cent), and puts on a pair of bedroom slippers, which have been removed from the free list and subjected to a duty of 20 per cent.

On the tiling in the bathroom the duty has been raised 25 per cent. On the floor of this room is some inlaid linoleum, on which the duty has been increased 20 per cent. The tariff on the mirror before which our consumer takes his morning shave has been raised 25 per cent. On his shaving brush, hairbrush, and toothbrush the duty has been increased 15 per cent; on the washbasin and bathtub it has been advanced 10 per cent. The glass tumbler used in his dental ablutions also takes a 10 per cent increase, and the sponge, if of good quality, takes an increase of 100 per cent.

The new tariff bill has been defended as a means of farm relief, but how any of these increases is going to aid agriculture is yet to be demonstrated. The farmer as a consumer will share these burdens along with everyone else.

But to return to the early morning operations of our average citizen: The clothes cabinet from which he selects his garments for the day's wear is subjected to an additional tariff tax of 20 per cent. The shirt he puts on bears an increase of 28 per cent, and the silk necktie an increase of 8 per cent. On his suit of clothes the duty has been raised another 10 per cent. His shoes have been removed from the free list and made dutiable at 20 per cent. He selects a fresh handkerchief (duty up 10 per cent), adjusts his eyeglasses (duty on the lenses up 10 per cent), gives his clothes a flick with the whiskbroom (duty up 66 per cent) and is ready for breakfast.

Wherever he turns, in the kitchen or dining room, the consumer will encounter new tariff taxes. The china, glassware, silverware, and kitchenware are all subjected to heavier duties under the new bill; and so are the fruit, cereal, milk, cream, butter, eggs, sugar, and cocoa which go to make his breakfast. Once upon a time the Republican Party tried to make a kind of fetish out of the "free breakfast table," but under the new bill the consumer's table will fairly groan under the weight of tariff taxes.

In a word, on practically everything which is essential to health, comfort, and decent appearance the consumer is going to be taxed more heavily than ever before by the Smoot-Hawley tariff, provided, of course, that Congress now dares to pass this bill of abominations and President Hoover is willing to risk the political consequences of approving it.

There are heavier taxes even on the surgical instruments and the ether which may be needed to save life. Not only are the new taxes heavier on food, clothing, house furnishings, and medical and surgical necessities, but they have also been increased on the materials going into the house which shelters our consumer from the weather. The cement which goes into the foundations of the building and the brick which go into the walls have been taken from the free list and made dutiable. The window panes which admit the sunlight and the hardwoods for the floors have also not been overlooked by the tariff boosters.

All these new taxes have been perpetrated in the name of farm relief. The farmer will obtain additional protection on his products, it is true, but it is a protection which does not really protect. As a producer he will find the tariff a swindle; as a consumer he and all other consumers as well will find it a burden. The consumer once more finds himself the forgotten man, but there is at least a chance that the fear of his wrath at the approaching election may save him.

THE TARIFF

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have asked for this time in order to read a short editorial dated yesterday from the Youngstown Vindicator. The Youngstown Vindicator is one of the strongest Democratic papers in the State of Ohio. Its president is the former Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. John H. Clarke, a very fine, upstanding man, who is loved, honored, and respected by everybody in Ohio. [Applause.]

The title of this editorial is "The Tariff." It reads as follows:

Before nightfall the long battle over the tariff should be ended. The bill will not be what the country expected and certainly not what President Hoover had in mind when he called Congress to make a few needed revisions to help western farmers. Most persons would call it a bad bill, and no one would like to see such a fight as this again. Yet there has been a great deal of exaggeration concerning the measure. Its opponents have gone so far in misstating its possible effect that many believe that its passage will mean another panic and years of depression. What is more likely to happen is that the very passage of the bill, whether it is good or bad, will go so far toward stabilizing business conditions that it may be expected to be the beginning of better times. Once the uncertainty is out of the way business will go ahead. It is hardly conceivable that President Hoover will veto the bill.

Don't worry, then, if the tariff bill passes. The country will be better off to have this matter settled one way or the other. If the new schedules go too high, the President will have authority to change them. Every tariff is unpopular at the time it is made, and unpopular as this bill is, we shall all think better of it a year from now when business conditions are normal again—as they surely will be long before then.

[Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I believe the editor of this paper should be commended for the fair way he has handled this important question.

THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for three minutes to read an editorial on the tariff.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Reserving the right to object, and I do not object, I want to know if this is by another Clarke?

Mr. SABATH. No. It is not by Clarke.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is very likely by a clerk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the last speaker violated the rules of the House by reading an editorial without asking unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. SNELL. Why did the gentleman not make the point of order at the time?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The gentleman had finished with it before I had an opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, in answer to the editorial appearing in some small country paper read by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] and written by some unknown Mr. Clarke, and which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE] lustily applauded, permit me to read a real editorial appearing in many of the leading and largest newspapers in the country and written by a gentleman who, to my regret, has done more to bring about the defeat of the Democratic nominee, Alfred Smith, and the election of Herbert Hoover than any other individual or group of individuals in the United States, William Randolph Hearst. [Applause and laughter.] Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, let me have the attention of you Republicans who laugh and snicker when I give credit to Mr. Hearst for the great service which he rendered to your party in the last presidential campaign. You did not act in that manner during the campaign of 1928, when from time to time you applauded in this very House utterances and editorials from these very newspapers which you to-day jeer. [Laughter and applause.]

Seldom, if ever before, in its long and distinguished history has the United States Senate faced a graver challenge than the approaching vote upon the Grundy tariff bill presents to every Senator.

Overwhelming evidence is before the Senate that the Grundy tariff bill is the most vicious legislation of its kind that has ever threatened this country or alarmed and angered the world.

Overwhelming evidence is before the Senate that all sorts and conditions of Americans in all parts of this country are bitterly opposed to the exactions of this tariff bill and hope for the bill's defeat.

Over 1,000 of our great political economists who have examined this bill are agreed that it is filled with injustices. These economists have united in a protest against the extortionate rates carried in this bill.

All these economists say what the Hearst newspapers have repeatedly said, that the Grundy tariff bill will not help the farmer, but will increase the cost of living to every citizen, including the farmer.

Enactment of the Grundy bill into law will add at least a thousand million dollars to the cost of living every year that it remains in effect.

It will curtail production at home and lose for us markets abroad.

It will constitute an embargo by our country against the products of foreign countries. And this will provoke foreign countries to retaliate with embargoes against American products.

It will make living so high in this country and so increase expenses here that the cost of production will be materially increased, and the ability of Americans to compete even in those foreign markets from which they are not excluded will thereby be greatly decreased.

The Grundy tariff bill ought to be rejected by the Senate because—

It violates the pledges of the Republican Party for a limited revision of the tariff to relieve agriculture.

It basely betrays the public welfare and basely serves special privilege, and brazenly makes the Republican Party the open and avowed servant of the special interests.

It will cripple business at home and hamper commerce abroad, halt the return of prosperity, and further impair public confidence in the integrity of government.

Finally, it will provoke a world-wide tariff war against the United States.

Of course, the President should have and probably will have the public spirit to veto the Grundy tariff bill, if it ever passes the Senate.

But in this emergency the American people look to their Senators in Congress to discharge their responsibility in this vital matter and not pass it on to the President.

If the United States Senate would keep its reputation and vindicate the confidence of the people in its independence and courage and integrity, it will reject the Grundy tariff bill and save this country from the curse of its extortions.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I regret that not only Mr. Hearst but millions of farmers, wage earners, and business men in general who, during the campaign, relied on the Republican promises, are doomed to disappointment. The Senate already yesterday has passed this outrageous bill, and within a few hours the Republicans, having the majority of votes, will do likewise in the House. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, there may be some doubt in the minds of some as to the probable action of the President, but there is none in my mind. I am positive, and that without having authority to speak for the President, that he will sign the bill. As otherwise we would not have seen the activity on the part of his trusties in the cloakrooms and the Chambers the last few days. Of course he will issue a statement that he is doing so reluctantly because some of the provisions—though very likely without mentioning them—do not meet with his approval, but being the best that he can secure and in order to eliminate further uncertainties he is signing same.

THE TARIFF

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 253, a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 253

Resolved, That for the purpose of the vote and debate the two conference reports on the bill H. R. 2667 shall be considered as one report. The reading of the two reports shall be waived, and the statements of the managers on the part of the House shall be read in lieu thereof. There shall be three hours of debate, which shall be confined to the reports, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. In the consideration of the reports all points of order shall be waived. At the conclusion of debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the adoption of the reports.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order against the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The resolution provides that "in the consideration of the reports all points of order shall be waived." Points of order are based on the rules of the House, either the few published rules or the precedents and rulings by presiding officers. This resolution proposes to do in effect what should be done by a motion to suspend the rules. The difficulty is, however, that to suspend the rules a two-thirds vote is required. This is not a resolution brought in for the purpose of obtaining by a majority vote the direct repeal of all of the rules of the House but is intended to serve a certain specific purpose in reference to only one measure of the House. For instance, the rule relating to Calendar Wednesday requires that to set that aside there must be a two-thirds vote. The rule prohibiting legislation on an appropriation bill could not be set aside, in my opinion, by this method, and that applies to other rules of the House. Points of order being rules of the House, in my opinion this resolution violates the rules of the House, in that it sets aside all rules relating to points of order.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I should be very glad to argue the point of order with the gentleman if I knew what his point of order is, but from anything my friend has said so far, I am unable to identify it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state it is not necessary. This is a very ordinary proceeding. It has been done hundreds of times to the knowledge of the Chair. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Speaker that I have no desire to argue the point of order, for I think the Speaker's ruling was correct, but I ask the gentleman from New York if he will yield to me for the purpose of addressing a legitimate parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker.

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. The rule as reported provides that for the purpose of vote and debate the two conference reports on the bill shall be considered as one report. Section 774 of the rules of the House provides:

On the demand of any Member, before the question is put, a question shall be divided if it include propositions so distinct in substance that one being taken away a substantive proposition shall remain.

This rule provides that the two conference reports, each one distinct and substantive, shall be considered as one report. Now, my inquiry is: Does that take away the right of any Member to ask for a division and a separate vote on the two conference reports?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that if the resolution is adopted by a majority, that suspends the rule quoted by the gentleman for to-day in connection with this bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the rule just presented provides a method for considering the two conference reports on H. R. 2667, commonly referred to as the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill.

We find ourselves in a peculiar position to-day. For the first time during my experience in the House we have before us two conference reports on the same bill, but as these two reports are very closely allied, deal in general terms with the same matter, and as the House has already voted on one of the

complete reports and has voted on each individual item contained in the other report, it seems to me perfectly proper that at this time they should be joined together and that we should do in the House what the Senate did by unanimous consent, that for the purpose of debate and vote we should consider both of these conference reports as one report.

At this time I simply want to say to the House that a vote for this rule and for these conference reports is a vote for the pending tariff bill. [Applause.] If you are opposed to that bill, then vote against this resolution and against the conference report.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I notice the rule provides that the statement made by the managers on the part of the House shall be read in lieu of the report. I have not had time to examine it just for the moment.

I think it will take an hour at least to read the statements accompanying these reports. They have been printed in the RECORD. I think the membership is familiar with them. Why the House should take an hour to read these statements or reports is something I can not understand.

Mr. SNELL. I was going to say to the gentleman from Texas that when the reading of the reports or statements is started, I am going to ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the statements on the part of the managers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlement of the House, when the history of the making of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill of 1930 shall have been completely written, it will attract the attention of students of economics principally for two reasons.

First, for the unusual, the unfair, and the unparliamentary method by which it was "jammed" through the Congress of the United States over the reasonable objection of a large, duly elected minority, so that no opportunity was ever afforded to fairly discuss it on its merits.

Secondly, it will be an interesting study as the unnecessary, the unreasonable, and the extortionate rates which it lays upon an already overburdened people. The load is now increased by 20 per cent.

This rule here to-day is the final thrust—the "et tu Brute" of the parliamentarian procedure accompanying this bill. At every step in the progress of this tariff bill the rules of the House have been ruthlessly thrust aside, even temporarily revoked so that the interests concerned might be served in this mad rush to plunder our people.

I have been a member of the Rules Committee of this House for seven years. The distinguished chairman is the only Republican member of that committee longer in service on that committee than I. I have seen countless rules reported from that powerful committee, but never until this good hour, in my experience, at least, has anyone, chairman, Rules Committee, or Republican steering committee, had the audacity to present to the House a rule which so completely violates all fair parliamentary procedure in at least three fundamental aspects.

First, this rule for consideration of the conference reports on the tariff bill prohibits a separate vote on the two separate and distinct conference reports. We are now compelled to vote on the two reports en bloc. We must take both or leave both. Up or down we must vote both reports, though some Members, Republicans as well as Democrats, might agree with one report and disagree with the other. When was that ruthless method ever before adopted? Let the Republican Members of this House, the parliamentarians especially, who hold sacred the rules of this House, point to precedents justifying that arbitrary procedure. Why this House has never considered the second conference report at all.

Secondly, the rules—and it must astound those Members interested in fair, unharnessed rules of procedure—the rule, I say, provides that "all points of order shall be waived." Search your precedents for a parallel of that "gag." Consider what that extraordinary provision of the rule means. Why, even though either or both conference reports should violate the fundamental rules of this House, the rule concerning germaneness, for instance, the rule conferring the power of the conferees within the limits adopted by the two Houses, aye, even though both conference reports should violate every single, solitary rule of this House, no Member can rise in his place and protect orderly and fair parliamentary procedure by making a point of order. Sic semper tyrannis!

Thirdly, the rule for the first time in my experience, at least, does not contain the usual unexceptional provision for at least one motion to recommit as provided in paragraph 4 of Rule XVI. Rule XI provides that the Committee on Rules—

> Shall not report any rule or order which shall operate to prevent the motion to recommit being made as provided in paragraph 4 of Rule XVI.

When the chairman of the Rules Committee yesterday filed the resolution of that committee, I reserved all points of order against the resolution because it seemed to me to be an outrageous violation of our rules that no motion to recommit was possible; that not even one motion to recommit was afforded this House. Search your precedents for that, you parliamentarians! It is no answer to the spirit of the rule that this is a conference report and not a bill. The rule makes no such distinction. Nor is it any answer that a motion to recommit would be ineffectual because the Senate conferees may have adjourned. Answer any way you try, the apparent purpose of the omission to include the right of one motion to recommit is to deprive the House of further action on the measure. It may be, as stated by the press and the country generally, that the best thing to stabilize the present business uncertainty caused by this bill would be to finally dispose of it in some way. You are at least obeying that mandate.

The only provision missing from this rule, the only last and final stroke against free discussion of legislation affecting 130,000,000 people, is a provision that "any Member opposed to the bill shall not be permitted to vote." It comes as a surprise that the rule did not disenfranchise the opponents of the measure. To leave that out must have been an oversight.

Fear not, you Democrats, that the Democratic minority on the Rules Committee did not protest against this outrageous procedure. Like the entire Democratic delegation from New York, they have fought this bill at every step. Our voices may be weak now. In June we may be flaying the windmills, but in November the cause of righteous and just and ordinary fairness will reap a harvest. The American people are too good sportsmen, they love fair play too much to further countenance such "steam rolling." They will stand for the old steam roller for a while, they will watch it go up the street, but when it turns around and continues to back up and roll over the helpless minority victim time and time again, then the unequaled sense of fair play will protest so loudly that the voices of yesterday ineffective in a little room in the gallery floor of this Capitol Building will be heard from Cape Cod to San Diego. We Democrats accept the challenge of the czars.

So much for the outrageous violation of all our rules of procedure.

As to the merits of this tariff bill, as to the rates it imposes, the American people almost as a unit tremble at the consequences of the enactment of this legislation. At least 85 per cent of our press, irrespective of their party affiliations, denounce the bill as the most iniquitous ever conjured. Mark you well, ladies and gentlemen, another Republican protective tariff bill will never be enacted. Inwardly all the leaders of your party feel like the colored soldier when he was embarking at Brest for home. A friend asked him how he felt about the war. The colored boy replied, "Well, it was all right; but this is my last World War." This is your last tariff bill.

Scores of foreign nations, protesting in vain at the bill's unfair discrimination against friendly countries, threaten, and have already enacted, reprisals which will tend to destroy our foreign commerce and our friendship with the nations of the world. We stand before the world to-day as a financial bully, drunk with wealth, sneeringly threatening to destroy the economic status of the poorer and economically weaker nations of the world. So repugnant is the measure, even to Republicans of the House and Senate, that scores of Members in both bodies who ordinarily have favored a protective tariff are nauseated at the extremities to which this bill has gone and can not stomach its un-Americanism and its injustice. Capitalists, bankers, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, business men, big and little, counted heretofore as favoring the policy of "protection," have already flooded Congress and the White House with their most vehement protests against the possible enactment of this vicious brigandage. Not one voice in ten thousand has been raised in support of this tariff bill. The farmers, for 70 years the backbone of the Republican Party and "protection," are incensed at its provisions. The "light" has finally broken on them. When they finally saw the possibility of a high tariff on the shingles and the floor boards of the old barn they rebelled, but to no avail. The industrial East, from which the votes come which will pass this bill, will attempt to continue to deceive the farmer into voting the Republican ticket. We shall see in November whether the farmers will forget.

For the first time the eyes of labor are opened and the wage earner abhors the bill. Business fears its consequence. Wall Street and the security exchanges of the country fear its enactment as the last straw which will crash all the security markets. Recently, on rumors and hopes that the bill might not become a law, the already demoralized markets buoyed up. There was a flurry on the upside. This morning the markets broke further, and no one can guess what will happen Monday. What will happen when the bill shall become a law by the President's signature? There are many people who believe we shall then have the worst market crash of recent times.

Who really wants this bill? Oh, yes; the Grundys and the Mellons and the Garys want it, and their satellites and their hirelings submit to their master's voices. But the people of the consuming public, the "little fellows," do not want it, aye, even "business" does not want it. Many a prayer will rise to heaven after to-day that the Chief Executive at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue will be brave enough, fair enough, American enough to do the big thing and veto this bill. If he does not, if he lacks the courage of red-blooded American manhood, we Democrats, we, who have actively and with all our voice and with all our strength and with all our resources, have opposed this imposition of another billion dollars of tribute on our people, we still stand adamant, maybe with our backs to the wall to-day, but we have our feet firmly planted at Thermopylae. We accept this challenge to the American people. We have only to wait until November. Then, when the burdensome effects of this, your handicraft, shall be felt by our people, in that cold gray realization of the autumnal dawn, we shall still be there—fighting. We accept the gauntlet you have thrown down. We snatch it up! We accept your brazen challenge! We will meet you in November, at Philippi. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, 20 years ago the country was tremendously aroused against what was then known all through the Nation as Cannonism and against the Cannon rules. Why? Because under the then existing rules of the House the Speaker possessed unlimited power. He was czar, he was in absolute control and all were obliged to pay homage to him—he was supreme. For nearly three terms he ruled the House with an iron hand—he appointed all the committees and controlled the legislation of this House. You, Mr. Speaker, and some of you gentlemen recollect the prolonged struggle that took place in the Sixty-first Congress to bring about the overthrow of Cannonism and the struggle to divest him of that unlimited power which he assumed and exercised over Congress. You, Mr. Speaker, and others remember the two days and two nights struggle in which finally a majority succeeded in freeing itself from the yoke of tyranny of the Speaker by adopting rules which took from him the power of appointment of committees and generally liberalizing the rules of the House and making Congress again a deliberate legislative body. The country acclaimed it a great victory, and the Members of the House attained the freedom of action and deliberation which the Constitution originally provided. The House become responsive to the needs of the Nation. The rule that you have brought out to-day, to my mind, is more vicious than the old Cannon rules which bound the membership of the House for many years and specially so during Speaker Cannon's régime. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I feel that the time is fast approaching when the country again will be aroused against the methods pursued by you gentlemen now in control of this House. This rule deprives the Members of the House of rights and privileges that we have at all times felt were ours and have jealously guarded.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides that no points of order may lie against the reports or any provision in the reports.

We have heretofore believed we were protected against legislation on the part of conferees. We know how often the conferees endeavor to usurp the power of Congress and write into a conference report provisions that have been rejected by the House.

But we were safeguarded under the present existing rules. We could raise a point of order against any matter that was not originally in the House or the Senate bill, and we could limit and prevent the usurpation of power on the part of the conferees whenever they exceeded their authority, and thereby preserve ours and the rights of the House.

But under this rule that protection and that right and privilege is taken away. I do not, nor do you, know what is contained in the two conference reports for which you will shortly vote. But regardless of what they contain, whether outside of the House or the Senate bill, you are told that you can not object, you can not make any point of order against them, and you are obliged to take it as submitted by the, by this rule, all-powerful conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I view with alarm this dangerous proceeding, and some day you who are trying to interrogate me and asking that I yield to you may regret that you have gone as far as you have gone with this rule. I feel that the time has arrived that we should protect ours as well as the rights of this House, that we should have some voice in the legislation, especially such important legislation as this.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, the gentleman knows that we had a vote on the first conference report. Did the gentleman, or anybody else, raise any point of order in the House when that opportunity was offered?

Mr. SABATH. I am not a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I do not know whether the committee reserved its rights at that time or not. I invariably do not mix in matters of other committees, where I feel that they are competent to protect themselves and the House. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, under this special rule within a few hours we will be compelled to vote on the most important legislation or bill ever presented to the House. This tariff bill is most iniquitous and the highest in the history of the Nation. What justification, what excuse, you gentlemen who vote for this bill will be able to make or give for your action is extremely difficult for me to foresee.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I and all who have the interest of our country and not the interest of the privileged and specially protected monopolies at heart will of necessity be compelled to vote against this bill and will deplore its passage. Nevertheless I feel that business conditions demand that we put to an end the 14 months' long uncertainty and exasperating delay which in a great measure has been responsible for the general depression, the ruination of business, and brought about the continuous great unemployment in our land. At one time I was hopeful that we would pass a bill that would be helpful and beneficial, but I am in grave doubt as to the final effect of this legislation on the country, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I would be immensely pleased and grateful if my apprehensions were unfounded and that the reverse might be true, as after all I am tremendously interested that confidence be restored and reestablished and that employment be found for all willing hands, so that the country could again attain that forward stride that spells progress and prosperity.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want to say one thing for the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] that when he has to perform an operation he does it quickly without an anæsthetic. [Laughter.]

This tariff bill represents the first principles of polished peculation—take it, take as much as possible, take it safely. This is a titanic larceny. It is superextortion. We all remember the early days of this extravaganza of theft. How the hordes of the privileged descended like a plague on the Capitol and began to eat out the heart of American prosperity. With eager eyes and clutching hands they waited outside of the Ways and Means room to get theirs, and they did not wait in vain.

The President had promised a tariff revision limited in scope, and now he must sign this atrocity without rime, reason, or limit, or off with his head. Congress has betrayed the people. The Republican Party has delivered for its financial backers. A colossal iniquity has been contrived by the Republicans to make two classes in America—the extremely rich and the extremely poor.

A party can be bribed as well as an individual, and the Republican Party was paid two years ago to do the cruel injustice of to-day. In the name of protection we are fastened with extortion.

Old King Canute GRUNDY held up his hand and the flow of trade stopped. He has passed away politically, but this tariff bill is his last will and testament to take care of all his blood relatives of protection. None of them need guardians.

As GRUNDY hath gone so shall ye all go. This is one time the Republicans are not going to get away with it. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, the curtain is about to fall on the last scene in the legislative drama, which has engaged the attention of the country for well-nigh 18 months. The bill has been discussed at length, and the time has passed when any argument against the bill can be of any avail whatsoever. Suffice it to say that you are about to pass the highest tariff bill in 140 years.

There has been no demand for this legislation. The files of the committee in the House and in the Senate will not disclose

that the voice of any considerable portion of America has been raised asking for any such legislation. On the contrary, there has been almost a nation-wide protest against the passage of the bill. Not only that, there is now almost a world-wide protest against the passage of any such legislation. It is the answer of the party in power to the cry of bankrupt agriculture for relief.

For every dime that you put into one pocket of the American farmer by this bill you take out a dollar from the other pocket. It is your answer to the plea for work of 3,000,000 American workingmen who are out of employment. The bill means curtailment of production because of loss of market and therefore increase in the number of the unemployed. It is your answer to the plea of the bread lines that exist to-day in every city in America.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some strange, occult influence behind this bill somewhere. The wonder is that in the face of such a protest such a measure could be put through. It must be that there has been an influence behind the bill that has not been fully disclosed. It must be that the select few who contribute thousands to successful campaigns are the hidden but compelling influence behind this bill, because they expect millions in return for the thousands they put up. Under the operation of this bill they will not be disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is putting it mildly if I say that President Hoover's administration has been a disappointment. He is an estimable gentleman and I respect him very highly, but I do not think any voice will be raised to dispute the statement that up to this good hour his administration has been a disappointment. It is said that opportunity knocks once at the door of every man. When this bill is carried to the White House opportunity will knock at the door of Herbert Hoover. If he would reinstate himself, if he would subserve the best interests of America, if he would regain the good will of the world, he will veto the most vicious piece of legislation that has ever been sent to the White House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Will he have the courage to do it, Mr. Speaker? We can only wait and see. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I had reserved some time because I expected that our friends on the Democratic side of the House would present some new arguments why this rule should not be adopted at the present time, but the arguments they have used have been the same ones they have used against every rule which has been presented in this House since I have been a Member. Thus far it has not had any special effect upon the membership of the House. Therefore, I shall not try to answer them at the present time but shall move the previous question on the adoption of the rule.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 140, answered "present" 1, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—222

Ackerman	Cochran, Pa.	Freeman	Johnson, Ind.
Adkins	Cole	French	Johnson, Nebr.
Andresen	Colton	Garber, Okla.	Johnson, S. Dak.
Andrew	Connery	Garber, Va.	Johnson, Wash.
Arentz	Connolly	Gifford	Jonas, N. C.
Aswell	Cooper, Ohio	Goodwin	Kading
Bacharach	Cooper, Wis.	Graham	Kahn
Bachmann	Coyle	Green	Kearns
Bacon	Crail	Guyer	Kelly
Baird	Crowther	Hadley	Kemp
Barbour	Culkin	Hale	Kendall, Ky.
Beedy	Darrow	Hall, Ill.	Kiefner
Beers	Davenport	Hall, Ind.	Kiess
Blackburn	Dempsey	Hall, N. Dak.	Kinzer
Bolton	Denison	Hancock	Kopp
Bowman	De Priest	Hardy	Korell
Brand, Ohio	DeRouen	Haugen	Lampert
Brigham	Dickinson	Hawley	Langley
Britten	Doutrich	Hess	Lankford, Va.
Brumm	Dowell	Hickey	Lea
Buckbee	Drane	Hill, Wash.	Leavitt
Burdick	Dunbar	Hoch	Leech
Butler	Dyer	Hogg	Lehlbach
Campbell, Pa.	Eaton, Colo.	Holaday	Letts
Carter, Calif.	Eaton, N. J.	Hooper	Luce
Carter, Wyo.	Elliott	Hope	McClintock, Ohio
Chalmers	Ellis	Hopkins	McCormick, Ill.
Chase	Englebright	Houston, Del.	McFadden
Chindblom	Estep	Hudson	McLaughlin
Christopherson	Evans, Calif.	Hudspeth	McLeod
Clague	Fenn	Hull, Morton D.	Magrady
Clancy	Fish	Hull, William E.	Manlove
Clark, Md.	Foss	Irwin	Mapes
Clarke, N. Y.	Free	Jenkins	Martin
Menges	Ramey, Frank M.	Speaks	Treadway
Merritt	Ransley	Spearing	Turpin
Michaelson	Reece	Sproul, Ill.	Vestal
Michener	Reid, Ill.	Stafford	Wainwright
Miller	Robinson	Stalker	Wason
Montet	Rogers	Stobbs	Watres
Moore, Ohio	Rowbottom	Strong, Kans.	Watson
Morgan	Sanders, N. Y.	Strong, Pa.	Welsh, Pa.
Mouser	Schafer, Wis.	Sullivan, Pa.	Whitley
Murphy	Sears	Summers, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Nelson, Me.	Seger	Swanson	Williamson
Newhall	Shaffer, Va.	Swick	Wilson
Niedringhaus	Short, Mo.	Swing	Wolfenden
O'Connor, La.	Shott, W. Va.	Taber	Wolverton, N. J.
O'Connor, Okla.	Shreve	Taylor, Tenn.	Wolverton, W. Va.
Palmer	Simmons	Temple	Wood
Parker	Simms	Thatcher	Woodruff
Perkins	Sloan	Thompson	Wurzbach
Pittenger	Smith, Idaho	Thurston	Yates
Pratt, Ruth	Snell	Tilson	Zihlman
Pritchard	Snow	Timberlake	
Purnell	Sparks	Tinkham	

NAYS—140

Abernethy	Dominick	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano
Allgood	Doughton	Johnson, Tex.	Parks
Almon	Douglas, Ariz.	Jones, Tex.	Patman
Arnold	Doxey	Kennedy	Patterson
Auf der Heide	Drewry	Kerr	Pou
Ayres	Driver	Kincheloe	Prall
Bell	Edwards	Knutson	Quayle.
Black	Eslick	Kvale	Quin
Blanton	Evans, Mont.	LaGuardia	Ragon
Bloom	Fisher	Lanham	Rainey, Henry T.
Box	Fitzpatrick	Lankford, Ga.	Ramseyer
Boylan	Fuller	Lindsay	Ramspeck
Brand, Ga.	Fulmer	Linthicum	Rankin
Briggs	Gambrill	Lozier	Rutherford
Browne	Garner	Ludlow	Sabath
Browning	Garrett	McClintic, Okla.	Sanders, Tex.
Brunner	Gasque	McCormack, Mass.	Sandlin
Busby	Gavagan	McDuffie	Schneider
Campbell, Iowa	Glover	McKeown	Selvig
Canfield	Goldsborough	McMillan	Sirovich
Carley	Granfield	McSwain	Smith, W. Va.
Cartwright	Greenwood	Mansfield	Somers, N. Y.
Celler	Gregory	Mead	Steagall
Clark, N. C.	Griffin	Milligan	Sullivan, N. Y.
Cochran, Mo.	Hall, Miss.	Montague	Sumners, Tex.
Collier	Halsey	Mooney	Tarver
Cooper, Tenn.	Hammer	Moore, Ky.	Tucker
Corning	Hare	Moore, Va.	Underwood
Cox	Hastings	Morehead	Vinson, Ga.
Craddock	Hill, Ala.	Nelson, Mo.	Warren
Crisp	Howard	O'Connell	Welch, Calif.
Cross	Huddleston	O'Connor, N. Y.	Whitehead
Crosser	Hull, Wis.	Oldfield	Whittington
Cullen	Igoe	Oliver, Ala.	Woodrum
Dickstein	Jeffers	Oliver, N. Y.	Wright

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Douglass, Mass.

NOT VOTING—65

Aldrich	Davis	Kunz	Sinclair
Allen	Doyle	Kurtz	Sproul, Kans.
Bankhead	Esterly	Lambertson	Stedman
Beck	Finley	Larsen	Stevenson
Bland	Fitzgerald	McReynolds	Stone
Bohn	Fort	Maas	Taylor, Colo.
Buchanan	Frear	Nelson, Wis.	Underhill
Burtness	Gibson	Nolan	Vincent, Mich.
Byrns	Golder	Norton	Walker
Cable	Hartley	Owen	White
Cannon	Hoffman	Peavey	Williams
Christgau	Hull, Tenn.	Porter	Wingo
Collins	James	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Wyant
Cooke	Johnson, Ill.	Rayburn	Yon
Cramton	Johnston, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.	
Curry	Kendall, Pa.	Romjue	
Dallinger	Ketcham	Seiberling	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Dallinger (for) with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts (against).
Mr. Cramton (for) with Mr. Byrns (against).
Mr. White (for) with Mr. Wingo (against).
Mr. Walker (for) with Mr. Christgau (against).
Mr. Esterly (for) with Mr. Bland (against).
Mr. Ketcham (for) with Mr. Sproul of Kansas (against).
Mr. Beck (for) with Mr. Stedman (against).
Mr. Underhill (for) with Mr. Davis (against).
Mr. Aldridge (for) with Mr. Bankhead (against).
Mr. Allen (for) with Mr. Doyle (against).
Mr. Johnston of Missouri (for) with Mr. Peavey (against).
Mr. Sinclair (for) with Mr. Larsen (against).
Mr. Reed of New York (for) with Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin (against).
Mr. Fort (for) with Mrs. Norton (against).
Mr. Finley (for) with Mr. Stevenson (against).
Mr. Hartley (for) with Mr. Lambertson (against).
Mr. Gibson (for) with Mr. Maas (against).
Mr. Hoffman (for) with Mr. Williams (against).
Mr. Bohn (for) with Mr. Hull of Tennessee (against).
Mr. Wyant (for) with Mr. Romjue (against).
Mr. Cable (for) with Mr. Cannon (against).
Mr. Porter (for) with Mr. Kunz (against).
Mr. Harcourt J. Pratt (for) with Mr. Rayburn (against).
Mrs. Owen (for) with Mr. Nolan (against).
Mr. Kendall of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. McReynolds (against).
Mr. Kurtz (for) with Mr. Collins (against).
Mr. Golder (for) with Mr. Buchanan (against).
Mr. Curry (for) with Mr. Taylor of Colorado (against).

Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no," but I wish to withdraw that vote and be paired with Mr. DALLINGER, who would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

COMMISSIONERS UNDER THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing under the rule a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7822) amending section 2 and repealing section 3 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stats. 964, ch. 301), entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation," and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). Ordered printed and referred to the Union Calendar.

THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference reports on the bill H. R. 2667, the tariff bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon calls up the conference reports on the bill H. R. 2667, the tariff bill. Under the rule the Clerk will read the statement accompanying the reports.

The Clerk began the reading of the statement, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report——

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I do not intend to object—but I do want to call attention to the fact that when it is necessary to bring in a political rule for the purpose of protecting certain of the membership in certain things, they usually make a mess of it. If this unanimous consent were not granted, this House could not vote on the conference report until at least half past 8 o'clock to-night and it would take three hours' debate under the rule which the Committee on Rules brought in for the purpose of protecting instead of promoting the interest of Members of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The conference reports and statements are as follows:

[H. Rept. No. 1892]

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on those amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, upon which an agreement was reported by a previous committee of conference to the House on April 28, 1930 (H. Rept. 1326), and to the Senate on April 29, 1930 (S. Doc. 138), having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the same action with respect to such amendments (except amendments numbered 327, 424, 425, 454, 657, 848, and 849) be taken as recommended in the report of such previous committee of conference. A print of such report is appended hereto for the information of the Senate and House.

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 424, 425, 454, 848, and 849.

Amendment numbered 327: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 327, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 367. (a) Watch movements, and time-keeping, time-measuring, or time-indicating mechanisms, devices, and instruments, whether or not designed to be worn or carried on or about the person, all the foregoing, if less than 1.77 inches wide, whether or not in cases, containers, or housings:

"(1) If more than 1½ inches wide, $1.25 each; if more than 1.2 inches but not more than 1½ inches wide, $1.40 each; if more than 1 inch but not more than 1.2 inches wide, $1.55 each; if more than nine-tenths of 1 inch but not more than 1 inch wide, $1.75 each; if more than eight-tenths of 1 inch but not more than nine-tenths of 1 inch wide, $2 each; if more than six-tenths of 1 inch but not more than eight-tenths of 1 inch wide, $2.25 each; if six-tenths of 1 inch or less wide, $2.50 each.

"(2) In the case of any of the foregoing having no jewels or only one jewel, the above rates shall be reduced by 40 per cent.

"(3) Any of the foregoing having more than seven jewels shall be subject to an additional duty of 15 cents for each jewel in excess of seven.

"(4) Any of the foregoing shall be subject to an additional duty of $1 for each adjustment of whatever kind (treating adjustment to temperature as two adjustments) in accordance with the markings as hereinafter provided.

"(5) Any of the foregoing shall be subject to an additional duty of $1 each, if constructed or designed to operate for a period in excess of 47 hours without rewinding, or if self-winding, or if a self-winding device may be incorporated therein.

"(6) Any of the foregoing having more than 17 jewels, whether adjusted or unadjusted, and whether with or without dials, shall, in lieu of the duties provided in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5), be subject to a duty of $10.75 each.

"(b) All the foregoing shall have cut, engraved, or die sunk, conspicuously and indelibly on one or more of the top plates or bridges: The name of the country of manufacture; the name of the manufacturer or purchaser; in words and in Arabic numerals the number of jewels, if any, serving a mechanical purpose as frictional bearings; and, in words and in Arabic numerals, the number and classes of adjustments, or, if unadjusted, the word 'unadjusted.'

"(c) Parts for any of the foregoing shall be dutiable as follows:

"(1) Parts (except pillar or bottom plates, or their equivalent, bridges or their equivalent, and jewels) imported in the same shipment with complete movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, provided for in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph (whether or not suitable for use in such movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments), 45 per centum ad valorem; but this clause of this subparagraph shall not be applicable to that portion of all the parts in the shipment which exceeds in value 4 per cent of the value of such complete movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments;

"(2) Pillar or bottom plates or their equivalent, shall be subject to one-half the amount of duty which would be borne by the complete movement, mechanism, device, or instrument for which suitable.

"(3) Each assembly or subassembly (unless dutiable under clause (1) of this subparagraph) consisting of two or more parts or pieces of metal or other material joined or fastened together shall be subject to a duty of 3 cents for each such part or piece of material, except that in the case of jewels the duty shall be 15 cents instead of 3 cents, and except that in the case of pillar or bottom plates or their equivalent the duty shall be the rate provided in clause (2) of this subparagraph instead of 3 cents, and except that in the case of a balance assembly the duty shall be 50 cents for the assembly instead of 3 cents for each part or piece thereof. No assembly or subassembly shall be subject to a greater amount of duty than would be borne by the complete movement, mechanism, device, or instrument for which suitable, nor to a less rate of duty than 45 per cent ad valorem. For the purpose of this clause a balance assembly shall be an assembly consisting of a balance wheel, balance staff, and hairspring, with or without the other parts commercially known as parts of a balance assembly. For the purpose of this clause bimetallic balance wheels (not part of a balance assembly), and mainsprings with riveted ends, shall each be considered as one part or piece.

"(4) All other parts (except jewels), 65 per cent ad valorem.

"(d) Jewels, suitable for use in any movement, mechanism, device, or instrument, dutiable under this paragraph or paragraph 368, or in any meter or compass, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"(e) Dials for any of the foregoing movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, if such dials are less than one and seventy-seven one hundredths inches wide and are imported separately, 5 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem. Dials for any of the movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments provided for in this paragraph, whether or not attached thereto, shall have stamped, cut, engraved, or die sunk, conspicuously and indelibly thereon the name of the country of manufacture; which marking if the dial is imported attached to any of the foregoing movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, shall be placed on the face of the dial in such manner as not to be obscured by any part of the case, container, or housing.

"(f) All cases, containers, or housings, designed or suitable for the inclosure of any of the foregoing movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, whether or not containing such movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, and whether

finished or unfinished, complete or incomplete, except such containers as are used for shipping purposes only:

"(1) If made of gold or platinum, 75 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem;

"(2) if in part of gold, silver, or platinum, or wholly of silver, 40 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem;

"(3) if set with precious, semiprecious, or imitation precious, or imitation semiprecious stones, or if prepared for the setting of such stones, 40 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem;

"(4) if of base metal (and not containing gold, silver, or platinum), 20 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem;

"(5) any of the foregoing cases, containers, or housings, if enameled, shall be subject to an additional duty of 15 per cent ad valorem.

"(g) Any of the foregoing cases, containers, or housings, shall have cut, engraved, or die sunk, conspicuously and indelibly on the inside of the back cover, the name in full of the manufacturer or purchaser and the name of the country of manufacture.

"(h) For the purposes of this paragraph the width of any movement, mechanism, device, or instrument, shall be the shortest surface dimension through the center of the pillar or bottom plate, or its equivalent, not including in the measurement any portion not essential to the functioning of the movement, mechanism, device, or instrument.

"(i) For the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph 368 the term 'jewel' includes substitutes for jewels.

"(j) An article required by this paragraph to be marked shall be denied entry unless marked in exact conformity with the requirements of this paragraph."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 657: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 657, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "Filaments of rayon or other synthetic textile, single or grouped, and yarns of rayon or other synthetic textile, singles, all the foregoing not specially provided for, weighing 150 deniers or more per length of 450 meters, 45 per cent ad valorem; weighing less than 150 deniers per length of 450 meters, 50 per cent ad valorem; and, in addition, yarns of rayon or other synthetic textile, plied, shall be subject to an additional duty of 5 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That none of the foregoing filaments shall be subject to a less duty than 40 cents per pound, and none of the foregoing yarns shall be subject to a less duty than 45 cents per pound. Any of the foregoing yarns if having more than 20 turns twist per inch shall be subject to an additional cumulative duty of 45 cents per pound"; and the Senate agree to the same.

W. C. HAWLEY,
ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
ISAAC BACHARACH,
Managers on the part of the House.

REED SMOOT,
JAMES E. WATSON,
SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

[S. Doc. 138]

[Print of previous conference report on tariff bill of 1930]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 11, 22, 24, 34, 44, 45, 53, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 104, 108, 109, 118, 141, 159, 160, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 190, 191, 192, 193, 209, 212, 215, 227, 234, 246, 247, 248, 253, 261, 263, 265, 266, 298, 299, 330, 331, 335, 336, 340, 343, 382, 384, 429, 432, 440, 447, 485, 513, 521, 529, 557, 565, 572, 573, 586, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 594, 603, 607, 609, 616, 621, 622, 623, 647, 651, 655, 667, 669, 671, 673, 675, 677, 679, 681, 682, 684, 690, 693, 700, 701, 714, 718, 733, 741, 742, 746, 757, 759, 760, 769, 770, 773, 774, 788, 789, 790, 792, 796, 801, 810, 811, 815, 826, 831, 832, 833, 835, 841, 847, 852, 853, 854, 856, 858. 859, 860, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 886, 894, 944, 949, 967, 968, 998, 1007, 1030, 1043, 1097, 1117, 1142, 1143, 1144, 1146, 1147, 1153, 1159, 1160, 1162, 1163, 1165, 1166, 1174, 1176, 1177, 1198, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1225, 1226, 1228, 1240, 1248, and 1253.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 28, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 46, 47, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 105, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 210, 211, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 225, 229, 231, 232, 233, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 249, 250, 251, 252, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 262, 264, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 286, 287, 288, 290, 291, 295, 296, 297, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 308, 309, 310, 313, 314, 316, 318, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 333, 334, 338, 339, 345, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 365, 366, 378, 388, 389, 390, 391, 393, 397, 398, 399, 400, 402, 403, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 426, 427, 428, 430, 431, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 574, 575, 577, 578, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 587, 593, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 604, 605, 606, 608, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 617, 618, 619, 620, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 648, 650, 653, 654, 656, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 668, 670, 672, 674, 676, 678, 680, 683, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 691, 692, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 710, 711, 712, 713, 715, 716, 717, 720, 721, 722, 723, 725, 726, 727, 728, 730, 731, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 743, 744, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 758, 762, 763, 766, 767, 768, 772, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 786, 793, 794, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 812, 813, 814, 816, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 828, 829, 834, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 850, 855, 857, 861, 889, 890, 900, 912, 918, 924, 939, 941, 943, 986, 988, 990, 991, 994, 996, 1000, 1001, 1005, 1011, 1042, 1044, 1045, 1054, 1056, 1065, 1069, 1073, 1088, 1100, 1101, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1110, 1113, 1115, 1116, 1118, 1119, 1121, 1122, 1123, 1124, 1125, 1127, 1136, 1137, 1145, 1148, 1149, 1150, 1154, 1155, 1164, 1167, 1169, 1170, 1172, 1173, 1175, 1178, 1180, 1181, 1182, 1183, 1184, 1185, 1186, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1194, 1195, 1196, 1197, 1199, 1200, 1201, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1222, 1223, 1224, 1227, 1229, 1230, 1231, 1232, 1233, 1234, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1241, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1245, 1246, 1247, 1249, 1250, 1251, and 1252, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1⅜ cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "3½ cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "formic acid, 3 cents per pound" and a semicolon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "5 cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "11 cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "oleic acid or red oil, 20 per cent ad valorem" and a semicolon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the

matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "12 cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "$1.25"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "75 cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "calcium acetate, crude, 1 cent per pound" and a semicolon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "30 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"pound.

"(b) Synthetic indigo, 'Colour Index No. 1177,' and sulphur black, 'Colour Index No. 978,' 3 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem.

"(c) The ad valorem rates provided in this paragraph shall be based upon the American selling price (as defined in subdivision (g) of section 402, Title IV) of any similar competitive article manufactured or produced in the United States. If."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "; digitalis, 20 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1¾ cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "10 per cent ad valorem; drawing ink, 15 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "three-fourths of"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 51. Menthol, 50 cents per pound; natural crude camphor, 1 cent per pound; natural refined camphor, 5 cents per pound; synthetic camphor, 5 cents per pound. If at the end of three years after the enactment of this act, the President finds that during the preceding six months the domestic production by quantity of synthetic camphor did not exceed 25 per cent of the domestic consumption thereof by quantity, or, at the end of four years after the enactment of this act, that during the preceding six months such domestic production did not exceed 30 per cent of such consumption, or, at the end of five years after the enactment of this act, that during the preceding six months such domestic production did not exceed 50 per cent of such consumption, he shall by proclamation so declare and, after six months thereafter, the rate on synthetic camphor shall be 1 cent per pound. To assist the President in making the investigation required by this provision, the Tariff Commission is empowered to investigate, to such extent as may be necessary, in the manner provided in the case of investigations under section 336 of this act, and shall report to the President the result of its investigation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "3½ cents per pound, but not less than 45 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 24 of the House bill, line 13, after "valorem," insert "eucalyptus, 15 per cent ad valorem" and a semicolon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 65. (a) Paints, colors, and pigments, commonly known as artists', school, students', or children's paints or colors:

"(1) In tubes, jars, cakes, pans, or other forms, not exceeding 1½ pounds net weight each, and valued at less than 20 cents per dozen pieces, and not assembled in paint sets, kits, or color outfits, three-fourths of 1 cent per tube, jar, cake, pan, or other form.

"(2) In tubes, jars, cakes, pans, or other forms, not exceeding 1½ pounds net weight each, and valued at 20 cents or more per dozen pieces, and not assembled in paint sets, kits, or color outfits: In tubes or jars, 2 cents per tube or jar and 40 per cent ad valorem; in cakes, pans, or other forms, 1¼ cents per cake, pan, or other form and 40 per cent ad valorem.

"(3) In tubes, jars, cakes, pans, or other form, not exceeding 1½ pounds, net weight each, when assembled in paint sets, kits, or color outfits, with or without brushes, water pans, outline drawings, stencils, or other articles, 70 per cent ad valorem on the value as assembled.

"(4) In bulk, or in any form exceeding 1½ pounds net weight each, 8¼ cents per ounce.

"(b) For the purposes of this paragraph, tubes, jars, cakes, pans, or other forms, shall not be considered as assembled in a paint set, kit, or color outfit, unless assembled in such form and container, and with such assortment of merchandise, as to be suitable for sale at retail to artists, students, or children, as a paint set, kit, or color outfit."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "containing by weight less than 30 per cent of zinc sulphide, 1¾ cents per pound; containing by weight 30 per cent or more of zinc sulphide, 1¾ cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 151: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "14 cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "2½ cents per pound"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "$3 per ton"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 90. Turpentine, gum and spirts of, and rosin, 5 per cent ad valorem."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "silica, crude, not specially provided for, $3.50 per ton" and a semicolon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 205: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 205, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment

insert "containing more than 97 per cent of calcium fluoride, $5.60 per ton; containing not more than 97 per cent of calcium fluoride, $8.40 per ton"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 206: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "; sand containing 95 per cent or more of silica and not more than six-tenths of 1 per cent of oxide of iron and suitable for use in the manufacture of glass, $2 per ton"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 207: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 207, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 208. (a) Mica, unmanufactured: Valued at not above 15 cents per pound, 4 cents per pound; valued at above 15 cents per pound, 4 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem.

"(b) Mica, cut or stamped to dimensions, shape, or form, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"(c) Mica films and splittings, not cut or stamped to dimensions: Not above twelve ten-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness, 25 per cent ad valorem; over twelve ten-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"(d) Mica films and slittings cut or stamped to dimensions, 45 per cent ad valorem.

"(e) Mica plates and built-up mica, and all manufactures of mica, or of which mica is the component material of chief value, by whatever name known, and to whatever use applied, and whether or not named, described, or provided for in any other paragraph of this act, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"(f) Untrimmed phlogopite mica from which no rectangular piece exceeding 2 inches in length or 1 inch in width may be cut, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"(g) Mica waste and scrap valued at not more than 5 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem; mica waste and scrap valued at more than 5 cents per pound shall be classified as mica, unmanufactured.

"(h) Mica, ground or pulverized, 20 per cent ad valorem."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 208: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 208, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "35 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 213: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 213, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "in addition to the foregoing there shall be paid a duty of 10 cents per dozen separate pieces on all tableware, kitchenware, and table and kitchen utensils" and a period; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 214: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "crystalline lump, chip, or dust, 30 per cent ad valorem; crystalline flake, 1.65 cents per pound"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 220: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "valorem; gauge glass tubes, wholly or in chief value of glass, 60 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(c) Illuminating articles of every description, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of glass, for use in connection with artificial illumination: Prisms, glass chandeliers, and articles in chief value of prisms, 60 per cent ad valorem; chimneys, 55 per cent ad valorem; globes and shades, 70 per cent ad valorem; all others, 60 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That parts not specially provided for, wholly or in chief value of glass, of any of the foregoing shall be subject to the same rate of duty as the articles of which they are parts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 223: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 223, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "That none of the foregoing weighing less than 16 ounces but not less than 12 ounces per square foot shall be subject to a less rate of duty than 50 per cent ad valorem: *Provided further*" and a comma; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 224: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 224, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "That cylinder, crown, and sheet glass, imported in boxes, shall be denied entry unless packed in units containing 50 square feet or multiples thereof, as nearly as sizes will permit, and the duty shall be computed thereon according to actual weight of glass"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 226: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 226, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "720 square inches, 17 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 1,008 square inches, 17½ cents per square foot; all above that, 19¾ cents per square foot"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 228: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 228, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "15 cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 230: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 230, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "15 cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 254: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 254, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "granular or sponge iron, $2.25 per ton" and a semicolon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 272: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 272, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert " : *Provided further*, That on hollow bars and hollow drill steel valued at more than 4 cents per pound there shall be levied, collected, and paid an additional duty of three-fourths of 1 cent per pound"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 284: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 284, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(b) Ingots, shot, bars, sheets, wire, or other forms, not specially provided for, or scrap, containing more than 50 per cent of tungsten, tungsten carbide, molybdenum, or molybdenum carbide, or combinations thereof: Ingots, shot, bars, or scrap, 50 per cent ad valorem; sheets, wire, or other forms, 60 per cent ad valorem."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 285: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 285, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 289: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 289, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "35 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 292: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 292, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "staples, in strip form, for use in paper fasteners or stapling machines, 2 cents per pound" and a semicolon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 293: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 293, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "8½ cents per pound and 40"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 294: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 294, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "; the foregoing rates shall apply to the foregoing articles

whether or not containing electrical heating elements as constituent parts thereof"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 306: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 306, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "35 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 307: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 307, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1¼ cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 311: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 311, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "55 per cent ad valorem, unless in chief value of glass, in which case the rate shall be 70 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 312: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 312, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "35 per cent ad valorem, unless in chief value of glass, in which case the rate shall be 60 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 315: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 315, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "valorem; drawing instruments, and parts thereof, wholly or in chief value of metal, 45 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 317: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 317, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "valued at not more than $2 per dozen, 5 cents each and 60 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $2 per dozen, 10 cents each and 60 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 319: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 319, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 364. Bells (except church and similar bells and carillons), finished or unfinished, and parts thereof, 50 per cent ad valorem."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 327: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 327, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 367. (a) Watch movements, and other time-keeping, time-measuring, or time-indicating mechanisms, devices, and instruments, all the foregoing designed to be, or such as ordinarily are, worn or carried on or about the person, if less than one and seventy-seven one-hundredths inches wide, whether or not in cases, containers, or housings:

"(1) If more than one and one-half inches wide, $1.25 each; if more than one and two-tenths inches but not more than one and one-half inches wide, $1.40 each; if more than one inch but not more than one and two-tenths inches wide, $1.55 each; if more than nine-tenths of one inch but not more than one inch wide, $1.75 each; if more than eight-tenths of one inch but not more than nine-tenths of one inch wide, $2 each; if more than six-tenths of one inch but not more than eight-tenths of one inch wide, $2.25 each; if six-tenths of one inch or less wide, $2.50 each.

"(2) In the case of any of the foregoing having no jewels or only one jewel, the above rates shall be reduced by 40 per cent;

"(3) Any of the foregoing having more than seven jewels shall be subject to an additional duty of 20 cents for each jewel in excess of seven.

"(4) Any of the foregoing shall be subject to an additional duty of $1 each for each adjustment of whatever kind (treating adjustment to temperature as two adjustments) in accordance with the marking as hereinafter provided.

"(5) Any of the foregoing shall be subject to an additional duty of $1 each, if constructed or designed to operate for a period in excess of 47 hours without rewinding, or if self-winding, or if a self-winding device may be incorporated therein.

"(6) Any of the foregoing having more than 17 jewels, whether adjusted or unadjusted, and whether with or without dials, shall in lieu of the duties provided in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5), be subject to a duty of $10.75 each.

"(b) All the foregoing shall have cut, engraved, or die sunk, conspicuously and indelibly on one or more of the top plates or bridges: The name of the country of manufacture; the name of the manufacturer or purchaser; in words and in Arabic numerals the number of jewels, if any, serving a mechanical purpose as frictional bearings; and, in words and in Arabic numerals, the number and classes of adjustments, or, if unadjusted, the word 'unadjusted.'

"(c) Parts for any of the foregoing shall be dutiable as follows:

"(1) Parts (except pillar or bottom plates, or their equivalent, bridges or their equivalent, and jewels) imported in the same shipment with complete movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, provided for in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph (whether or not suitable for use in such movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments), 45 per cent ad valorem; but this clause of this subparagraph shall not be applicable to that portion of all the parts in the shipment which exceeds in value 4 per cent of the value of such complete movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments.

"(2) Pillar or bottom plates, or their equivalent, shall be subject to one-half the amount of duty which would be borne by the complete movement, mechanism, device, or instrument for which suitable.

"(3) Each assembly or subassembly (unless dutiable under clause (1) of this subparagraph) consisting of two or more parts or pieces of metal or other material joined or fastened together shall be subject to a duty of 3 cents for each such part or piece of material, except that in the case of jewels the duty shall be 20 cents instead of 3 cents, and except that in the case of pillar or bottom plates or their equivalent the duty shall be the rate provided in clause (2) of this subparagraph instead of 3 cents, and except that in the case of a balance assembly the duty shall be 50 cents for the assembly instead of 3 cents for each part or piece thereof. No assembly or subassembly shall be subject to a greater amount of duty than would be borne by the complete movement, mechanism, device, or instrument for which suitable, nor to a less rate of duty than 45 per cent ad valorem. For the purpose of this clause a balance assembly shall be an assembly consisting of a balance wheel, balance staff, and hairspring, with or without the other parts commercially known as parts of a balance assembly. For the purpose of this clause bimetallic balance wheels (not part of a balance assembly), and mainsprings with riveted ends, shall each be considered as one part or piece.

"(4) All other parts (except jewels), 65 per cent ad valorem.

"(d) Jewels, unset, suitable for use in any movement, mechanism, device, or instrument, dutiable under this paragraph or paragraph 368, or in any meter or compass, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"(e) Dials for any of the foregoing movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, if such dials are less than 1.77 inches wide and are imported separately or attached to any of the foregoing movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments having not more than 17 jewels, 5 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem. Dials for any of the movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments provided for in this paragraph shall have stamped, cut, engraved, or die sunk, conspicuously and indelibly thereon the name of the country of manufacture; which marking, if the dial is imported attached to any of the foregoing movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, shall be placed on the face of the dial in such manner as not to be obscured by any part of the case, container, or housing.

"(f) All cases, containers, or housings, designed or suitable for the inclosure of any of the foregoing movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, whether or not containing such movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, and whether finished or unfinished, complete or incomplete, except such containers as are used for shipping purposes only:

"(1) If made of gold or platinum, 75 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem.

"(2) If in part of gold, silver, or platinum, or wholly of silver, 40 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem.

"(3) If set with precious, semiprecious, or imitation precious, or imitation semiprecious stones, or if prepared for the setting of such stones, 40 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem.

"(4) If of base metal (and not containing gold, silver, or platinum), 20 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem.

"(5) Any of the foregoing cases, containers, or housings, if enameled, shall be subject to an additional duty of 15 per cent ad valorem.

"(g) Any of the foregoing cases, containers, or housings, shall have cut, engraved, or die sunk, conspicuously and indelibly on

the inside of the back cover, the name in full of the manufacturer or purchaser and the name of the country of manufacture.

"(h) For the purposes of this paragraph the width of any movement, mechanism, device, or instrument, shall be the shortest surface dimension through the center of the pillar or bottom plate, or its equivalent, not including in the measurement any portion not essential to the functioning of the movement, mechanism, device, or instrument.

"(i) For the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph 368 the term 'jewel' includes substitutes for jewels.

"(j) An article required by this paragraph to be marked shall be denied entry unless marked in exact conformity with the requirements of this paragraph."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 328:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 328, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 368. (a) Clocks, clock movements, including lever movements, clockwork mechanisms, time-keeping, time-measuring, or time-indicating mechanisms, devices, and instruments, synchronous and subsynchronous motors of less than one-fortieth of one horsepower valued at not more than $3 each, not including the value of gears or other attachments, and any mechanism, device, or instrument intended or suitable for measuring time, distance, speed, or fares, or the flowage of water, gas, or electricity, or similar uses, or for regulating, indicating, or controlling the speed of arbors, drums, disks, or similar uses, or for recording or indicating time, or for recording, indicating, or performing any operation or function at a predetermined time or times, all the above (except the articles enumerated or described in paragraph 367), whether or not in cases, containers, or housings:

"(1) If valued at not more than $1.10 each, 55 cents each; valued at more than $1.10 but not more than $2.25 each, $1 each; valued at more than $2.25 but not more than $5 each, $1.50 each; valued at more than $5 but not more than $10 each, $3 each; valued at more than $10 each, $4.50 each.

"(2) Any of the foregoing shall be subject to an additional duty of 65 per cent ad valorem.

"(3) Any of the foregoing containing jewels shall be subject to an additional cumulative duty of 25 cents for each such jewel.

"(b) All the foregoing shall have cut, engraved, or die sunk, conspicuously and indelibly on the most visible part of the front or back plate: The name of the country of manufacture; the name of the manufacturer or purchaser; and the number of jewels, if any. If such markings are in whole or in part sufficiently similar to the trade name or trade-mark of an established American manufacturer as to be liable to deceive the user in the United States, entry thereof shall be denied, if such trade name or trade-mark has been placed on file with the collector of customs.

"(c) Parts for any of the foregoing shall be dutiable as follows:

"(1) Parts (except plates provided for in clause (2) of this subparagraph, and jewels) imported in the same shipment with complete movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, provided for in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph (whether or not suitable for use in such movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments), 45 per cent ad valorem; but this clause of this subparagraph shall not be applicable to that portion of all the parts in the shipment which exceeds in value 1½ per cent of the value of such complete movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments.

"(2) A plate suitable for assembling thereon the clockwork mechanism constituting or contained in any of the foregoing movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, shall be subject to one-half the amount of duty which would be borne by the complete movement, mechanism, device, or instrument for which suitable. If two or more such plates are imported together they shall be dutiable as one plate if they are necessary, as a set, for such assembling.

"(3) Each assembly or subassembly (unless dutiable under clause (1) or (4) of this subparagraph) consisting of two or more parts or pieces of metal or other material joined or fastened together shall be subject to a duty of 65 per cent ad valorem and, in addition, to a duty of 3 cents for each such part or piece of material, except that in the case of jewels the specific duty shall be 25 cents instead of 3 cents. For the purpose of this clause and clause (4), bimetallic balance wheels, and mainsprings with riveted ends, shall each be considered as one part or piece.

"(4) Each assembly or subassembly consisting in part of a plate or plates provided for in clause (2) of this subparagraph shall be subject to the rate of duty provided for such plate or plates, and, in addition, to a duty of 5 cents for each part or piece of material (except such plate or plates) in such assembly or subassembly, except that in the case of jewels the specific duty shall be 25 cents instead of 5 cents.

"(5) No assembly or subassembly shall be subject to a greater amount of duty than would be borne by the complete movement, mechanism, device, or instrument for which suitable.

"(6) All other parts (except jewels), 65 per cent ad valorem.

"(d) Dials for any movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments enumerated or described in this paragraph or in paragraph 367 (except dials specifically provided for in paragraph 367) when imported separately, 50 per cent ad valorem. All such dials (whether imported separately or attached to any of the foregoing) shall have stamped, cut, engraved, or die sunk, conspicuously and indelibly thereon the name of the country of manufacture; which marking, if the dial is imported attached to any of the foregoing movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, shall be placed on the face of the dial in such manner as not to be obscured by any part of the case, container, or housing.

"(e) Cases, containers, or housings suitable for any of the movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments enumerated or described in this paragraph, not specially provided for, when imported separately, 45 per cent ad valorem. Any such case, container, or housing, whether imported separately or attached to any of the foregoing movements, mechanisms, devices, or instruments, shall have stamped, cut, engraved, or die sunk, conspicuously and indelibly on the back thereof, the name of the country of manufacture.

"(f) An article required by this paragraph to be marked shall be denied entry unless marked in exact conformity with the requirements of this paragraph.

"(g) Taximeters and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, 85 per cent ad valorem."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 329: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 329, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 369. (a) Automobile trucks valued at $1,000 or more each, automobile truck and motor bus chassis valued at $750 or more each, automobile truck bodies valued at $250 or more each, motor busses designed for the carriage of more than 10 persons, and bodies for such busses, all the foregoing, whether finished or unfinished, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"(b) All other automobiles, automobile chassis, and automobile bodies, and motor cycles, all the foregoing, whether finished or unfinished, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"(c) Parts (except tires and except parts wholly or in chief value of glass) for any of the articles enumerated in subparagraph (a) or (b), finished or unfinished, not specially provided for, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"(d) If any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government imposes a duty on any article specified in this paragraph, when imported from the United States, in excess of the duty herein provided, there shall be imposed upon such article, when imported either directly or indirectly from such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government, a duty equal to that imposed by such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government on such article imported from the United States, but in no case shall such duty exceed 50 per cent ad valorem."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 332: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 332, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "steam turbines, 20 per cent ad valorem" and a semicolon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 337: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 337, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "27½ per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 341: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 341, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "4"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 342: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 342,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 344: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 344, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "and 10 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 346: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 346, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "and 10 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 347: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 347, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "and 20 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 348: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 348, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "35 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 349: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 349, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "45 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 350: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 350, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "55 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 367: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 367, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "45 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 368: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 368, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "45 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 392: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 392, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "47½ per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 401: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 401, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "$2.50 per ton"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 404: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 404, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "$2.27½"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 405: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 405, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "$2.92½"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 425: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 425, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "40 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 448: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 448, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 454: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 454, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "or frozen" and a comma; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 483: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 483, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1½ cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 484: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 484, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "4½ cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 492: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 492, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "not specially provided for, not shelled, 2½ cents per pound; shelled, 5 cents per pound; cashew nuts, shelled or unshelled, 2 cents per pound; any of the foregoing, if blanched, shall be subject to the same rate of duty as if not blanched"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 514: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 514, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "3 cents per pound in the case of peas, and, in the case of chickpeas or garbanzos, 2"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 576: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 576, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "40 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 579: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 579, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 924. All the articles enumerated or described in this schedule (except in par. 922) shall be subject to an additional duty of 10 cents per pound on the cotton contained therein having a staple of 1⅛ inches or more in length."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 615: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 615, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 1102. (a) Wools, not specially provided for, not finer than 44s, in the grease or washed, 29 cents per pound of clean content; scoured, 32 cents per pound of clean content; on the skin, 27 cents per pound of clean content; sorted, or matchings, if not scoured, 30 cents per pound of clean content: *Provided*, That a tolerance of not more than 10 per cent of wools not finer than 46s may be allowed in each bale or package of wools imported as not finer than 44s."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 649: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 649, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 1122. Fabrics (except printing-machine cylinder lapping in chief value of flax), in the piece or otherwise, containing 17 per cent or more in weight of wool, but not in chief value thereof, and whether or not more specifically provided for, shall be dutiable as follows:

"That proportion of the amount of the duty on the fabric, computed under this schedule, which the amount of wool bears to the entire weight, plus that proportion of the amount of the duty on the fabric, computed as if this paragraph had not been enacted, which the weight of the component materials other than wool bears to the entire weight."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 652: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 652, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "woven fabrics in the piece, not exceeding 30 inches in width, whether woven with fast or split edges, wholly or in chief value of silk, including umbrella silk or Gloria cloth, 60 per cent ad valorem; any of the foregoing, if Jacquard-figured, 65 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 657: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 657, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "Filaments of rayon or other synthetic textile, single or grouped, and yarns of rayon or other synthetic textile, singles,

all the foregoing not specially provided for, weighing 150 deniers or more per length of 450 meters, 45 per cent ad valorem; weighing less than 150 deniers per length of 450 meters, 50 per cent ad valorem; and, in addition, yarns of rayon or other synthetic textile, plied, shall be subject to an additional duty of 5 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That none of the foregoing shall be subject to a less duty than 45 cents per pound. Any of the foregoing yarns if having more than 20 turns twist per inch shall be subject to an additional cumulative duty of 45 cents per pound"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 707: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 707, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "three-fourths of"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 708: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 708, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1½ cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 709: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 709, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "8¾ cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 719: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 719, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "; tubes wholly or in chief value of paper, commonly used for holding yarn or thread, if parallel, 1 cent per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem; if tapered, 3 cents per pound and 35 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 724: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 724, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "one-fourth of 1 cent per inch, 60 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than one-fourth of 1 cent and not more than 1 cent per inch, one-half of 1 cent per inch and 60 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 1 cent and not more than 5 cents per inch, 1 cent per inch and 40"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 729: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 729, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and on page 177 of the House bill, line 19, after "hemp," insert "and braids and plaits, wholly or in chief value of ramie, all the foregoing"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 732: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 732, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "$3.50 per dozen and 50"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 745: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 745, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "2½ cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 747: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 747, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "Dolls and doll clothing, composed in any part, however small, of any of the laces, fabrics, embroideries, or other materials or articles provided for in paragraph 1529 (a), 90 per cent ad valorem; dolls and toys, composed wholly or in chief value of any product provided for in paragraph 31, having any movable member or part, 1 cent each and 60 per cent ad valorem; not having any movable member or part, 1 cent each and 50 per per cent ad valorem; parts of dolls or toys, composed wholly or in chief value of any product provided for in paragraph 31, 1 cent each and 50 per cent ad valorem; all other dolls, parts of dolls (including clothing), doll heads, toy marbles, toy games, toy containers, toy favors, toy souvenirs" and a comma; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 748: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 748, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "As used in this paragraph the term 'toy' means an article chiefly used for the amusement of children, whether or not also suitable for physical exercise or for mental development" and a period; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 761: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 761, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "and plates, mats, linings, strips, and crosses of dressed dog, goat, or kid skins, 25 per cent ad valorem; all the foregoing, if dyed, 30 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 764: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 764, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and on page 189 of the House bill, line 4, after "valorem," insert "; composed wholly or in chief value of dog, goat, or kid skins, and not specially provided for, 35 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 765: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 765, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 190 of the House bill, line 1, after "valorem," insert "but not less than 25 cents per pound"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 771: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 771, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(b) Men's silk or opera hats, in chief value of silk, $2 each and 75 per cent ad valorem."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 784: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 784, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "or 1530 (e), or in Title II (free list)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 785: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 785, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and on page 195 of the House bill, line 1, strike out "or (c)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 787: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 787, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "Hose and half-hose wholly or in chief value of cotton or of wool shall not be dutiable at the above rate by reason of being embroidered, if the embroidery is such as is commonly known as clocking and does not exceed 1 inch in width or 6 inches in length, exclusive of the fork, but shall be subject to a duty of 75 per cent ad valorem" and a period; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 791: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 791, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "valued at not more than 70 cents per dozen, 3 cents each and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 70 cents per dozen, 4 cents each and 40 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That any of the foregoing valued at not more than 70 cents per dozen, if made with hand rolled or hand made hems, shall be subject to an additional duty of 1 cent each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 795: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 795, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 1530. (a) Hides and skins of cattle of the bovine species (except hides and skins of the India water buffalo imported to be used in the manufacture of rawhide articles), raw or uncured, or dried, salted, or pickled, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"(b) Leather (except leather provided for in subparagraph (d) of this paragraph), made from hides or skins of cattle of the bovine species:

"(1) Sole or belting leather (including offal), rough, partly finished, finished, curried, or cut or wholly or partly manufactured into outer or inner soles, blocks, strips, counters, taps, box toes, or any forms or shapes suitable for conversion into boots, shoes, footwear, or belting, 12½ per cent ad valorem.

"(2) Leather welting, 12½ per cent ad valorem.

"(3) Leather to be used in the manufacture of harness or saddlery, 12½ per cent ad valorem.

"(4) Side upper leather (including grains and splits), patent leather, and leather made from calf or kip skins, rough, partly

finished, or finished, or cut or wholly or partly manufactured into uppers, vamps, or any forms or shapes suitable for conversion into boots, shoes, or footwear, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"(5) Upholstery, collar, bag, case, glove, garment, or strap leather, in the rough, in the white, crust, or russet, partly finished, or finished, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"(6) Leather to be used in the manufacture of footballs, basket balls, soccer balls, or medicine balls, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"(7) All other rough, partly finished, finished, or curried, not specially provided for, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"(c) Leather (except leather provided for in subparagraph (d) of this paragraph), made from hides or skins of animals (including fish, reptiles, and birds, but not including cattle of the bovine species), in the rough, in the white, crust, or russet, partly finished, or finished, 25 per cent ad valorem; vegetable-tanned rough leather made from goat or sheep skins (including those commercially known as India-tanned goat or sheep skins), 10 per cent ad valorem; any of the foregoing if imported to be used in the manufacture of boots, shoes, or footwear, or cut or wholly or partly manufactured into uppers, vamps, or any forms or shapes suitable for conversion into boots, shoes, or footwear, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"(d) Leather of all kinds, grained, printed, embossed, ornamented, or decorated, in any manner or to any extent (including leather finished in gold, silver, aluminum, or like effects), or by any other process (in addition to tanning) made into fancy leather, and any of the foregoing cut or wholly or partly manufactured into uppers, vamps, or any forms or shapes suitable for conversion into boots, shoes, or footwear, all the foregoing by whatever name known, and to whatever use applied, 30 per cent ad valorem.

"(e) Boots, shoes, or other footwear (including athletic or sporting boots and shoes), made wholly or in chief value of leather, not specially provided for, 20 per cent ad valorem; boots, shoes, or other footwear (including athletic or sporting boots and shoes), the uppers of which are composed wholly or in chief value of wool, cotton, ramie, animal hair, fiber, rayon or other synthetic textile, silk, or substitutes for any of the foregoing, whether or not the soles are composed of leather, wood, or other materials, 35 per cent ad valorem.

"(f) Harness valued at more than $70 per set, single harness valued at more than $40, saddles valued at more than $40 each, saddlery, and parts (except metal parts) for any of the foregoing, 35 per cent ad valorem; saddles made wholly or in part of pigskin or imitation pigskin, 35 per cent ad valorem; saddles and harness, not specially provided for, parts thereof, except metal parts, and leather shoe laces, finished or unfinished, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"(g) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe methods and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this paragraph."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 797: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 797, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 1532. (a) Gloves made wholly or in chief value of leather, whether wholly or partly manufactured, shall be dutiable at the following rates, the lengths stated in each case being the extreme length (including the unfolded length of cuffs or other appendages) when stretched to their fullest extent namely: Men's gloves not over 12 inches in length, $6 per dozen pairs; women's and children's gloves not over 12 inches in length, $5.50 per dozen pairs; for each inch or fraction thereof in excess of 12 inches, 50 cents per dozen pairs: *Provided*, That, in addition thereto, on all the foregoing there shall be paid each of the following cumulative duties: When machine seamed, otherwise than overseamed, $1 per dozen pairs; when seamed by hand, $5 per dozen pairs; when lined with cotton, wool, silk, or other fabrics, $3.50 per dozen pairs; when trimmed with fur, $4 per dozen pairs; when lined with leather or fur, $5 per dozen pairs: *Provided further*, That all the foregoing shall be dutiable at not less than 50 per cent ad valorem: *Provided further*, That glove tranks, with or without the usual accompanying pieces, shall be subject to 75 per cent of the duty provided for the gloves in the fabrication of which they are suitable.

"(b) Gloves wholly or in chief value of leather made from horsehides or cowhides (except calfskins), whether wholly or partly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 798: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 798, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "Artificial flies, snelled hooks, leaders or casts, finished or unfinished, 55 per cent ad valorem; fishing rods and reels, and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for, 55 per cent ad valorem; fish hooks, artificial baits, and all other fishing tackle and parts thereof, fly books, fly boxes, fishing baskets or creels, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for, except fishing lines, fishing nets, and seines, 45 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That any prohibition of the importation of feathers in this act shall not be construed as applying to artificial flies used for fishing, or to feathers used for the manufacture of such flies"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 799: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 799, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "Candles, 27½ per cent ad valorem; manufactures"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 800: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 800, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "; manufactures of chip roping, 25 per cent ad valorem"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 817: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 817, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "Sponges, commercially known as sheepswool, 30 per cent ad valorem; sponges, commercially known as"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 824: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 824, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "50 cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 825: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 825, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "30 per cent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 827: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 827, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "Black leads for pencils, not in wood or other material, and black leads exceeding 0.06 of 1 inch in diameter, 6 cents"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 830: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 830, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "photographic dry plates, not specially provided for, 20 per cent ad valorem" and a semicolon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 848: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 848, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "or driven across the northern boundary line by the owner for temporary pasturage purposes only" and a comma; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 849: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 849, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "eight months in the case of the northern boundary line, and, in the case of the southern boundary line, within three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 851: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 851, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "Arrowroot, crude or manufactured, and arrowroot starch and flour"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 887: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 887, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 1640. Burrstones, manufactured or bound up into millstones."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 888: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 888,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1641"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 891: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 891, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1642"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 892: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 892, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1643"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 938: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 938, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "(notwithstanding any other provision of this act) those grades of"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1083: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1083, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert a comma and the following: "and in the case of individuals returning from abroad, all professional books, implements, instruments, and tools of trade, occupation, or employment" and a comma; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1084: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1084, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That a resident of the United States shall not take advantage of the exemption herein granted within a period of 30 days from the last exemption claimed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1114, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "prescribe. Such marking, stamping, branding, or labeling shall be as nearly indelible and permanent as the nature of the article will permit. The Secretary of the Treasury may, by regulations prescribed hereunder, except any article from the requirement of marking, stamping, branding, or labeling if he is satisfied that such article is incapable of being marked, stamped, branded, or labeled or can not be marked, stamped, branded, or labeled without injury, or except at an expense economically prohibitive of the importation, or that the marking, stamping, branding, or labeling of the immediate container of such article will reasonably indicate the country of origin of such article" and a period; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1120, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "The provisions of this section relating to goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured by forced labor or/and indentured labor, shall take effect on January 1, 1932; but in no case shall such provisions be applicable to goods, wares, articles, or merchandise so mined, produced, or manufactured which are not mined, produced, or manufactured in such quantities in the United States as to meet the consumptive demands of the United States" and a period; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 319. Duty on coffee imported into Porto Rico:

"The Legislature of Porto Rico is hereby empowered to impose tariff duties upon coffee imported into Porto Rico, including coffee grown in a foreign country coming into Porto Rico from the United States. Such duties shall be collected and accounted for as now provided by law in the case of duties collected in Porto Rico."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1152: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1152, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 157 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 23, strike out "January" and insert "July"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1158: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1158, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(b) Review of appraiser's decision: A decision of the appraiser that foreign value, export value, or United States value can not be satisfactorily ascertained shall be subject to review in reappraisement proceedings under section 501; but in any such proceeding, an affidavit executed outside of the United States shall not be admitted in evidence if executed by any person who fails to permit a Treasury attaché to inspect his books, papers, records, accounts, documents, or correspondence, pertaining to the value or classification of such merchandise."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1161: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1161, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 162 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 18, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1168, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(d) Exceptions by regulations: The Secretary of the Treasury may by regulations provide for such exceptions from the requirements of this section as he deems advisable."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1235: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1235, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "case, which shall be paid out of any appropriations available for the collection of the revenue from customs" and a period; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1239: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1239, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 181 of the Senate engrossed amendments, lines 17 and 18, strike out "United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals" and insert "United States Customs Court"; and on page 182 of the Senate engrossed amendments, lines 5 and 6, strike out "United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals" and insert "United States Customs Court"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on the following amendments:

DISAGREEMENT AS TO SUBSTANCE

Amendments numbered 195, 364, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 376, 394, 395, 396, 885, 893, 903, 904, 1004, 1006, 1035, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1095, 1128, 1129, 1130, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1134, 1135, 1138, 1139, 1140, 1141, and 1151.

DISAGREEMENT AS TO CLERICAL AMENDMENTS DEPENDING ON AMENDMENT NUMBERED 1140

Amendments numbered 1156, 1157, and 1171.

AGREEMENT AS TO SUBSTANCE BUT DISAGREEMENT AS TO PARAGRAPH NUMBERS OR REFERENCES THERETO

Amendments numbered 901, 914, 919, 934, 950, 953, 962, 964, 983, 992, 1031, 1032, 1047, 1064, 1071, 1109, and 1179.

DISAGREEMENT SOLELY AS TO PARAGRAPH NUMBERS OR REFERENCES THERETO

Amendments numbered 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 65, 66, 67, 374, 375, 377, 379, 380, 381, 383, 385, 386, 387, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 902, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 913, 915, 916, 917, 920, 921, 922, 923, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 935, 936, 937, 940, 942, 945, 946, 947, 948, 951, 952, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 963, 965, 966, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 984, 985, 987, 989, 993, 995, 997, 999, 1002, 1003, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1033, 1034, 1036, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1046, 1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1055, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1070, 1072, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1082, 1085, 1086, 1087, 1089, 1090, 1094, 1096, 1098, 1099, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, 1111, and 1112.

REED SMOOT,
JAMES E. WATSON,
SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

W. C. HAWLEY,
ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
ISAAC BACHARACH,
Managers on the part of the House.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amend-

ments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

TITLE I.—DUTIABLE LIST

On amendment No. 1: The House bill, in referring to our possessions in Samoa, used the descriptive phrase "the island of Tutuila." The Senate amendment uses the phrase "American Samoa"; and the House recedes.

SCHEDULE 1.—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINT

The following amendments made clerical changes and the House recedes: 35, 46, 54, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 70, and 183.

The following amendments make changes in subdivision references; and the House recedes: 44, 45, and 53.

The following amendments make changes in paragraph numbers and in references to paragraph numbers; and the House recedes: 75, 77, 78, 79, 82, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 105, 107, 110, 114, 116, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 125, 126, 128, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 137, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 150, 154, 156, 157, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, and 189.

On amendments Nos. 2 and 3: The House bill imposed a duty of three-fourths of 1 cent per pound on acetic acid containing by weight not more than 65 per cent of acetic acid, and of 2 cents per pound on that containing by weight more than 65 per cent. The Senate amendments increase these rates to 2 and 3 cents, respectively. The House recedes on amendment No. 2 with an amendment making the rate 1⅜ cents per pound in the first bracket; and the Senate recedes on amendment No. 3.

On amendment No. 4: This amendment reduces from 5 cents to 2½ cents per pound, the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on acetic anhydride; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 3½ cents per pound.

On amendment No. 5: This amendment reduces from 1½ cents to 1 cent per pound, the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on boric acid; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 6: This amendment reduces from 18 to 17 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on citric acid; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 7: The House bill imposed a duty of 4 cents per pound on formic acid. The Senate amendment strikes out the reference to formic acid, the effect of which is to make formic acid dutiable at 25 per cent under the basket clause of paragraph 1; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 3 cents per pound.

On amendments Nos. 8, 9, and 10: The House bill imposed a duty of 6 cents per pound on tannic acid, tannin, and extracts of nutgalls, containing by weight of tannic acid less than 50 per cent; 12 cents per pound on that containing 50 per cent or more and not medicinal; and 22 cents per pound on that containing 50 per cent or more and medicinal. The Senate amendments reduce these rates to 4 cents, 10 cents, and 18 cents per pound, respectively; and the House recedes with amendments on amendments Nos. 8 and 9, making those rates 5 and 11 cents, respectively, and recedes on amendment No. 10.

On amendments Nos. 11 and 852: These amendments remove sulphide of arsenic and arsenious acid (white arsenic) from the free list and impose the following duties thereon: Arsenious acid or white arsenic, crude or refined, 2 cents per pound; sulphide and other arsenic salts and compounds, not specially provided for, containing 10 per cent or more of arsenic determined as arsenious acid or white arsenic, 2 cents per pound of arsenious acid or white arsenic contained therein; and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 12: This amendment reduces from 10 cents to 6 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on gallic acid; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 13 and 846: The House bill imposed a duty of one-half of 1 cent per pound on nitric acid. The Senate amendments place this article on the free list; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 14: The House bill does not specifically mention oleic acid or red oil, which fell under the basket clause of paragraph 1 at 25 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically enumerates this article and imposes a specific duty thereon of 1½ cents per pound; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 20 per cent ad valorem.

On amendments Nos. 15 and 16: The House bill imposed a duty of 2 cents per pound on phosphoric acid containing by weight less than 80 per cent of phosphoric acid and 3½ cents per pound on that containing 80 per cent or more. The Senate amendments make all phosphoric acid dutiable at 2 cents per pound; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 17: The Senate amendment reduces from 15 cents to 10 cents per pound the rate imposed by the House bill on pyrogallic acid; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 12 cents per pound.

On amendment No. 18: This amendment imposes on carbon dioxide, weighing with immediate containers and carton 1 pound or less per carton, a duty of 1 cent per pound on contents, immediate containers, and carton. Under the House bill the rate was 25 per cent, under the basket clause of paragraph 1. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 19: The Senate amendment reduces from 25 to 20 per cent the duty imposed by the House bill on acetone and ethyl methyl ketone, and their homologues, and acetone oil; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 20: The Senate amendment reduces from three-tenths of 1 cent to one-fifth of 1 cent per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on aluminum sulphate, alum cake or aluminous cake, containing not more than 15 per cent of alumina and more iron than the equivalent of one-tenth of 1 per cent of ferric oxide; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 21: The House bill imposed a duty of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound on ammonium sulphate. Senate amendment No. 21 strikes out this provision, with the effect of transferring ammonium sulphate to the free list; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 22: The House bill imposed a duty of 2 cents per pound on antimony oxide. The Senate amendment makes this article dutiable at the same rate as antimony regulus or metal, viz, 2 cents per pound under paragraph 376; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 23: The Senate amendment reduces from $1 to 50 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on amber and amberoid unmanufactured, not specially provided for; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 24: The House bill imposed a duty of 4 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem on synthetic gums and resins not specially provided for. The Senate amendment strikes out this provision, the effect of which was to make the classification doubtful; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 25: The House bill imposes a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on bleached shellac. The Senate amendment strikes out the reference to bleached shellac in this paragraph, the effect of which is to make it free of duty under the free list provision for "lac" (par. 1707 of the Senate bill); and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 26: The Senate amendment reduces from $1.50 to $1 per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on caffeine; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate $1.25 per pound.

On amendment No. 27: The Senate amendment reduces from 90 cents to 60 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on caffeine citrate; and the House recedes with an amendment making this rate 75 cents per pound.

On amendment No. 28: Amendment 28 strikes out the duty imposed by the House bill of 1 cent per pound on impure tea, tea waste, tea siftings and sweepings, for manufacturing purposes, in bond. Amendment 1064 transfers these items to the free list. The House recedes on amendment No. 28.

On amendments Nos. 29, 889, and 890: Under the House bill crude calcium acetate was on the free list, with a proviso that if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government should impose a duty on calcium acetate when imported from the United States, an equal duty should be imposed upon such article coming into the United States from such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government. Senate amendment No. 29 makes crude calcium acetate dutiable at 1½ cents per pound, while amendment No. 889 strikes out the reference to calcium acetate on the free list, and amendment No. 890 eliminates the counterevailing duty in view of the action on amendment No. 29. The House recedes on amendment No. 29 with an amendment making the rate of duty 1 cent per pound, and recedes on amendments Nos. 889 and 890.

On amendment No. 30: This amendment reduces from 2½ cents to 1 cent per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on carbon tetrachloride; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 31: This amendment reduced from 6 cents to 4 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on chloroform; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 32: The Senate amendment reduces from 35 to 25 per cent the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on tetrachloroethane and trichloroethylene; and the House recedes with an amendment making this rate 30 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 33: The Senate amendment increases from 2½ cents to 5½ cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on casein or lactarene and mixtures of which this

article is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 34: The House bill imposed a duty of four-tenths of 1 cent per pound on chalk or whiting or Paris white, dry, ground, or bolted. The Senate amendment changes this rate to 25 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 36 and 941: The House bill imposed a duty of 10 cents per pound on crude chicle. The Senate amendments transfer this article to the free list; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 37: The Senate amendment reduces from 15 cents to 5 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on chicle refined or advanced in value by drying, straining, or any other process or treatment whatever beyond that essential to the proper packing; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 38: This amendment imposes a duty of 20 cents per ounce on ethyl-hydrocupreine and salts and compounds thereof, which under the House bill were of doubtful classification; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 39: This is a clarifying amendment; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 47, 51, and 52: The House bill imposed a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem and 7 cents per pound on synthetic indigo and sulphur black, based on American selling price, or if there is no similar competitive domestic article, then on the United States value. The Senate amendments transfer synthetic indigo, "Colour Index No. 1177," and sulphur black, "Colour Index No. 978," to a separate subparagraph at the rate of 20 per cent ad valorem and 3 cents per pound on the same basis as the values under the House bill; and the House recedes on amendments 47 and 51, and recedes on amendment 52 with an amendment making a change in a section reference.

On amendments Nos. 50 and 124: The House bill retained the provision of the 1922 act specifying vanillin in paragraph 61 at 45 per cent ad valorem. The effect of language of existing law retained in the House bill in paragraph 28 was to make this article dutiable under paragraph 28 at 45 per cent ad valorem and 7 cents per pound, based on American selling price, or if there is no similar competitive domestic article, then on the United States value. The Senate amendments make a clarifying amendment by striking out the reference to vanillin in paragraph 61 and specifying it by name in paragraph 28; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 51 and 52: See amendment No. 47.

On amendments Nos. 55, 57, and 58: These amendments are made necessary by the action of the Senate in providing more than one specific duty in this paragraph; and the House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendment No. 68: The Senate amendment reduces from 35 cents to 30 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on collodion and other liquid solutions of pyroxylin, of other cellulose esters or ethers, or of cellulose; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 69: This amendment is a clarifying amendment to make certain that the rate provided will apply to all waste wholly or in chief value of cellulose acetate; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 71: The House bill imposed a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem on transparent sheets of cellulose, not exceeding three one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness, chiefly used for wrapping, by whatever name known. The Senate amendment substitutes for this a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem on sheets, bands, and strips (whether known as cellophane or by any other name whatsoever), exceeding 1 inch in width but not exceeding three one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness, made by any artificial process from cellulose, a cellulose hydrate, a compound of cellulose (other than cellulose acetate), or a mixture containing any of the foregoing, by solidification into sheets, bands, or strips; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 72: The Senate amendment reduces from 35 to 30 per cent the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on compounds of cellulose, known as vulcanized or hard fiber, made wholly or in chief value of cellulose; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 73 and 74: The House bill imposed a duty of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound on gentian, of 1 cent per pound on sarsaparilla root, of 25 per cent ad valorem on belladonna, digitalis, henbane, and stramonium, and of 10 cents per pound on ergot. Amendments Nos. 73 and 74 strike these articles off the dutiable list and amendment No. 992 places them on the free list. The House recedes on amendment No. 74 (striking out the duty on ergot) and recedes on amendment No. 73, with an amendment placing a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on digitalis.

On amendment No. 76: Under the House bill amyl acetate is dutiable under the basket clause of this paragraph at 25 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment imposes a specific duty on this article of 7 cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 80: This amendment reduces from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound the duty imposed by the House bill on formaldehyde solution or farmalin; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 1¾ cents per pound.

On amendment No. 81: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on hexamethylenetetramine. The Senate amendment changes this rate to 11 cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 83: The House bill imposed a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem and 5 cents per pound on edible gelatin valued at less than 40 cents per pound. The Senate amendment retains the ad valorem rate at 20 per cent, but reduces the specific rate to 3½ cents per pound; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 84, 85, 86, and 87: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem and 2 cents per pound on gelatin, glue, glue size, and fish glue, not specially provided for, valued at less than 40 cents per pound, and of 25 per cent ad valorem and 8 cents per pound on that valued at 40 cents or more per pound. Senate amendments Nos. 84 and 86 reduce the ad valorem rates in both cases to 20 per cent, and amendments Nos. 85 and 87 reduce the specific rates to 1½ cents per pound and 7 cents per pound, respectively; and the Senate recedes on all these amendments.

On amendments Nos. 88 and 89: These amendments increase from 25 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on casein glue; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 92: The Senate amendment reduces from 20 to 10 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on ink and ink powders not specially provided for; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 15 per cent on drawing inks and 10 per cent on ink and ink powders not specially provided for.

On amendment No. 94: This amendment reduces from 20 cents to 10 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on iodine, resublimed; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 98: This amendment reduces from 25 per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on extracts of licorice in pastes, rolls, or other forms; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 101: The House bill did not specifically mention manufactures of carbonate of magnesia, which would probably be dutiable under paragraph 214 at 30 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically mentions such articles and imposes a duty of 2 cents per pound thereon; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 102: The Senate amendment reduces from 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound the duty imposed by the House bill on magnesium sulphate or Epsom salts; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

On amendment No. 103: The House bill imposed a duty of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound on kieserite. Amendment 103 strikes out this provision and amendment 964 transfers this article to the free list; and the House recedes on amendment 103.

On amendment No. 104: The Senate amendment reduces from 7 cents to 5 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on magnesium oxide or calcined magnesia; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 106: The following table shows the duties upon menthol, natural crude camphor, natural refined camphor, and synthetic camphor, as proposed by the House bill, the Senate amendment, and as agreed to in conference:

Commodity	House bill	Senate amendment	Conference agreement
Menthol	75 cents per pound.	30 cents per pound.	50 cents per pound.
Natural crude camphor	1 cent per pound.	1 cent per pound.	1 cent per pound.
Natural refined camphor	6 cents per pound.	5 cents per pound.	5 cents per pound.
Synthetic camphor	1 cent per pound.	do	Do.

The Senate amendment also contains a provision (retained under the conference agreement) the effect of which is to reduce the duty on synthetic camphor to 1 cent per pound if the President finds (1) at the end of three years after the enact-

ment of the act, that the domestic production of synthetic camphor by quantity did not exceed 25 per cent of domestic consumption during the preceding six months, or (2) at the end of four years, that during the preceding six months the domestic production did not exceed 30 per cent of domestic consumption, or (3) at the end of five years, that during the preceding six months the domestic production did not exceed 50 per cent of such consumption.

On amendments Nos. 108 and 109: The House bill imposed a duty of 10 cents per gallon on crude sperm oil and 14 cents per gallon on sperm oil refined or otherwise processed. The Senate amendment reduces these rates to 6 cents and 12 cents per gallon, respectively; and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 111: The Senate amendment increases from $4\frac{16}{100}$ cents to 4½ cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on linseed or flaxseed oil, and combinations and mixtures in chief value of such oil; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 112 and 113: The House bill imposed a duty of 8½ cents per pound on olive oil weighing with immediate container less than 40 pounds, the duty being based upon contents and "containers." The Senate amendments increase this rate to 9½ cents per pound on contents and "container"; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 115: The House bill imposed a duty of 5 cents per pound on soybean oil. The Senate amendment changes this rate to $2\frac{8}{10}$ cents per pound but not less than 45 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 3½ cents per pound but not less than 45 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 118: The Senate amendment reduces from 4 cents to 3 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on hydrogenated or hardened oils and fats; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 121 and 998: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on eucalyptus oil. Senate amendment No. 121 strikes out the reference to eucalyptus oil in paragraph 58 and amendment No. 998 places it on the free list. The House recedes on amendment No. 121 with an amendment making the rate 15 per cent ad valorem, and the Senate recedes on amendment No. 998.

On amendment No. 124: See amendment No. 50.

On amendment No. 127: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on bath salts, whether or not having medicinal properties. The Senate amendment retains the 25 per cent rate on bath salts not perfumed, but increases the rate on perfumed bath salts (whether or not having medicinal properties) to 75 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 129 and 1011: The House bill imposed a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on London purple. The Senate amendments transfer this article to the free list; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 132: The following table shows the duties upon paints, colors, and pigments, commonly known as artists', school, students', or children's paints or colors, as proposed by the House bill, the Senate amendments, and as agreed to in conference:

Commodity	House bill	Senate amendment	Conference agreement
Paints, colors, and pigments, commonly known as artists' colors, etc.:			
When in tubes, jars, cakes, pans, etc., not over 1½ pounds net weight—			
Valued at less than 20 cents per dozen pieces—			
Not assembled	40 per cent	1 cent each	¾ of 1 cent each.
Assembled	70 per cent	70 per cent	70 per cent.
Valued at 20 cents or more per dozen pieces—			
Not assembled—			
In tubes or jars	2 cents each plus 40 per cent.	40 per cent	2 cents each plus 40 per cent.
In cakes, pans, etc	1¼ cents each plus 40 per cent.	do	1¼ cents each plus 40 per cent.
Assembled	70 per cent	70 per cent	70 per cent.
In bulk or in any form over 1½ pounds net weight.	40 per cent	8¼ cents per ounce.	8¼ cents per ounce.

The Senate amendment also contained a provision that no paints, etc., should take the above rates on assemblies unless imported in the identical form, container, and assortment of merchandise customarily and generally sold to the ultimate consumer or user. This provision as modified in conference provides that the paints shall not be considered as assembled unless assembled in such form and container and with such assortment of merchandise, as to be suitable for sale at retail to artists, students, or children as a paint set, kit, or color outfit.

On amendment No. 136: The House bill imposed a duty of 3 cents per pound on all ultramarine blue, dry, in pulp, or ground in or mixed with oil or water, and on all wash and other blues containing ultramarine. The Senate amendment increases the rate to 4 cents per pound in the case of any of the foregoing valued at more than 10 cents per pound, but retains the House rate on those valued at 10 cents per pound or less; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 138: The Senate amendment reduces from 25 to 20 per cent the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on bone black or bone char and on blood char; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 141: Under the House bill carbon black was not specifically enumerated, and was dutiable under paragraph 73 of the House bill at 20 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically provides for this article at the lower rate of 15 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 147: The House bill imposed a duty of 22 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem on vermilion reds containing quicksilver, dry or ground in or mixed with oil or water. The Senate amendment eliminates the ad valorem rate and increases the specific rate to 35 cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 149: The House bill imposed a duty of 1¾ cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem on lithopone and other combinations or mixtures of zinc sulphide and barium sulphate containing by weight 30 per cent or more of zinc sulphide. The Senate reduces this rate to 1¾ cents per pound; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 1¾ cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 151: The Senate amendment reduces from 18 cents to 13 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on potassium citrate; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 14 cents per pound.

On amendment No. 152: The Senate amendment reduces from 2¼ cents to 1½ cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on potassium chlorate and potassium perchlorate; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 153: The Senate amendment reduces from 5½ cents to 1 cent per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on refined potassium nitrate or saltpeter; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 155: This amendment makes dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem lithium, beryllium, and caesium, which under the House bill were probably free of duty as metals unwrought. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 158 and 1045: The House bill imposed a duty of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound on sodium bicarbonate or baking soda. The Senate amendments transfer this article to the free list; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 159 and 879: The House bill imposed a duty of one-eighth of 1 cent per pound on refined sodium borate or borax. The Senate amendments transfer this article to the free list; and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 160 and 1043: The House bill imposed a duty of 1½ cents per pound on sodium chlorate. The Senate amendments transfer this article to the free list; and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 161: The Senate amendment reduces from 15 cents to 12 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on sodium citrate; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 162: The Senate amendment reduces from 2¾ cents to 2 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on sodium formate; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 163: The House bill imposed a duty of 3½ cents per pound on sodium oxalate. The Senate amendment changes this rate to 25 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 2½ cents per pound.

On amendments Nos. 164 and 165: The House bill imposed a duty of 1 cent per pound on sodium phosphate (except pyro phosphate) containing by weight less than 45 per cent of water, and 2 cents per pound on sodium phosphate (except pyro phosphate) not specially provided for. Senate amendment No. 164 increases the rate on that containing by weight less than 45 per cent of water to 1½ cents per pound, and amendment No. 165 reduces the rate on that not specially provided for to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 166: The Senate amendment reduces from 1¾ cents to 1½ cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on sodium silicofluoride; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 167: The Senate amendment reduces from $4 to $2 per ton the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on anhydrous sodium sulphate; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate $3 per ton.

On amendments Nos. 168 and 169: The House bill imposed a duty of three-eighths of 1 cent per pound on sodium sulphide containing not more than 35 per cent of sodium sulphide, and three-fourths of 1 cent per pound on that containing more than 35 per cent. The Senate amendments increase these rates, respectively, to one-half of 1 cent per pound and 1 cent per pound; and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 170, 171, and 172: The House bill imposed a duty of three-eighths of 1 cent per pound on sodium silicate, sulphite, bisulphite, metabisulphite, and thiosulphate. Senate amendments Nos. 170 and 172 increase the rate on sodium sulphite, bisulphite, and metabisulphite to one-half of 1 cent per pound, and amendment No. 171 reduces the rate on sodium silicate and thiosulphate to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound. The Senate recedes on all these amendments.

On amendments Nos. 181 and 1073: Under paragraph 1784 of the House bill, turpentine, gum and spirits of, and rosin were free of duty. Senate amendment No. 1073 strikes out the reference to these articles on the free list, and amendment No. 181 imposes a duty thereon of 10 per cent ad valorem. The House recedes on amendment No. 1073, and recedes on amendment No. 181 with an amendment making the rate 5 per cent ad valorem.

SCHEDULE 2.—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE

The following amendment makes a clerical change, and the House recedes: 196.

The following amendment makes a change in paragraph number, and the Senate recedes: 192.

The following amendments make changes in paragraph and subparagraph references, and the House recedes: 197, 245, 250, and 252.

On amendment No. 190: This is a clerical amendment made necessary by amendments Nos. 191 and 193. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 191: The House bill did not specifically enumerate glazed earthen tiles commercially or commonly known as strips, or glazed earthen tiles commercially or commonly known as trimmers or trim, both such articles being dutiable at 10 cents per square foot (but not less than 50 nor more than 70 per cent ad valorem) if valued at not more than 40 cents per square foot; or 60 per cent ad valorem if valued at more than 40 cents per square foot. The Senate amendment specifically enumerates such strips and trimmers or trim and imposes the following duties: On strips of one color not exceeding 1 inch in width, 1¼ cents each; stenciled, regardless of color, not exceeding 1 inch in width, 1½ cents each; all the foregoing, if embossed or decorated except by stenciling, and all other strips, 60 per cent ad valorem; on trimmers or trim, one-fourth of 1 cent per square inch, but not less than 60 per cent. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 193: The House bill did not specifically enumerate so-called quarries or quarry tiles measuring seven-eighths of an inch or over in thickness, such articles being dutiable at the rates in paragraph 202 (a) of the House bill. The Senate amendment specifically enumerates these tiles and reduces the rate to 30 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 194: This amendment increases from five-sixteenths of 1 cent per pound to fifteen thirty-seconds of 1 cent per pound the House rate on crude magnesite; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 198: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on statues, statuettes, and bas-reliefs, wholly or in chief value of plaster of Paris, not specially provided for. The Senate amendment increases this rate to 60 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 199: The House bill imposed a duty of fifty-five one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound on wholly or partly manufactured pumice stone. The Senate amendment increases this rate to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 200: This amendment is a clarifying amendment changing the word "or" to "and"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 201: The House bill did not enumerate bentonite, which was dutiable as a clay or earth, not specially provided for, at $1 per ton if unwrought and unmanufactured or $2 per ton if wrought or manufactured. The Senate amendment specifically enumerates this article and makes the rates $1.50 and $3.25 per ton, respectively; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 202: The Senate amendment reduces from $1.50 to $1 per ton the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on crude feldspar; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 203: Under the House bill clays or earths artificially activated with acid or other material were not specifically provided for and were of doubtful classification. The Senate amendment specifically enumerates such clays or earths and imposes thereon a duty of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 204, 206, and 1056: The House bill imposed a duty of $4 per ton on silica crude, and of $7.50 per ton on silica suitable for use as a pigment, both when not specially provided for. Senate amendment No. 204 strikes out this language and amendment No. 206 restores crude silica, not specially provided for, at the reduced rate of $3.50 per ton, while amendment No. 1056 places silica, not specially provided for, on the free list. Amendment No. 206 also imposes a duty of $3.50 per ton on sand containing 95 per cent or more of silica and suitable for use in the manufacture of glass, not specially provided for, which was on the free list under paragraph 1770 of the House bill. The House recedes on amendment No. 204 with an amendment restoring silica, crude, not specially provided for, at $3.50 per ton, and recedes on amendment No. 1056. The House recedes on amendment No. 206 with an amendment making dutiable at $2 per ton sand containing 95 per cent or more of silica and not more than six-tenths of 1 per cent of oxide of iron and suitable for use in the manufacture of glass.

On amendment No. 205: The House bill imposed a duty of $8.40 per ton on fluorspar. The Senate amendment makes this rate applicable to fluorspar containing not more than 93 per cent of calcium fluoride, but reduces to $5.60 per ton the rate on fluorspar containing above 93 per cent of calcium fluoride; and the House recedes with an amendment making the content dividing line 97 per cent instead of 93 per cent.

On amendment No. 206: See amendment No. 204.

On amendment No. 207: This amendment rewrites and amplifies the House provisions in respect to mica. The House recedes with an amendment making clarifying changes in respect of phlogopite. The following table shows the duties as proposed by the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement:

Mica	House bill	Senate amendment	Conference agreement
Unmanufactured:			
Valued not above 15 cents per pound	4 cents per pound.	4 cents per pound.	4 cents per pound.
Valued above 15 cents per pound	2 cents per pound plus 25 per cent.	4 cents per pound plus 25 per cent.	4 cents per pound plus 25 per cent.
Cut or stamped to dimensions, shape, or form.	30 per cent	40 per cent	40 per cent.
Films or splittings (not to dimensions):			
Not above 0.0012 inch thick	do	Films and splittings, 25 per cent.	Films and splittings, 25 per cent.
Above 0.0012 inch thick	do	Films and splittings, 40 per cent.	Films and splittings, 40 per cent.
Films or splittings (dimensioned)	40 per cent as manufactured.	Films and splittings, 45 per cent.	Films and splittings, 45 per cent.
Plates, built-up, and manufactures of	40 per cent	40 per cent	40 per cent.
Waste and scrap:			
Valued not above 5 cents per pound	20 per cent	25 per cent	25 per cent.
Valued above 5 cents and not above 15 cents per pound.	do	4 cents per pound.	4 cents per pound.
Valued above 15 cents per pound	do	4 cents per pound plus 25 per cent.	4 cents per pound plus 25 per cent.
Ground	do	20 per cent	20 per cent.
Phlogopite, untrimmed, of size stipulated:			
Valued not above 15 cents per pound	do	15 per cent	15 per cent.
Valued above 15 cents per pound	do	do	Do.

On amendment No. 208: The House bill imposed a duty of three-eighths of 1 cent per pound on talc, steatite or soapstone, and French chalk when ground, washed, powdered, or pulverized (except toilet preparations). The Senate amendment makes this duty 25 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes with an amendment making this rate 35 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 209: The House bill imposed upon decorated earthenware a duty of 10 cents per dozen pieces and 50 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment strikes out the specific rate and increases the ad valorem to 55 per cent; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 210, 211, and 213: The House bill imposed upon china and porcelain, not decorated, etc., a duty of 10 cents per dozen pieces and 60 per cent ad valorem, and upon the

decorated, etc., a duty of 10 cents per dozen pieces and 70 per cent ad valorem. Senate amendments 210 and 211 strike out the specific duties of 10 cents per dozen pieces and amendment No. 213 imposes an additional duty of 10 cents per dozen separate pieces on all "tableware, kitchen ware, and utensils." The House recedes on amendments Nos. 210 and 211 and recedes on amendment No. 213 with an amendment making it more clear that the utensils specified are only table and kitchen utensils.

On amendment No. 212: Under the House bill any china or porcelain containing 25 per cent or more of calcined bone was dutiable at the rates applicable under that paragraph to articles not containing that percentage of calcined bone. The Senate amendment reduces the rate on such articles to 50 per cent ad valorem if not decorated, etc., and to 55 per cent if decorated, etc.; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 214: The House bill imposed upon graphite or plumbago, crude or refined, if crystalline lump, chip, or dust, a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem and of 1¼ cents per pound if crystalline flake. The Senate amendment eliminates the House classification and makes all crystalline graphite dutiable at 2 cents per pound; and the House recedes with an amendment restoring the House classification and making the rates, respectively, 30 per cent ad valorem and 1.65 cents per pound.

On amendment No. 215: The House bill contained a definition of the term "crystalline flake." The Senate amendment eliminates this definition but inserts definitions of the terms "amorphous" and "crystalline"; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 216: The House bill imposed a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem on carbons and electrodes, of whatever material composed, and wholly or partly manufactured, for producing electric arc light. The Senate amendment increases to 60 per cent the rate of duty on such articles if less than one-half inch in diameter or of equivalent cross-sectional area; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 217, 219, 220, and 242: Amendment 219 (together with amendments Nos. 217 and 242) imposes a rate of 65 per cent on glass rods, which under the House bill were dutiable either at 85 per cent under subparagraph (a) of paragraph 218, or at 50 per cent under paragraph 230, or at 40 per cent under paragraph 231, and a rate of 40 per cent ad valorem on rods of fused quartz or silica, which under the House bill were dutiable at 50 per cent under subparagraph (a) of paragraph 218, or at 30 per cent under paragraph 214, and a rate of 65 per cent on glass canes, which under the House bill were dutiable at 50 per cent under paragraph 230. Amendments Nos. 219 and 220 reduce from 65 per cent to 55 per cent the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on gauge glass tubes. The House recedes on amendments Nos. 217, 219, and 242, and recedes on amendment No. 220 with an amendment making the rate on gauge glass tubes 60 per cent.

On amendment No. 218: This is a clarifying amendment; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 221: The House bill imposed a duty of 65 per cent ad valorem upon illuminating articles of every description, including chimneys, globes, shades, and prisms, for use in connection with artificial illumination, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of glass. The Senate amendment increases the duty on globes and shades to 70 per cent ad valorem; and reduces the other duties as follows: Prisms, glass chandeliers, and articles in chief value of prisms, to 30 per cent; chimneys, to 55 per cent; all other, to 60 per cent ad valorem. The amendment also adds a proviso that parts, not specially provided for, wholly or in chief value of glass (including cased glass), shall be subject to the same rate of duty as the articles of which they are parts. The House recedes with an amendment eliminating as surplusage the words "including cased glass" wherever they appear in the Senate text, and making the rate on prisms, glass chandeliers, and articles in chief value of prisms, 60 per cent.

On amendment No. 222: The House bill imposed a duty of 70 per cent ad valorem on bottles and jars, wholly or in chief value of glass, of the character used or designed to be used as containers of perfume, talcum powder, toilet water, or other toilet preparations, and on bottles, vials, and jars, wholly or in chief value of glass, fitted with or designed for use with ground-glass stoppers. The Senate amendment limits the application of the subparagraph in the case of bottles, vials, and jars, wholly or in chief value of glass, fitted with or designed for use with ground-glass stoppers, to such articles when suitable for use and of the character ordinarily employed for the holding or transportation of merchandise. It reduces to 25 per cent the duty on all articles in the subparagraph made by automatic machine and increases to 75 per cent the duty on such articles when otherwise produced. The amendment further provides that for the purposes of the subparagraph no regard shall be had to the method of manufacture of the stoppers or covers. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 223: The House bill provided that the specific rates of duty on cylinder, crown, and sheet glass should not be less than 50 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment strikes out this minimum duty; and the House recedes with an amendment retaining the House provision but limiting the application of the minimum duty to glass weighing less than 16 but not less than 12 ounces per square foot.

On amendment No. 224: The House bill provides that cylinder, crown, and sheet glass, imported in boxes, shall contain 50 square feet, as nearly as sizes will permit, and the duty shall be computed thereon according to the actual weight of the glass. The Senate amendment denies entry to such glass unless packed in units containing 50 square feet or 100 square feet, or multiples of either; and the House recedes with an amendment striking out certain surplus language.

On amendment No. 225: The House bill imposed upon rolled glass, not sheet glass, whether or not fluted, figured, ribbed, or rough, or the same containing a wire netting within itself, various specific duties per square foot according to size and weight, with the proviso that such glass when ground wholly or in part, and rolled or sheet glass not less than one-fourth of 1 inch in thickness when obscured in any manner, should be subject to the same rate of duty as plate glass. The Senate amendment eliminates the specific duties per square foot, imposes a duty of 1½ cents per pound and strikes out the proviso (which is reinserted with changes by amendment No. 229, as a separate subparagraph); and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 226: The House bill imposed on plate glass, by whatever process made, exceeding 384 but not exceeding 720 square inches, a duty of 19 cents per square foot and on all above that 22 cents per square foot. The Senate amendment makes the rate 17 cents if such glass exceeds 384 but does not exceed 1,008 square inches, and 19¾ cents per square foot above that; and the House recedes with an amendment inserting an additional bracket at the rate of 17½ cents per square foot on plate glass exceeding 720 but not exceeding 1,008 square inches.

On amendment No. 227: The House bill provided that the duty in the case of plate glass measuring one-half of 1 inch or over should not be less than 50 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment makes the dividing line three-eighths of 1 inch; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 228: The House bill imposed on plate glass containing a wire netting within itself, not exceeding 384 square inches, a duty of 17 cents per square foot. The Senate amendment reduces this duty to 13½ cents per square foot; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 15 cents per square foot.

On amendment No. 229: The House bill, by a proviso in paragraph 221, stricken out by amendment No. 225, provided that rolled, cylinder, crown, and sheet glass, when ground in whole or in part, and rolled or sheet glass not less than one-fourth of 1 inch in thickness when obscured in any manner, should be subject to the same rate of duty as plate glass. Amendment 229 inserts a new subparagraph at the end of paragraph 222 and provides that rolled, cylinder, crown, and sheet glass, not plate glass, if ground wholly or in part (whether or not polished) otherwise than for the purpose of ornamentation, or if one-fourth of 1 inch or more in thickness and obscured by coloring prior to solidification, shall be subject to the duties provided for plate glass in subparagraph (a) or (b) of this paragraph; if any of the foregoing is subjected to any of the processes specified in paragraph 224, the additional duty provided therein shall apply. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 230: The House bill imposed a duty of 17 cents per square foot on plate, cylinder, crown, and sheet glass, by whatever process made, when made into mirrors, finished or partly finished, exceeding in size 144 square inches and not exceeding 384 square inches. The Senate amendment reduces this duty to 13½ cents per square foot; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 15 cents per square foot.

On amendment No. 231: This amendment makes applicable to rolled glass the additional duty of 5 per cent ad valorem provided by the House bill on plate, cylinder, crown, or sheet glass subjected to certain processes, such as obscuration, coloring, etc.; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 232: This amendment strikes out certain language as surplusage; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 233: The House bill imposed upon cylinder, crown, and sheet glass, and amendment 231, agreed to by the conference, imposes upon rolled glass, an additional duty of 5 per cent ad valorem if colored. Amendment No. 233 excepts from this additional duty by reason of coloring glass not

less than one-fourth of 1 inch in thickness when obscured by coloring prior to solidification, which glass, under the action of the conference heretofore referred to in connection with amendment No. 229, has already been made dutiable at the plate-glass rates. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 234: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on optical glass or glass used in the manufacture of lenses or prisms for spectacles, or for optical instruments or equipment, or for optical parts, scientific or commercial, in any and all forms. The Senate amendment reduces this duty to 45 per cent; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 235: This amendment makes a change in the House text for purposes of clarity; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 236: This amendment makes it clear that prism binoculars are not to be classified as opera or field glasses, being provided for in subparagraph (a); and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 237: This amendment makes a change in the House text for purposes of clarity; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 238: The House bill imposed a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on incandescent electric-light bulbs and lamps, with filaments. The Senate amendment makes this rate applicable to such bulbs with filaments of carbon or other nonmetallic material, but reduces the rate to 20 per cent in respect of such bulbs containing metal filaments; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 239: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on glass mirrors, not specially provided for, not exceeding in size 144 square inches, with or without frames or cases. The Senate amendment excepts framed or cased mirrors in chief value of gold, platinum, or silver; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 240: This amendment strikes out as surplusage the proviso in the House bill which provides that no mirror in a frame or case (unless such mirror, exclusive of the frame or case, is the component of chief value) shall be classified under paragraph 230, if it has a substantial use other than as a mirror; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 241: This amendment rewrites the provision of the House bill for glass ruled or etched in any manner, and manufactures of such glass, without change in rate; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 242: The House bill imposed a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on opal, enamel, or cylinder glass rods. The Senate amendment eliminates rods (see amendment 217); and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 243: The House bill imposed an additional duty of 3 cents per superficial foot on slabs and paving tiles of marble, breccia, or onyx, if rubbed or polished. The Senate amendment makes this rate applicable to such articles if rubbed in whole or in part, but increases the additional duty to 6 cents per superficial foot if polished in whole or in part, whether or not rubbed; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 244 and 887: The House bill imposed a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on burrstones, manufactured or bound up into millstones. Senate amendment No. 244 strikes out this duty and amendment No. 887 places such articles on the free list. The House recedes on amendment No. 244 and recedes on amendment No. 887 with an amendment making a change in paragraph number.

On amendments Nos. 246 and 247: The House bill imposed a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem upon granite suitable for use as monumental, paving, or building stone, if pitched or lined, and excepted such granite from the 25 cents per cubic foot duty on unmanufactured granite. The Senate amendments strike out the words "pitched, lined"; and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 248: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 cents per cubic foot on travertine stone, unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn, or polished. The Senate amendment reduces the duty to 20 cents per cubic foot; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 249: The House bill imposed a duty of $1.75 per ton on grindstones, finished or unfinished. Senate amendment No. 249 strikes out this provision and amendment No. 950 places these articles upon the free list. The House recedes on amendment No. 249.

On amendment No. 251: The House bill imposed a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on slate, slates, slate chimney pieces, mantels, slabs for tables, roofing slates, and all other manufactures of slate, not specially provided for. The Senate amendment increases this duty to 25 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

SCHEDULE 3.—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF

The following amendments make changes in paragraph, subparagraph, and clause references, and the House recedes: 280, 352, 353, 354, 356, 357, 361, and 362.

On amendment No. 253: The House bill imposed a duty of $1.12½ per ton on iron in pigs and iron kentledge. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 75 cents per ton; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 254 and 269: Under the House bill granular or sponge iron was dutiable in paragraph 303 at various rates, depending on the value of the article, the lowest rate being $4.48 per ton and the average rate being $6.72 per ton. Amendment No. 269 strikes out the reference to this article in paragraph 303 and amendment No. 254 inserts it in paragraph 301 at the rate of 75 cents per ton. The House recedes on amendment No. 269 and recedes on amendment No. 254 with an amendment making the rate $2.25 per ton.

On amendments Nos. 255 and 256: These amendments specifically mention hammer scale, roll scale, and mill scale. Under the House bill these articles are dutiable as scrap steel or iron at the same rate (75 cents per ton), and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 257: The House bill imposed an additional duty of 4 cents per pound on the chromium content in excess of two-tenths of 1 per cent in the products provided for in paragraph 301. The Senate amendment reduces this additional duty to 3 cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 258: The House bill imposed a duty of 1 cent per pound on the metallic manganese content of manganese ore or concentrates containing in excess of 30 per cent of metallic manganese. The Senate amendment makes the duty applicable whenever the content is in excess of 10 per cent manganese, and includes within the provision ferruginous manganese ore (which was free of duty under the House bill, probably as a crude mineral) and manganiferous iron ore (which was free of duty under paragraph 1698 of the House bill); and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 259 and 260: The House bill imposed a duty of 60 cents per pound on the tungsten content and 25 per cent ad valorem on ferrotungsten, metallic tungsten, tungsten powder, tungstic acid, and all other compounds of tungsten. The Senate amendments rewrite the House text transferring ferrotungsten to subparagraph (h) of paragraph 302 without change of rate; increasing the rate on lumps, grains, or powders of tungsten metal, tungsten carbide, or of mixtures or combinations containing tungsten metal or tungsten carbide, to 60 cents per pound on the tungsten content and 50 per cent ad valorem; and increasing the rate on tungstic acid and all other compounds of tungsten n. s. p. f. to 60 cents per pound on the tungsten content and 40 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 261: The House bill imposed a duty of 5 cents per pound on silicon aluminum, aluminum silicon, alsimin, ferrosilicon aluminum, and ferroaluminum silicon. The Senate amendment reduces the rate on silicon aluminum and aluminum silicon to 3½ cents per pound, changes the rate on ferrosilicon aluminum and ferroaluminum silicon to 25 per cent ad valorem. strikes out the trade name "alsimin" (which remains dutiable as ferrosilicon aluminum or ferroaluminum silicon), and makes the foregoing rates applicable only when aluminum is not the component material of chief value; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 262 and 263: The House bill imposed a duty of 3½ cents per pound on the chromium content of ferrochrome or ferrochromium containing 3 per cent or more of carbon, and 30 per cent ad valorem on that containing less than 3 per cent, and the same rate on chrome metal or chromium metal. The Senate amendment reduces these rates, respectively, to 2½ cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes on amendment No. 262 and the Senate recedes on amendment No. 263.

On amendment No. 264: Under the House bill tantalum and tantalum alloys not specially provided for are not specifically mentioned and are probably free of duty as metals unwrought, not specially provided for. The Senate amendment imposes a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on tantalum and on specified tantalum alloys; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 265: The House bill imposed a duty of $2 per pound on cerium metal. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to $1 per pound; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 266: The House bill imposed a duty of $2 per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem on ferrocerium and all other cerium alloys. The Senate amendment retains the ad valorem rate but reduces the specific rate to $1 per pound; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 267 and 268: Under the House bill ductile columbium or niobium metal was dutiable under subparagraph (n) of paragraph 302 at 25 per cent ad valorem and ductile nonferrous alloys of columbium or niobium metal were dutiable at 40 per cent ad valorem as ductile nonferrous alloys of tantalum under subparagraph (r). The Senate amendments make these products dutiable under subparagraph (r) at 40 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 269: See amendment No. 254. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 270: The House bill imposed a duty of two-tenths of 1 cent per pound on muck bars, pieces thereof except crop ends, bar iron, and round iron in coils or rods, iron in slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than iron in bars and more advanced than pig iron, except castings, when valued at not more than 1 cent per pound. The Senate amendment eliminates this bracket, the effect of which is to increase the rate on such articles to three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 271: The House bill imposed a duty of two-tenths of 1 cent per pound on steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, by whatever process made; die blocks or blanks; billets and bars, whether solid or hollow; shafting; pressed, sheared, or stamped shapes, not advanced in value or condition by any process or operation subsequent to the process of stamping; hammer molds or swaged steel; gun-barrel molds not in bars; concrete reinforcement bars; all descriptions and shapes of dry sand, loam, or iron molded steel castings; sheets and plates and steel not specially provided for; all the foregoing valued at not over 1 cent per pound. The Senate amendment eliminates this bracket, the effect of which is to increase the rate on such articles to three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 272: The House bill imposed an additional duty of $1\frac{3}{16}$ cents per pound on hollow bars and hollow drill steel valued at more than 4 cents per pound. The Senate amendment eliminates this additional duty; and the House recedes with an amendment making the additional duty three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

On amendment No. 273: In addition to the duties provided for in paragraphs 303, 304, 307, 308, 312, 313, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 322, 323, 324, 327, and 328, the House bill imposed an additional ad valorem duty on all steel or iron, in all forms and shapes, by whatever process made, and by whatever name designated, whether cast, hot or cold rolled, forged, stamped, or drawn, when such steel or iron contains any alloying element in excess of certain designated percentages; and additional cumulative specific duties on the vanadium, tungsten, molybdenum, or chromium contained in such steel or iron in excess of certain designated percentages. The Senate amendment rewrites the House text so as to subject to the additional duties the iron and steel in all the articles enumerated or described in such paragraphs as well as in the materials; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 274: Under the House bill one of the cumulative duties referred to in the explanation of amendment No. 273 was a duty of 4 cents per pound on the chromium content in excess of two-tenths of 1 per cent. The Senate amendment reduces the rate to 3 cents per pound (applicable as explained in connection with amendment No. 273); and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 275: The House bill imposed a duty of seven-twentieths of 1 cent per pound on boiler or other plate iron or steel, except crucible plate steel and saw plate steel, not thinner than one hundred and nine one-thousandths of 1 inch, cut or sheared to shape or otherwise, or unsheared, and skelp iron or steel sheared or rolled in grooves, all the foregoing valued at 1 cent per pound or less. The Senate amendment eliminates this bracket, the effect of which is to increase the rate on such articles to five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 276, 277, and 278: The Senate amendments eliminate the term "building forms," since it has no meaning in the trade; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 279: The House bill imposed a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on rivet, screw, fence, and other iron or steel wire rods, whether round, oval, or square, or in any other shape, nail rods and flat rods up to 6 inches in width ready to be drawn or rolled into wire or strips, all the foregoing in coils or otherwise, valued at over 4 cents per pound. The Senate amendment changes this rate to six-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 281 and 282: See amendment No. 284.

On amendment No. 283: The House bill imposed a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on wire rope. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 35 per cent; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 284, 281, and 282: Under the House bill wire composed of tungsten or molybdenum was dutiable under subparagraph (a) of paragraph 316 at 25 per cent ad valorem if uncovered, and at 35 per cent ad valorem if covered. Senate amendments Nos. 281 and 282 except tungsten and molybdenum wire from the provisions of subparagraph (a) and amendment No. 284 specifically provides for such wire at 60 per cent ad valorem. The House recedes on amendments Nos. 281 and 282. Ingots and shot containing tungsten or molybdenum are dutiable in the House bill under paragraph 302 at 60 cents per pound on the tungsten content and 25 per cent ad valorem if of tungsten, and if of molybdenum at 50 cents on the molybdenum content and 15 per cent ad valorem. Bars, sheets, or other forms (except wire) not specially provided for, containing more than 50 per cent of tungsten or molybdenum or their carbides, are dutiable under the House bill at 50 per cent in paragraph 398, and scrap of the same materials probably is dutiable under the provision for waste, not specially provided for, in paragraph 1555. Senate amendment No. 284 makes all the foregoing dutiable at 60 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes on this amendment with an amendment making the rate 50 per cent ad valorem in the case of ingots, shot, bars, and scrap, but retaining the 60 per cent rate in the case of sheets, wire, or other forms.

On amendment No. 285: The House bill imposed a duty of 55 per cent ad valorem on Fourdrinier wires and cylinder wires, suitable for use in paper-making machines (whether or not parts of or fitted or attached to such machines), and on woven-wire cloth suitable for use in the manufacture of Fourdrinier wires or cylinder wires. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 40 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 50 per cent ad valorem.

On amendments Nos. 286 and 287: The House bill excepted from the provisions of this paragraph autoclaves, catalyst chambers or tubes, converters, reaction chambers, scrubbers, separators, shells, stills, ovens, soakers, penstock pipes, cylinders, containers, drums, and vessels, any of the foregoing provided for in paragraph 327 (relating to castings of iron). The Senate amendments except from the paragraph any of the foregoing made of cast steel, and any of the foregoing made of cast iron whether or not provided for in paragraph 327; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 288: The House bill refers to articles of a certain diameter, and the Senate amendment specifies that the diameter of the articles provided for in this paragraph shall be determined as the largest inside diameter, exclusive of nonmetallic lining; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 289: The House bill imposed a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on autoclaves, catalyst chambers or tubes, converters, reaction chambers, scrubbers, separators, shells, stills, ovens, soakers, penstock pipes, cylinders, containers, drums, and vessels, any of the foregoing composed wholly or in chief value of iron or steel, by whatever process made (see amendments Nos. 286 and 287), wholly or partly manufactured, if over 20 inches in diameter (see amendment No. 288) and having metal walls 1¼ inches or more in thickness, and parts for any of the foregoing. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 25 per cent; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 35 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 290: The House bill imposed a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on cast-iron pipe of every description, and cast-iron fittings for cast-iron pipe. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 25 per cent; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 291 and 389: Under the House bill molders' patterns wholly or in chief value of metal were dutiable under the basket clause of the metal schedule (par. 398) at 50 per cent ad valorem, and those wholly or in chief value of wood were provided for in paragraph 413 of the House bill at 40 per cent ad valorem. Senate amendment No. 389 strikes out the reference to molders' patterns in paragraph 413 of the House bill and amendment No. 291 specifically provides for all molders' patterns, of whatever material composed, for the manufacture of castings, at 50 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 292: Under the House bill, staples, in strip form, for use in paper fasteners or stapling machines were dutiable in this paragraph as staples not specially provided for at six-tenths of 1 cent per pound. The Senate amendment specifically provides for this article and increases the rate to 10 cents per pound; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 2 cents per pound.

On amendment No. 293: The House bill imposed a duty of 11 cents per pound and 55 per cent ad valorem on table, household, kitchen, and hospital utensils, and hollow or flat ware, not specially provided for, composed wholly or in chief value of aluminum. The Senate amendment eliminates the specific duty and reduces the ad valorem duty to 25 per cent; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 8½ cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 294: The House bill imposed an additional duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on table, household, kitchen, and hospital utensils, provided for in this paragraph when containing electrical heating elements as constituent parts thereof. The Senate amendment strikes out this additional duty; and the

House recedes with an amendment making it clear that the rates specified in paragraph 339 apply to the articles named therein whether or not the articles contain such electrical heating elements.

On amendments Nos. 295 and 296: The House bill imposed a duty of $1.50 per thousand and 50 per cent ad valorem on crochet needles or hooks. The Senate amendments reduce this rate to $1.15 per thousand and 40 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 297: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on tape; knitting, and all other needles, not specially provided for, on bodkins of metal, and on needlecases or needlebooks furnished with assortments of needles or combinations of needles and other articles. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 45 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 298: Under the House bill, belt buckles, trouser buckles, waistcoat buckles, shoe or slipper buckles, and parts thereof, made wholly or partly of iron, steel, or other base metal, valued at more than $1.66⅔ per hundred, were dutiable under paragraph 1527 (c) (2) at the following cumulative rates: 1 cent each and in addition thereto three-fifths of 1 cent per dozen for each 1 cent the value exceeds 20 cents per dozen, and 50 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment removes this class of buckles from paragraph 1527 by specifically providing for them at a rate of 20 cents per hundred, plus an additional duty of 20 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 299: The House bill imposed a duty of 15 cents per gross on pens, not specially provided for, of plain or carbon steel and 18 cents per gross on those of other metal. The Senate amendment makes all metallic pens, not specially provided for, dutiable at 12 cents per gross; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 300: The Senate amendment eliminates the term "drill bits," as it is not an accurate trade designation, and inserts in lieu thereof more accurate designation "drills"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 301: This amendment makes clear that the 50 per cent rate provided in paragraph 352 will be confined to metal-cutting tools; and the House recedes.

On amentment No. 302: The House bill imposed a rate of 60 per cent ad valorem on certain tools containing more than certain percentages of vanadium, tungsten, molybdenum, or chromium. The Senate amendment makes this rate also applicable to cutting tools not for metal cutting; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 303: This amendment makes it clear that the provisions of paragraph 352 imposing duties on certain metal cutting and other cutting tools shall not apply to holding or operating devices; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 304: This amendment makes it clear that the rates imposed by paragraph 353 on electrical telegraph apparatus wholly or in chief value of metal shall apply to electrical telegraph printing and typewriting apparatus; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 305: The Senate amendment excepts laboratory instruments from paragraph 353 (electrical instruments), the effect of which is to transfer them to paragraph 360, which provides for laboratory instruments; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 306: The House bill imposed a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on all articles suitable for producing, rectifying, modifying, controlling, or distributing electrical energy; electrical telegraph, telephone, signaling, radio, welding, ignition, wiring, therapeutic, and X-ray apparatus, instruments, and devices; and articles having as an essential feature an electrical element or device, such as electric motors, fans, locomotives, portable tools, furnaces, heaters, ovens, ranges, washing machines, refrigerators, and signs; all the foregoing, and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of metal, and not specially provided for. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 30 per cent; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 35 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 307: The House bill imposed a duty of 2 cents each and 50 per cent ad valorem on penknives, pocketknives, clasp knives, pruning knives, budding knives, erasers, manicure knives, and all knives by whatever name known including such as are denominatively mentioned in this act, which have folding or other than fixed blades or attachments, valued at not more than 40 cents per dozen. The Senate amendment reduces the specific rate to 1 cent each but retains the ad valorem rate at 50 per cent; and the House recedes with an amendment making the specific rate 1¼ cents each.

On amendment No. 308: Under the House bill hand forceps were dutiable under this paragraph at 60 per cent ad valorem, and manicure or pedicure nippers were dutiable under paragraph 361 at 10 cents each and 60 per cent ad valorem if valued at not more than $2 per dozen, or 20 cents each and 60 per cent ad valorem if valued at more than $2 per dozen. Senate amendment No. 308 strikes out the reference to hand forceps, which in effect makes this article dutiable under paragraph 359, if surgical or dental forceps, or under paragraph 360, if scientific or laboratory forceps. The amendment also specifically provides for manicure and pedicure nippers at 60 per cent ad valorem without the additional specific duty. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 309: In addition to the specific duties provided on straight razors and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, the House bill imposed an ad valorem duty of 45 per cent. The Senate amendment reduces this ad valorem rate to 30 per cent; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 310: This is a clarifying amendment; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 311: The House bill imposed a duty of 70 per cent ad valorem on surgical instruments and parts thereof, including hypodermic needles, hypodermic syringes, and forceps, composed wholly or in part of iron, steel, copper, brass, nickel, aluminum, or other metal, finished or unfinished. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 45 per cent; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 55 per cent ad valorem, except that the rate on any of the foregoing in part of the metals enumerated, but in chief value of glass, is retained at 70 per cent.

On amendment No. 312: The House bill imposed a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem on dental instruments and parts thereof, including hypodermic needles, hypodermic syringes, and forceps, wholly or in part of iron, steel, copper, brass, nickel, aluminum, or other metal, finished or unfinished. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 35 per cent; and the House recedes with an amendment agreeing to the 35 per cent rate, except that the rate on any of the foregoing in part of the metals enumerated, but in chief value of glass, is retained at 60 per cent.

On amendment No. 313: The Senate amendment eliminates the term "philosophical" as applied to instruments, apparatus, etc., as being no longer in commercial use, the intent being sufficiently covered by the words "scientific and laboratory" and "surveying and mathematical"; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 314 and 315: The House bill imposed a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on drawing instruments and parts thereof, wholly or in chief value of metal, and not plated with gold, silver, or platinum, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for. The Senate amendments increase the rate to 60 per cent, the designation being changed to "drawing instruments, and parts thereof, wholly or in chief value of metal"; and the House recedes on both amendments with an amendment making the rate 45 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 316: This amendment is made necessary by the conference agreement on amendment No. 308; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 317: The House bill imposed a duty of 10 cents each and 60 per cent ad valorem on pliers other than slip joint, pincers, nippers, of all kinds (see amendment No. 316), and hinged hand tools for holding and splicing wire, finished or unfinished, valued at not more than $2 per dozen, and a duty of 20 cents each and 60 per cent ad valorem on all the foregoing valued at more than $2 per dozen. The Senate amendment eliminates both brackets and the specific rates, making all the foregoing dutiable at 60 per cent regardless of value; and the House recedes with an amendment restoring the House classification retaining the ad valorem rate, but changing the specific rates, respectively, to 5 cents each and 10 cents each.

On amendment No. 318: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on muzzle-loading muskets, shotguns, rifles, and parts thereof. Amendment No. 318 strikes out the House provisions and amendment No. 983 transfers these articles to the free list. The House recedes on amendment No. 318.

On amendment No. 319: Under the House bill bells (except carillons) were dutiable under paragraph 398 as manufactures of metal not specially provided for. The Senate amendment specifically provides for bells (except church and similar bells and carillons), finished or unfinished, and parts thereof, at 70 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 50 per cent ad valorem.

On amendments Nos. 320, 322, 323, and 324: The Senate amendments strike out the designations "double or single barreled breech-loading and repeating" and "breech-loading and repeating" and "breech-loading" when applied to shotguns or rifles

as being surplusage, all muzzle-loading arms being specifically provided for; and the House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendment No. 321: The House bill imposed a duty of $10 each plus an additional duty of 45 per cent ad valorem on double or single barreled breech-loading and repeating shotguns, rifles, and combination shotguns and rifles, valued at more than $25 each. The Senate amendment (see also amendment No. 320) retains this rate in the case of any of the foregoing valued at more than $25 each and not more than $50 each, and changes the basic rate on those valued at more than $50 each from $10 each to 20 per cent ad valorem, retaining the additional duty of 45 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 322, 323, and 324: See amendment No. 320.

On amendments Nos. 325 and 326: Under the House bill, parts and fittings for pistols and revolvers, automatic, single-shot, magazine, or revolving, were dutiable at the same rates as pistols and revolvers, viz: $2 each if valued at not more than $4 each; $2.50 each when valued at more than $4 and not more than $8 each; and $3.50 each when valued at more than $8 each; and in addition thereto, on all the foregoing, 55 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendments remove parts and fittings from the classification with pistols and revolvers and provide for them at 50 per cent ad valorem in lieu of the specific duties, at the same time retaining the additional duty of 55 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 327: Under the existing law a duty is imposed upon watch movements at specific rates, based upon the number of jewels contained therein, the rates running from 75 cents each on watch movements having less than 7 jewels to $10.75 each on those having more than 17 jewels, while watch cases and parts of watches were dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem. Unset jewels for watches, clocks, meters, or compasses were dutiable at 10 per cent ad valorem, and enameled dials for watches or other instruments at 3 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem. The House bill completely rewrites the language of the existing law, and provides a new basis of classification, depending upon the physical characteristics of the mechanism. The provisions of the paragraph are made to apply to time-keeping, time-measuring, or time-indicating mechanisms, devices, and instruments, whether or not designed to be worn or carried on or about the person, if less than 1.77 inches wide and if having any type of stem, rim, or self-winding mechanism, and watch movements designed or intended to be worn or carried on or about the person, any of the above if completely assembled, whether or not in cases, containers, or housings. The basic rates are adjusted according to the size of the movements and run from $1.25 each on those more than 1½ inches wide to $2.50 each on those six-tenths of 1 inch or less in width, with a reduction in these rates of 40 per cent if such movements have only 1 jewel or no jewels, and an additional duty of 20 cents for each jewel in excess of 7. The House bill also imposes an additional duty of $1 for each adjustment with a minimum adjustment rate of $3 in the case of all watches containing 15 or more jewels and 1 inch or more in diameter, and a further duty of $1 each if constructed or designed to operate for a period in excess of 47 hours without rewinding, or if self-winding, or if a self-winding device may be incorporated therein. Parts (except pillar or bottom plates) not constituting a subassembly, and mainsprings are made dutiable at 65 per cent ad valorem; pillar or bottom plates were subjected to one-half the amount of duty borne by the complete movement; and each subassembly was subjected to the same rate of duty as the complete movement. On unset jewels, a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem was imposed, and on dials whether or not attached to movements, a duty of 5 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem. Cases were made dutiable at various rates, depending upon the component material, and whether or not set with precious, semiprecious, or imitation precious or semiprecious stones. The Senate amendment strikes out the House text and restores the language and rates of existing law. The House recedes with an amendment, using the House bill as a basis, making certain changes in language and certain changes in substance. The principal changes in substance are as follows:

(1) The provisions of the paragraph apply to watch movements, and time-keeping, time-measuring, or time-indicating mechanisms, devices, and instruments, whether or not designed to be worn or carried on or about the person, all the foregoing, if less than 1.77 inches wide, whether or not in cases, containers, or housings.

(2) The rate of 20 cents on each jewel in excess of 7 contained in any movement, etc., is reduced to 15 cents.

(3) The minimum $3 adjustment rate of the House bill has been removed.

(4) Movements, etc., having more than 17 jewels, whether adjusted or unadjusted, and whether with or without dials, are given a flat rate of $10.75 each in lieu of the rates fixed in the House bill.

(5) Parts for repair purposes to the extent of 4 per cent of the value of any shipment of complete movements, etc. (except plates, bridges, and jewels), whether or not constituting subassemblies, are made dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem, the same rate as in the present act. Assemblies and subassemblies (other than those to which the 45 per cent rate applies) are made dutiable as follows: 3 cents for each piece of material except jewels (15 cents each) and except pillar or bottom plates (half the duty on the complete movement, etc.), and except balance assemblies (50 cents for the entire assembly). No assembly or subassembly is to be subject to more duty than the duty on the complete movement, etc., nor to a less duty than 45 per cent.

(6) The dial duty is not imposed on dials attached to movements.

On amendment No. 328: Under the existing law a duty is imposed on clocks and clock movements, including lever clock movements, and clockwork mechanisms, cased or uncased, whether imported complete or in parts, and any device or mechanism having an essential operating feature intended for measuring time, distance, or fares, or the flowage of water, gas, electricity, or similar uses, or for regulating or controlling the speed of arbors, drums, disks, or similar uses, or for recording, indicating, or performing any operation or function at a predetermined time or times, any of the foregoing whether wholly or partly complete or knocked down, based on the number of jewels in the escapement and on the value, at rates running from 35 cents each and 45 per cent ad valorem on those having no jewels, to $4 each and 45 per cent ad valorem on those with over four jewels, while cases and casings for clockwork mechanisms imported separately were dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem; and parts not specially provided for at 50 per cent ad valorem (jewels for clocks dutiable under paragraph 367 at 10 per cent ad valorem under both House bill and Senate amendment).

The House bill entirely rewrites the language, providing classification primarily on the basis of whether completely assembled or in subassemblies or parts. The paragraph of the House bill applies to the following: Clocks, clock movements, including lever movements, clockwork mechanisms, time-keeping, time-measuring, or time-indicating mechanisms, devices and instruments, synchronous and subsynchronous motors of less than one-fortieth of 1 horsepower, and any mechanism, device, or instrument intended or suitable for measuring time, distance, speed, or fares, or the flowage of water, gas, or electricity, or similar uses, or for regulating, indicating, or controlling the speed of arbors, drums, disks, or similar uses, or for recording or indicating time, or for recording, indicating, or performing any operation or function at a predetermined time or times, all the above (except the articles enumerated or described in par. 367), if completely assembled, whether or not in cases, containers, or housings. The House bill also provides rates for complete movements, etc., and for subassemblies of two or more pieces (except plates) of from 55 cents each and 65 per cent ad valorem to $4.50 each and 65 per cent ad valorem, with an additional cumulative duty of 25 cents for each jewel or substitute for jewel. The House bill also provides rates on plates of one-half the duty on the complete movement, on cases of 45 per cent ad valorem, on dials 50 per cent ad valorem, and on other parts 65 per cent. The House bill also separately mentions taximeters and provides a rate of 85 per cent ad valorem.

The House recedes with amendments making a few changes in language and some changes in substance. The important changes in substance are as follows:

(1) Synchronous and subsynchronous motors of less than one-fortieth of 1 horsepower, valued at more than $3 each, not including the value of gears or other attachments, are removed from the operation of the paragraph.

(2) Parts (except plates and jewels) to the extent of 1½ per cent of the value of complete movements, etc., in any shipment are made dutiable at 45 per cent, the same rate as in the present act. Assemblies and subassemblies, not containing plates and not bearing the 45 per cent rate for repair parts, are made dutiable at 65 per cent plus 3 cents for each part or piece of material except jewels, which carry a specific rate of 25 cents instead of 3 cents. Subassemblies containing plates are dutiable at the rate provided on the plate plus 5 cents for each other piece of material except in the case of jewels, which are dutiable at 25 cents instead of 5 cents. No assemblies or

subassemblies shall be subject to a greater amount of duty than would be borne by the complete movement, etc., for which suitable.

On amendment No. 329: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on automobiles, automobile bodies, automobile chassis, motor cycles, and parts of the foregoing, not including tires, all the foregoing whether finished or unfinished, and provided for a countervailing duty of not more than 50 per cent. The Senate amendment rewrites the House text and retains the 25 per cent rate on automobile trucks valued at $1,000 or more each, automobile truck and motor bus chassis valued at $750 or more each, automobile truck bodies valued at $250 or more each, motor busses designed for the carriage of more than 10 persons, and bodies for such busses, all the foregoing whether finished or unfinished. On all other automobiles, automobile chassis, and automobile bodies, and motor cycles, all the foregoing, finished or unfinished, the Senate amendment reduces the rate to 10 per cent ad valorem, and on parts (except tires and parts wholly or in chief value of glass, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for) the amendment retains the House rate of 25 per cent ad valorem. The amendment also strikes out the countervailing duty. The House recedes with an amendment retaining the Senate text, but restoring the countervailing duty.

On amendment No. 330: The House bill imposed on bicycles, and parts thereof, a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem, and provided for a countervailing duty of not more than 50 per cent. The Senate amendment strikes out the countervailing-duty provision; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 331 and 332: The House bill limited the provision for steam engines by adding the word "reciprocating," and made special provision for turbines at the rate of 30 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendments have the effect of restoring turbines to the classification of "steam engines" at 15 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes on amendment No. 331 and the House recedes on amendment No. 332 with an amendment restoring the House provision but fixing the rate on steam turbines at 20 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 333: the House bill imposes a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on printing presses, not specially provided for. Bookbinding and paper-box machinery were classifiable under the House provision in this paragraph for machines, n. s. p. f. at 30 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment reduces the rate to 25 per cent ad valorem; rewrites the House language so as to read "printing machinery (except for textiles)"; and specifically enumerates in this classification "bookbinding machinery, and paper-box machinery"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 334: The House bill imposes a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem on machines for knitting full-fashioned hosiery. The Senate amendment strikes out this House language, the effect of which is to classify the item as knitting machines in this paragraph, dutiable at 40 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 335: This amendment reduces from 40 to 35 per cent ad valorem the House rate on textile machinery, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 336: The House bill imposes a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on punches, shears, and bar cutters, intended for use in fabricating structural or other rolled iron or steel shapes. The Senate amendment strikes out this House provision, the effect of which is to make these items dutiable at 30 per cent ad valorem as "machine tools"; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 337: This amendment reduces from 30 to 25 per cent the House rate on machines, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 27½ per cent ad valorem.

On amendments Nos. 338 and 339: The House bill provides that parts, wholly or in chief value of metal, of any of the machinery dutiable under this paragraph, shall be dutiable at the same rate of duty as the articles of which they are parts. Senate amendment 338, adds after the word "parts," where it first appears, the words "not specially provided for"; and the House recedes. Amendment No. 339 adds after the words "in chief value of metal," the words "or porcelain," thus transferring porcelain parts from paragraph 212 where they would be dutiable at the House rates at 10 cents per dozen pieces and 60 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 340: The House bill imposed a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on forks, hoes, and rakes. The Senate amendment strikes out this provision, the effect of which would be to make the items except hay forks automatically fall in the classification "agricultural implements" on the free list; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 341 and 342: The House bill imposes the following duties: Aluminum, aluminum scrap, and alloys (except those provided for in paragraph 302) in which aluminum is the component material of chief value, in crude form, 5 cents per pound; in coils, plates, sheets, bars, rods, circles, disks, blanks, strips, rectangles, and squares, 9 cents per pound. The Senate amendments reduce these rates to 2 and 3½ cents per pound, respectively; and the House recedes with amendments making these rates, respectively, 4 cents per pound and 7 cents per pound.

On amendment No. 343: The Senate amendment reduces from 40 to 35 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on aluminum foil less than six one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 344: The House bill imposed on bronze powder, or Dutch metal powder, or aluminum powder, in leaf, a duty of 6 cents per one hundred leaves and 25 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment strikes out the ad valorem rate, but leaves unchanged the specific rate; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 6 cents per one hundred leaves and 10 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 345: This amendment reduces from one-half of 1 cent to three-eighths of 1 cent per 100 square inches, the House rate on stamping and embossing materials of bronze powder, or Dutch metal powder, or aluminum powder, mounted on paper or equivalent backing, and releasable from the backing by means of heat and pressure; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 346: The House bill imposed a duty of 6 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem on tinsel wire, made wholly or in chief value of gold, silver, or other metal. The Senate amendment strikes out the ad valorem duty but leaves the specific duty unchanged; and the House recedes with an amendment making the ad valorem rate 10 per cent.

On amendment No. 347: The House bill imposed a duty of 6 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem on lame or lahn, made wholly or in chief value of gold, silver, or other metal. The Senate amendment strikes out the ad valorem rate but leaves the specific rate unchanged; and the House recedes with an amendment making the ad valorem rate 20 per cent.

On amendment No. 348: The House bill imposed a duty of 6 cents per pound and 45 per cent ad valorem on bullions and metal threads made wholly or in chief value of tinsel wire, or lame or lahn. The Senate amendment reduces the ad valorem rate to 20 per cent but leaves the specific rate unchanged; and the House recedes with an amendment making the ad valorem rate 35 per cent.

On amendment No. 349: This amendment reduces from 55 to 30 per cent ad valorem the House rate on beltings and other articles made wholly or in chief value of tinsel wire, metal thread, lame or lahn, or of tinsel wire, lame or lahn and india rubber, bullions, or metal threads, not specially provided for; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 45 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 350: This amendment reduces from 65 to 40 per cent ad valorem the House rate on woven fabrics, ribbons, fringes, and tassels, made wholly or in chief value of any of the materials or articles referred to above under amendments Nos. 346–349; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 55 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 351: The House bill imposed a duty on illuminating or lighting fixtures, lamps, lamp bases, candelabra, and candlesticks, any of the foregoing and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for, if wholly or in chief value of base metal or alloy, 50 per cent ad valorem; if wholly or in chief value of, or plated with platinum, gold, or silver, 65 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment strikes out the House language, the effect of which is to throw the items into the basket clause of the metal schedule. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 355 and 1005: The House bill imposed a duty of 1 cent per pound on nickel oxide. Amendment No. 355 strikes out the House language, and amendment No. 1005 transfers this item to the free list; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 358, 359, and 360: These are perfecting amendments to extend the sampling in bond privilege to lead-bearing flue dust; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 363: The House bill imposed the following duties on zinc in zinc-bearing ore: Containing less than 10 per cent zinc, free; containing 10 per cent and less than 20 per cent zinc, one-half cent per pound; containing 20 per cent and less than 25 per cent zinc, 1 cent per pound; containing 25 per cent or

more, 1½ cents per pound. The Senate amendment imposes a duty of 1½ cents per pound on all zinc in ore, except pyrites containing not more than 3 per cent zinc; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 365: The House bill imposed a duty of 72 per cent ad valorem on print rollers. The Senate amendment retains the ad valorem rate and imposes an additional specific rate of $5 each; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 366: The House bill imposed a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem on embossing rollers. The Senate amendment reduces the rate to 30 per cent ad valorem and adds the perfecting clause "of steel or other metal"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 367: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on certain hand tools specifically enumerated. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 40 per cent ad valorem. The House recedes with an amendment making the rate 45 per cent.

On amendment No. 368: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on articles or wares not specially provided for, of base metal and not plated with platinum, gold, or silver, and not colored with gold lacquer. The Senate amendment changed the rate to 40 per cent; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 45 per cent ad valorem.

SCHEDULE 4.—WOOD AND MANUFACTURES OF

On amendment No. 378: The House bill imposes a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on plywood. The Senate amendment provides that birch and alder plywood shall be subject to an additional duty of 10 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 382: The House bill imposes a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on boxes, barrels, and other articles containing certain fruit, but provides that the thin wood, so called, comprising the sides, tops, and bottoms of fruit boxes of the growth or manufacture of the United States, exported as fruit-box shooks, may be reimported in completed form, filled with fruit, by the payment of duty at one-half the rate imposed on similar boxes of entirely foreign growth and manufacture; but proof of the identity of such shooks shall be made under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Senate amendment rewrites this provision and includes fruit-barrel staves; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 384: Bamboo stems were free of duty under the House bill. The Senate amendment specifically provides for bamboo stems suitable for rug poles and imposes a duty thereon of 45 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 388: This amendment increases from 15 to 20 cents per gross the House duty on spring clothespins; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 389: This amendment strikes out "molders' patterns," made necessary by the Senate action in connection with amendment No. 291, and makes parts of furniture, not specially provided for, dutiable at the same rate as the finished article; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 390: In the House bill wood moldings and carvings to be used in architectural and furniture decoration are not specifically mentioned, but are classified as manufactures of wood or bark, not specially provided for, dutiable at 33⅓ per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically names these items and imposes a duty thereon of 40 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 391 and 392: The House bill imposes a duty of 55 per cent on bentwood furniture, wholly or partly finished. Senate amendment No. 391 makes parts of bentwood furniture dutiable at the same rate as the furniture; and amendment No. 392 reduces the House rate to 40 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes on amendment No. 391 and recedes on amendment No. 392 with an amendment making the rate 47½ per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 393: In the House bill, paintbrush handles, wholly or in chief value of wood, are not specifically mentioned, but are classified as "manufactures of wood or bark, not specially provided for," and dutiable at 33⅓ per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically names this item, but makes no change in the duty; and the House recedes.

SCHEDULE 5.—SUGAR, MOLASSES, AND MANUFACTURES OF

On amendments Nos. 397 and 398: The House bill imposed a duty of 3.3 cents per gallon on molasses and sugar sirups, not specially provided for, testing not above 48 per cent total sugars; and, if testing above 48 per cent total sugars, of six-tenths of 1 cent additional for each per cent of total sugars and fractions of a per cent in proportion. The Senate amendments reduce these rates, respectively, to one-fourth of 1 cent and two hundred and seventy-five one-thousandths of 1 cent; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 399 and 400: The House bill imposed a duty of 7½ cents per pound on maple sugar, and 5 cents per pound on maple sirup. The Senate amendments increase these rates to 8 cents per pound and 5½ cents per pound, respectively; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 401: The House bill imposed a duty of $3 per ton on sugarcane in its natural state. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to $2 per ton; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate $2.50 per ton.

On amendment No. 402: This amendment makes no change in the rate on sugar candy and confectionery not specially provided for, but is made necessary by the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 403; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 403: The House bill imposes a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on sugar after being refined, when tinctured, colored, or in any way adulterated. The Senate amendment provides that the ad valorem rate on such sugar shall not be less than the rate of duty provided in paragraph 501 for sugar of the same polariscopic test; and the House recedes.

SCHEDULE 6.—TOBACCO AND MANUFACTURES OF

On amendments Nos. 404 and 405: The House bill imposed the following duties on wrapper tobacco, and filler tobacco when mixed or packed with more than 35 per cent of wrapper tobacco, and all leaf tobacco the product of two or more countries or dependencies when mixed or packed together; if unstemmed, $2.50 per pound; if stemmed, $3.15 per pound. The Senate amendments reduce these rates, respectively, to $2.10 and $2.75; and the House recedes with amendments making the rates $2.27½ and $2.92½, respectively.

SCHEDULE 7.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISONS

The following amendments make changes in paragraph and subparagraph numbers and the House recedes: 450, 453, 464, 466, 469, 471, 472, 476, 477, 478, 479, 482, 487, 488, 489, 491, 493, 495, 503, 504, 507, 508, 509, 512, 515, 517, 518, 520, 522, 526, 530, 533, 535, 536, 540, 542, and 555.

On amendments Nos. 406, 407, 408, and 409: The House bill imposed a duty of 2 cents per pound on cattle weighing less than 800 pounds each, and 2½ cents per pound on cattle weighing 800 pounds or more each. The Senate amendments impose a duty of 2½ cents per pound on cattle weighing less than 700 pounds each, and 3 cents per pound on cattle weighing 700 pounds or more each; and the House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendment No. 410: Under the House bill, dried blood albumen was free of duty. The Senate amendment makes dried blood albumen dutiable at 12 cents per pound, if light, and 6 cents per pound, if dark; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 411 and 414: The House bill imposed a duty of 5 cents per gallon on whole milk, fresh or sour, and provides that when this class of milk contains more than 7 per cent of butterfat it shall be dutiable as cream. The Senate amendment No. 411 increases from 5 to 6½ cents the rate of duty, and amendment No. 414 lowers from 7 to 5½ the percentage of butterfat content making fresh or sour milk dutiable as cream; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 412: This amendment increases from 48 cents per gallon to $56\frac{8}{10}$ cents per gallon the House duty on cream, fresh or sour; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 413: This amendment increases from 1¾ to $2\frac{1}{20}$ cents per gallon the House duty on skimmed milk, fresh or sour, and buttermilk; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 414: See amendment No. 411. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 415, 416, 417, and 418: The House bill imposed the following rates of duty on condensed or evaporated milk: In air-tight containers, unsweetened, $1\frac{4}{10}$ cents per pound; sweetened, 2¼ cents per pound; all other, 2 cents per pound. Senate amendments Nos. 415, 417, and 418 increase these rates, respectively, to $1\frac{8}{10}$, 2¾, and $2\frac{53}{100}$ cents per pound; and amendment No. 416 confines the 2¾-cent rate on the sweetened to such as is contained in air-tight containers. The House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendments Nos. 419, 420, 421, and 422: The House imposed a duty of 4¾ cents per pound on dried whole milk, 10½ cents per pound on dried cream, and 2½ cents per pound on dried skimmed milk and dried buttermilk. The Senate amendments Nos. 419, 420, and 421 increase these rates, respectively, to $6\frac{1}{12}$, 12⅓, and 3 cents per pound; and amendment No. 422 provides that dried skimmed milk containing more than 3 per cent of butterfat, and dried buttermilk containing more than 6 per cent of butterfat, shall be dutiable as dried

whole milk; and dried whole milk containing more than 35 per cent of butterfat shall be dutiable as dried cream; and the House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendment No. 423: This amendment increases from 30 per cent to 35 per cent the House duty on malted milk, and compounds or mixtures of or substitutes for milk or cream; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 424 and 425: The House bill imposed a duty of 7 cents per pound but not less than 35 per cent ad valorem on cheese and substitutes therefor. The Senate amendments increase this duty to 8 cents per pound but not less than 42 per cent ad valorem, and provide further that cheese made of sheep's milk and commonly known as "Romano" or "Pecorino," "Romanello or Kefalotyri or Vize, and Casseri," shall be dutiable at 8 cents per pound, and Feta White cheese at 5 cents per pound. The Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 426: This amendment increases from 6 to 8 cents per pound the House duty on live chickens, ducks, geese, turkeys, and guineas (except baby chicks); and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 427: This amendment increases from 8 cents to 10 cents per pound the House duty on dead chickens, ducks, geese, and guineas, dressed or undressed, fresh, chilled, or frozen; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 428: The Senate amendment increases from 8 to 11 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on whole eggs, egg yolk, and egg albumen, frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved, and not specially provided for, whether or not sugar or other material is added; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 429: The House bill imposed a duty of 18 cents per pound on dried whole eggs, dried egg yolk, and dried egg albumen, whether or not sugar or other material is added. The Senate amendment increases the rate on whole eggs to 36 cents per pound, increases the rate on egg albumen to 60 cents per pound, and that on egg yolk to 30 cents per pound, and specifically enumerates spraying as one of the drying processes included in the House bill in general terms. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 430: The House bill imposed a duty of $30 per head on horses and mules valued at not more than $150 per head, and a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem when valued at more than $150 per head. Amendment No. 430 excepts from these duties horses imported for immediate slaughter, and amendment No. 953 places such animals on the free list. The House recedes on amendment No. 430.

On amendment No. 431: The House bill imposed a duty of 2 cents per pound on halibut, salmon, mackerel, and swordfish, and 1 cent per pound on other fish, not specially provided for, when fresh or frozen (whether or not packed in ice), whole, or beheaded or eviscerated, or both, but not further advanced. The Senate amendment permits the removal also of the fins; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 432: The House bill imposed a duty of 2 cents a pound on frozen halibut, if whole, or beheaded, or eviscerated, or both, but not further advanced. The Senate amendment increases the rate to 5 cents per pound; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 433, 434, and 435: The House bill imposed on cod, haddock, hake, pollock, and cusk, when pickled or salted (except when packed in oil or in oil and other substance, and except when packed in air-tight containers weighing with their contents not more than 15 pounds each), the following duties: When neither skinned nor boned, 1¾ cents per pound when containing not more than 43 per cent of moisture by weight, and 1¼ cents per pound when containing more than 43 per cent of moisture by weight; when skinned or boned, whether or not dried, 2½ cents per pound. The Senate amendments reduce these rates, respectively, to 1¼ cents, three-fourths of 1 cent, and 2 cents per pound; and the House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendments Nos. 436, 437, and 438: The Senate amendments strike out the word "sea" as applied to herring. The House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendment No. 439: The House bill imposed a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on crab meat, crab paste, and crab sauce. The Senate amendment rewrites the House language to read "crab meat, fresh or frozen (whether or not packed in ice), or prepared or preserved in any manner, including crab paste and crab sauce," but makes no change in the rate of duty; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 440: This amendment reduces from 35 to 30 per cent ad valorem the House duty on clams, clam juice, or either in combination with other substances, packed in air-tight containers; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 441: The House bill imposed a duty on caviar and other fish roe for food purposes: Sturgeon, 30 per cent ad valorem; other, 20 cents per pound. The Senate amendment provides that if any of the foregoing roe is boiled and packed in air-tight containers, whether or not in bouillon or sauce, it shall be dutiable at 30 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 442: Under the House bill oysters were not specifically mentioned, but were classified as shellfish, not specially provided for, in the free list. The Senate amendment imposes a duty of 8 cents per pound, including weight of immediate container, on oysters, oyster juice, or either in combination with other substances packed in air-tight containers; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 443: This amendment increases from 15 to 16 cents per bushel of 32 pounds the House duty on oats, hulled or unhulled; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 444: The House bill imposed a duty of 42 cents per bushel on wheat. The Senate amendment provides that wheat which is unfit for human consumption shall be dutiable at 10 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 445, 446, and 994: Under paragraph 1726 of the House bill, oil cake and oil-cake meal are free of duty. Senate amendment 445 provides that soybean oil cake and soybean oil-cake meal shall be dutiable at three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; amendment No. 446 provides that all other vegetable oil cake and oil-cake meal shall also be dutiable at three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and amendment No. 994 strikes out the reference to oil cake and oil-cake meal in the free list; and the House recedes on all three amendments.

On amendment No. 447: This amendment strikes out the House duty of 10 per cent ad valorem and substitutes the rate of one-half of 1 cent per pound on unground or ground screenings, scalpings, chaff, or scourings of wheat, flaxseed, or other grains or seeds; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 448 and 449: The House bill imposed a duty of 2 cents per pound on cherries in their natural state or dried. Senate amendment 448 strikes out the words "or dried" and substitutes the words "or frozen if not sweetened," and amendment 449 provides that cherries "dried, desiccated, or evaporated," shall be dutiable at 6 cents per pound. The House recedes on amendment 449, and recedes on amendment 448 with an amendment omitting the words inserted by the Senate amendment.

On amendments Nos. 451 and 452: The House bill imposed a duty of 5½ cents per pound on cherries sulphured, or in brine, with stems and pits, and 9½ cents per pound with stems or pits removed. The Senate amendments strike out the words "stems and" in the first bracket and "stems in" in the second; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 454 and 455: The House bill imposed a duty of 5½ cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem on cherries, candied, crystallized, glacé, maraschino, or prepared or preserved in any manner. Amendment No. 454 specifically enumerates cherries "frozen if sweetened" and amendment No. 455 increases the duty to 9½ cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem. The Senate recedes on amendment No. 454 and the House recedes on amendment No. 455.

On amendment No. 456: This amendment increases from 6 to 8 cents per proof gallon the House duty on vinegar; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 457 and 458: The House bill imposed on orange, grapefruit, and lemon peel the following duties: Crude, dried, or in brine, 2 cents per pound; candied, or otherwise prepared or preserved, 8 cents per pound. Senate amendment No. 457 provides that "other fruit" peel shall be included in these provisions, and amendment No. 458 adds "crystallized, or glacé" to the forms of peel dutiable at 8 cents; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 459: This amendment adds "crystallized, or glacé" to the forms of citrons or citron peel made dutiable at 6 cents per pound by the House bill; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 460: Under the House bill fig paste was dutiable at 35 per cent ad valorem as fruit paste in paragraph 750. The Senate amendment specifically includes fig paste in the bracket with fresh or dried figs at 5 cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 461: The House bill imposed a duty on dates as follows: Fresh or dried, unpitted, 1 cent per pound; pitted or prepared or preserved, not specially provided for, 35 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment provides, in lieu of the House rates, the following duties: Dates, fresh or dried,

with pits, 1 cent per pound; with pits removed, 2 cents per pound; any of the foregoing in packages weighing with the immediate container not more than 10 pounds each, 7½ cents per pound; prepared or preserved, not specially provided for, 35 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 462: This amendment increases from 2 to 2½ cents per pound the House duty on lemons; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 463: Under the House bill, mangoes are not specifically mentioned, but are classified as fruits in their natural state, not specially provided for, dutiable at 35 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment puts mangoes in a separate paragraph and makes the duty 15 cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 465: This amendment increases from 35 to 50 cents per crate the House duty on pineapples; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 467 and 468: The House bill imposed a duty of one-half of 1 cent per pound on dried plums, prunes, and prunelles. Senate amendment No. 468 increases this duty to 2 cents per pound; and amendment No. 467 adds the designation "desiccated, or evaporated." The House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 470 and 1117: The House bill did not specifically mention avocados or avocado pears, also known as alligator pears. Senate amendment No. 470 makes this fruit dutiable at 15 cents per pound, and amendment No. 1117 prohibits the importation of avocados unless they have a fat content of not less than 8 per cent by weight by chemical analysis, and are accompanied by a sworn certificate made by a competent chemist that each shipment has been tested and contains not less than 8 per cent fat content by weight by chemical analysis. The House recedes on amendment No. 470 and the Senate recedes on amendment No. 1117.

On amendments Nos. 473, 474, and 475: The House bill imposed a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on candied, crystallized, or glacé apricots, figs, dates, peaches, pears, plums, prunes, prunelles, berries, and other fruits, not specially provided for. Senate amendment No. 474 increases the rate to 40 per cent ad valorem, and amendments Nos. 473 and 475 eliminate the provisions for "fruit peels," made necessary by Senate amendment No. 457; and the House recedes on all three amendments.

On amendment No. 480: The House bill imposed a duty on imitation almonds. The Senate amendment changes this wording to "almond substitute"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 481: In the House bill chestnuts (including marrons), candied, crystallized, or glacé, or prepared or preserved in any manner, are not specifically mentioned, but are classified in paragraph 759 of the House bill, at 35 per cent ad valorem, or under paragraph 506 at 40 per cent. The Senate amendment specifically enumerates these items and makes them dutiable at 25 cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 483 and 484: The House bill imposed a duty of 2 cents per pound on cream or Brazil nuts, not shelled, and 6 cents per pound if shelled. The Senate amendments reduce these rates, respectively, to 1 cent per pound and 3 cents per pound; and the House recedes with amendments making the rates, respectively, 1½ cents per pound and 4½ cents per pound.

On amendment No. 485: Pignolia nuts and pistache nuts are not specifically mentioned in the House bill, but are classified for duty in paragraph 759 of the House bill as edible nuts not specially provided for at 5 cents per pound if not shelled and 10 cents per pound if shelled. The Senate amendment specifically provides for these nuts at the lower rate of 1 cent per pound, no distinction being made between those which are shelled and those which are not shelled; and the Senate recedes, the effect of which is to place these nuts in the basket clause. (See amendment No. 492.)

On amendment No. 486: The Senate amendment provides that nuts included in the paragraph which are blanched shall be subject to the same rate of duty as if not blanched; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 490: In the House bill, pecans are not specifically mentioned, but are classified in paragraph 759 as "edible nuts, not specially provided for," bearing a rate of duty, if not shelled, of 5 cents per pound, and if shelled, 10 cents per pound. The Senate amendment makes specific mention of pecans, but makes no change in the duties; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 492: The Senate amendment reduces the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on edible nuts, not specially provided for, from 5 cents per pound if not shelled, and from 10 cents per pound if shelled, to 1 cent per pound in both cases, and makes this rate applicable whether or not such nuts are blanched. The House recedes with an amendment making the rates 2½ cents and 5 cents per pound, respectively, except that cashew nuts are dutiable at 2 cents per pound.

On amendment No. 494: This amendment increases from 63 to 65 cents per bushel the House duty on flaxseed; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 496: The Senate amendment increases from 5 cents to 8 cents per pound the House rate on alfalfa seed; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 497: The Senate amendment increases from 5 cents to 8 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on alsike clover seed; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 498: The Senate amendment increases from 6 cents to 8 cents per pound the House rate on red clover seed; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 499: The Senate amendment increases from 3 cents to 4 cents per pound the House rate on sweet-clover seed; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 500: In the House bill ryegrass seed is not specifically mentioned, but it is classified in paragraph 761 in the provision for "all other grass and forage crop seeds not specially provided for," bearing a duty of 2 cents per pound. The Senate amendment specifically mentions this item and makes the rate of duty thereon 3 cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 501: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 502: The House bill imposed a duty of 10 cents per pound on bentgrass seed. The Senate amendment adds, in parentheses, the botanical name, "genus agrostis," and increases the rate of duty to 40 cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 505: The House bill made all cowpeas dutiable under this paragraph. The Senate amendment limits the duties provided for to "black-eye cowpeas," and amendment No. 1032 transfers all other cowpeas to the free list. The House recedes on amendment No. 505.

On amendment No. 506: The Senate amendment increases from 2½ to 3 cents per pound the House rate on dried beans not specially provided for and on dried black-eye cowpeas (see amendment No. 505); and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 510: The House bill imposed a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem on mushrooms, fresh, or dried or otherwise prepared or preserved. The Senate amendment changes this rate to 10 cents per pound and 45 per cent ad valorem if fresh or dried, and 10 cents per pound on drained weight and 45 per cent ad valorem if otherwise prepared or preserved; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 511: The House bill imposed a duty of 30 per cent on truffles, fresh, or dried, or otherwise prepared or preserved. Amendment No. 511 strikes out this duty and amendment No. 1071 transfers truffles to the free list. The House recedes on amendment No. 511.

On amendments Nos. 513 and 514: The House bill imposed certain duties on peas and chickpeas or garbanzos. Amendment No. 513 strikes out chickpeas or garbanzos and amendment No. 1032 places them on the free list. The House bill made the duty on green or unripe peas and chickpeas or garbanzos 2 cents per pound. Amendment No. 514 makes the rate 3 cents per pound on green peas. The Senate recedes on amendment No. 513 and the House recedes on amendment No. 514 with an amendment making the rate on peas, green or unripe, 3 cents per pound, and the rate on chickpeas or garbanzos, green or unripe, 2 cents per pound.

On amendment No. 516: This amendment increases from 2 to 2½ cents per pound the House duty on onions; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 519: This amendment increases from 40 to 50 per cent ad valorem the House rate on tomatoes prepared or preserved in any manner; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 521: This amendment reduces from 25 to 20 cents per 100 pounds the House duty on turnips and rutabagas; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 523: In the House bill celery, lettuce, and cabbage are not specifically mentioned, but are classified as vegetables in their natural state, not specially provided for, bearing a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically names these items and makes the duty 2 cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 524, 525, and 527: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on crude horse-radish,

while prepared horse-radish was not specially mentioned. Senate amendments Nos. 524 and 525 make the rate of duty on crude horse-radish 3 cents per pound, while amendment No. 527 makes prepared horse-radish dutiable with prepared vegetables not specially provided for at 35 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendment No. 528: Under the House bill, sauerkraut was not specifically mentioned, but was dutiable at 35 per cent ad valorem as a prepared vegetable not specially provided for. The Senate amendment specifically provides for sauerkraut at 50 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 529: The House bill imposed a duty of 6 cents per pound on pimientos, packed in brine or in oil, or prepared or preserved in any manner. Under the House bill this duty is applicable whether the pimientos thus packed, prepared, or preserved, are whole or are cut, sliced, or otherwise reduced in size. The Senate amendment inserts the words "whole, cut, sliced, or otherwise reduced in size" with intent to clarify the provision; and the Senate recedes on this amendment as surplusage.

On amendments Nos. 531 and 532: These amendments increase from 1½ to 2 cents per pound the House duty on crude chicory; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 534: The House bill imposed a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on cocoa and chocolate, sweetened, prepared in any manner. The Senate amendment rewrites the House language so as to make the duty 4 cents per pound on sweetened cocoa and chocolate in bars or blocks weighing 10 pounds or more each, the 40 per cent ad valorem rate being retained on sweetened cocoa and chocolate in any other form, whether or not prepared; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 537: The Senate amendment increases from $4 to $5 per ton the House rate on hay; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 538: The Senate amendment increases from $1 to $1.50 per ton the House rate on straw; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 539: The Senate amendment increases from $10 to $20 per ton the House rate on broomcorn; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 541: This amendment increases from 75 cents to $1.50 per pound the House duty on lupulin; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 552, 553, and 544: The House bill imposed the following duties: Anise seeds, 2 cents per pound; caraway seeds, 1 cent per pound; cardamom seeds, 10 cents per pound; cassia, cassia buds, and cassia vera, unground, 2 cents per pound; cloves, unground, 3 cents per pound; clove stems, unground, 2 cents per pound; cinnamon and cinnamon chips, unground, 2 cents per pound; coriander seeds, one-half of 1 cent per pound; cummin seeds, and fennel seeds, 1 cent per pound; ginger root, not preserved or candied, unground, 2 cents per pound; mace, unground, 4 cents per pound; nutmegs, unground, 2 cents per pound; black or white pepper, unground, 2 cents per pound; and pimento (allspice), unground, 1 cent per pound. The first 11 amendments above enumerated strike out these provisions, and amendment No. 1047 transfers these items to the free list. The House recedes on the first 11 of these amendments.

On amendment No. 551: This amendment increases from 8 to 10 cents per pound the House duty on mustard, ground or prepared, in bottles or otherwise; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 556: In the House bill all cotton is on the free list. This amendment imposes a duty of 7 cents per pound on cotton having a staple of 1⅛ inches or more in length; and the House recedes.

SCHEDULE 8.—SPIRITS, WINES, AND OTHER BEVERAGES

On amendment No. 557: The House bill imposes a duty of $5 per proof gallon on brandy and other spirits manufactured or distilled from grain or other materials, cordials, liqueurs, arrack, absinthe, kirschwasser, ratafia, and bitters of all kinds containing spirits, and compounds and preparations of which distilled spirits are the component material of chief value and not specially provided for. The Senate amendment reduces to $2.60 per proof gallon any such articles, compounds, and preparations, if unfit for beverage use; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 558: This amendment inserts a subparagraph letter; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 559: The House bill imposed certain specific duties on fruit juices according to alcoholic content. The Senate amendment provides, in the case of concentrated juice of lemons, oranges, or other citrus fruit, fit for beverage purposes, and of sirups containing such juice, that the specific rate per gallon be applied to the quantity of unconcentrated natural juice employed to make the concentrated product, as shown by chemical analysis; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 560: This amendment permits high-proof fruit spirits made in distilleries connected with wineries for use in the fortification of wines to be withdrawn and used, under the same laws and regulations applicable to the withdrawal and use of alcohol for all nonbeverage purposes; and the House recedes.

SCHEDULE 9.—COTTON MANUFACTURES

On amendment No. 561: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on cotton sewing thread, and on crochet, darning, embroidery, and knitting cottons, put up for handwork, in lengths not exceeding 840 yards. The Senate amendment changes the House rate to one-half of 1 cent per 100 yards, but not less than 20 nor more than 35 per cent ad valorem and provides that in no case shall the duty be assessed on a less number of yards than is marked on the goods as imported; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 562: The House bill imposed certain ad valorem duties on cotton cloth, not bleached, printed, dyed, or colored, according to the yarn count. The Senate amendment provides that no such cloth shall be subject to a less duty than fifty-five one-hundredths of 1 cent per average number per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 563: Under the House bill tire fabric or fabric for use in pneumatic tires, including cord fabric, was dutiable as cotton cloth at various rates, depending on yarn count, etc. The Senate amendment imposes a rate of 25 per cent ad valorem on such fabric; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 564: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 565: This amendment reduces from 55 to 45 per cent ad valorem the House rate on tapestries and other Jacquard-figured upholstery cloths (not including pile fabrics or bed ticking) in the piece or otherwise, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 566 and 567: The House bill imposed a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on cotton blankets. Senate amendment No. 566 includes blanket cloth, napped or unnapped, and reduces the ad valorem rate to 30 per cent, and Senate amendment No. 567 provides a minimum specific rate of 14¼ cents per pound; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 568 and 569: The House bill imposes a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on candle wicking. The Senate amendments change the duty to 10 cents per pound and 12½ per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 570: The House bill imposed a duty of 40 per cent on belts, belting, and ropes, for the transmission of power, of cotton or other vegetable fiber or of cotton or other vegetable fiber and india rubber. The Senate amendment strikes out this provision and substitutes a duty of 30 per cent on belts and belting, for machinery, of cotton or other vegetable fiber or of cotton or other vegetable fiber and india rubber; and a duty of 40 per cent on rope used as belting for textile machinery, of cotton. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 571, 572, and 573: The House bill imposed the following duties on gloves and mittens, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber: Made of fabric knit on a warp-knitting machine, 60 per cent ad valorem; made of fabric knit on other than a warp-knitting machine, 50 per cent ad valorem. Senate amendment 571 makes the rates applicable to such gloves and mittens whether finished or unfinished; and amendments 572 and 573 reduce the rates to 30 and 25 per cent, respectively. The House recedes on amendment No. 571 and the Senate recedes on amendments Nos. 572 and 573.

On amendment No. 574: Under the House bill shirts of cotton, not knit or crocheted, were not specifically mentioned and were dutiable as cotton clothing not specially provided for at the rate of 37½ per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically mentions such shirts and increases the duty to 45 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 575: This amendment increases from 55 to 75 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on rag rugs, wholly or in chief value of cotton, of the type commonly known as "hit-and-miss"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 576: This amendment reduces from 45 to 35 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on chenille rugs, wholly or in chief value of cotton; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 40 per cent.

On amendments Nos. 577 and 840: Under paragraph 1555 of the House bill a duty of 2 cents per pound was imposed on cotton wiping rags. Senate amendment No. 840 strikes the House provision from the bill and amendment No. 577 imposes a duty of 3 cents per pound on rags, including wiping rags, wholly or in chief value of cotton, except rags chiefly used in paper making; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 578: This amendment makes a change in paragraph number; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 579: This amendment imposes an additional duty of 10 cents per pound on the cotton, having a staple of 1⅛ inches or more in length, contained in articles enumerated or described in Schedule 9; and the House recedes with an amendment excepting the articles in paragraph 922 of the Senate bill from the additional duty.

SCHEDULE 10.—FLAX, HEMP, JUTE, AND MANUFACTURES OF

On amendment No. 580: This amendment increases from 1½ to 2 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on hemp and hemp tow; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 581: This amendment increases from 3 to 3½ cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on hackled hemp; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 582: This amendment reduces from 11 to 9 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on twist, twine, and cordage, composed of two or more jute yarns or rovings twisted together, the size of the single yarn or roving of which is 5-pound or finer; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 583: The House bill imposed on single yarns in the gray, of flax, hemp, or ramie, or a mixture of any of them, not finer than 60 lea, specific rates of duty per pound, with a minimum of 27½ and a maximum of 37½ per cent ad valorem; and on those finer than 60 lea an ad valorem rate of 25 per cent; and additional specific rates per pound on any of the foregoing when boiled, bleached, dyed, or otherwise treated. The Senate amendment eliminates these rates and imposes a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on yarns not finer than 60 lea, and of 25 per cent ad valorem on those finer than 60 lea; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 584: The House bill imposed on threads, twines, and cords, composed of two or more yarns of flax, hemp, or ramie, or a mixture of any of them, twisted together, specific rates of duty per pound and additional specific rates per pound if boiled, bleached, dyed, or otherwise treated, with a proviso for a minimum ad valorem duty of 32½ per cent. The Senate amendment eliminates these rates on such articles and makes the rate 40 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 585 and 586: The House bill imposed on cordage, including cables, tarred or untarred, composed of three or more strands, each strand composed of two or more yarns, wholly or in chief value of manila (abaca), sisal, henequen, or other hard fiber, a duty of 2½ cents per pound, and, in addition thereto, on any of the foregoing smaller than three-fourths of 1 inch in diameter, 15 per cent ad valorem. Senate amendment No. 585 reduces the specific rate to 2 cents per pound; and amendment No. 586 strikes out the additional ad valorem rate. The House recedes on amendment No. 585, and the Senate recedes on amendment No. 586.

On amendment No. 587: The House bill provided that gill nettings, nets, webs, and seines, and other nets for fishing, wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, or ramie, and not specially provided for, shall be subject to the highest duty per pound imposed upon any of the thread, twines, or cord of which the mesh is made, plus 10 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment strikes out the House provision as to rates and imposes a flat rate of 45 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 588, 589, 590, and 591: Under paragraph 1009 (a) of the House bill, woven fabrics, not including articles finished or unfinished, of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value (except such as are commonly used as paddings or interlinings in clothing), exceeding 30 and not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, weighing not less than 4 and not more than 12 ounces per square yard, and exceeding 12 inches but not exceeding 36 inches in width, were dutiable at a rate of 55 per cent ad valorem. Such woven fabrics commonly used for paddings or interlinings in clothing were provided for in paragraph 1009 (b) of the House bill, according to thread count and weight, at 55 per cent ad valorem, if made of flax or hemp, and at 50 per cent ad valorem if made of jute. Senate amendments Nos. 589 and 590 increase to 4½ ounces the weight basis and reduce to 24 inches the width basis for assessing duties on the articles contained in paragraph 1009 (a). Senate amendment No. 588 strikes out the exception in paragraph 1009 (a) in the case of such fabrics used as paddings or interlinings in clothing; and amendment No. 591 strikes paragraph 1009 (b) from the bill. The Senate recedes on all these amendments.

On amendment No. 592: This amendment makes a change in subparagraph letter; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 593: This amendment reduces from 55 to 45 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on woven fabrics, in the piece or otherwise, wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber, except cotton, filled, coated, or otherwise prepared for use as artists' canvas; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 594: The House bill imposed a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on plain-woven fabrics, not including articles finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, ramie, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton, weighing less than 4 ounces per square yard. The Senate amendment increases the maximum weight to 4½ ounces per square yard, in conformity with the action of the Senate in respect of amendment No. 589; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 595: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 per cent on handkerchiefs of vegetable fiber, except cotton, hemmed or hemstitched, or unfinished having drawn threads. The Senate amendment subjects such articles to an additional duty of 1 cent each if made with hand-rolled or hand-made hems; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 596: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 597: This amendment increases from 40 to 42 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on inlaid linoleum; and the House recedes.

SCHEDULE 11.—WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF

On amendment No. 598: This amendment includes "Kerry" and "Haslock" among the "carpet" wools enumerated under paragraph 1101 (a); and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 599 and 600: The House bill imposed a duty of 24 cents per pound on scoured "carpet" wools and camel's hair. Senate amendment 599 increases the House rate to 27 cents, and amendment 600 provides that the duty shall apply only to the clean content of the scoured wool; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 601: This amendment reduces from 23 to 22 cents per pound of clean content, the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on "carpet" wools or hair of the camel, on the skin; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 602: The House bill imposed a duty of 26 cents per pound of clean content on "carpet" wools and hair of the camel, if sorted, or matchings. The Senate amendment reduces the duty to 25 cents per pound and makes it apply to such articles only if not scoured; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 603: This amendment strikes out the House provision which allows a tolerance of not more than 10 per cent of wools not finer than 44s in each bale or package of wools imported under paragraph 1101 as not finer than 40s; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, and 609: The House bill provided for the remission or refund of duties paid on wools provided for in paragraph 1101 and hair of the camel, imported under bond, upon proof within four years from date of importation or withdrawal from bonded warehouse that the wools or hair have been manufactured into yarns to be used in the manufacture of certain permitted articles, viz: Rugs, carpets, or other floor covering, or knit or felt boots or heavy fulled lumbermen's socks; and also provides a penalty for their use in the manufacture of articles other than those specified. Amendment No. 604 changes the 4-year period to a 3-year period; and the House recedes. Amendment No. 605 provides that duties shall be remitted or refunded only in case the yarns have actually been used in the manufacture of the permitted articles; and the House recedes. Amendments Nos. 606 and 608 add press cloth and camel's-hair belting to the list of permitted articles; and the House recedes. Amendments Nos. 607 and 609 exclude from the list of permitted articles knit or felt boots and heavy fulled lumbermen's socks; and the Senate recedes.

On Amendment No. 610: Under the House bill wools and hair in the grease were defined to include only those which were shorn from the animal without any cleansing; that is, in their natural condition. Under the Senate amendment wools and hair cleansed only by shaking, willowing, and burr-picking are

permitted to be imported as wools and hair in the grease. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 611: The House provides that washed wool and hair shall be considered such as have been washed, with water only, on the animal's back or on the skin. The Senate amendment amplifies the House definition to include all wool and hair, not scoured, with a higher clean yield than 77 per cent; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 612: This amendment excludes from the definition of scoured wools and hair such wools as have been cleansed only by shaking, willowing, burr-picking, or carbonizing; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 613: This amendment provides that for purposes of the wool schedule skirtings shall not be considered as sorted wools or hair or matchings; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 614: The House bill provided that, for the purposes of the wool schedule, sorted wool or hair or matchings should be wools and hair in which the identity of individual fleeces had been destroyed, and also provided that fleeces which had been classed but not skirted, or skirted but not classed, or both classed and skirted, but from which the backs had not been removed, should not be considered as sorted. Inasmuch as in the case of a fleece which has been classed but from which the back has not been removed the identity of the individual fleece could never be considered to have been destroyed, the Senate amendment strikes out any reference to classed fleeces as redundant; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 615: The following table shows the rates provided in the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement on wools, not provided for in paragraph 1101, and not finer than 44s:

	House bill	Senate amendment	Conference agreement
In the grease or washed.	24 cents per pound of clean content.	34 cents per pound of clean content.	29 cents per pound of clean content.
Scoured	24 cents per pound	37 cents per pound of clean content.	32 cents per pound of clean content.
On the skin	23 cents per pound of clean content.	32 cents per pound of clean content.	27 cents per pound of clean content.
Sorted or matchings.	26 cents per pound of clean content.	35 cents per pound of clean content.	30 cents per pound of clean content.

The House bill also provided that in the case of wools imported as not finer than 44s, a tolerance of not more than 10 per cent of wools not finer than 46s might be allowed in each bale or package. The Senate amendment strikes out all the House language, the effect of which is to transfer the wools included within the House provision to Senate bill paragraph 1102. The House recedes with an amendment changing the rates to the amounts shown in the above table, and with a clarifying amendment limiting the duties on sorted or matchings to those not scoured, but retaining the tolerance provision.

On amendment No. 616: This amendment makes a change in subparagraph number; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 617, 618, 619, and 620: The following table shows the rates provided in the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement, on wools, not provided for in paragraph 1101, and finer than 44s; and hair of the Angora goat, Cashmere goat, alpaca, and other like animals.

	House bill	Senate amendment	Conference agreement
In the grease or washed.	34 cents per pound of clean content.	34 cents per pound of clean content.	34 cents per pound of clean content.
Scoured	34 cents per pound	37 cents per pound of clean content.	37 cents per pound of clean content.
On the skin	33 cents per pound of clean content.	32 cents per pound of clean content.	32 cents per pound of clean content.
Sorted or matchings.	36 cents per pound of clean content.	35 cents per pound of clean content.	35 cents per pound of clean content.

The Senate amendment also includes a clarifying provision limiting the duties on sorted wools or hair or matchings to those not scoured. The House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendments Nos. 621, 622, and 623: These amendments are made necessary by the action of the Senate in striking out the tolerance provisions in amendments Nos. 603 and 615. The Senate recedes on all three amendments.

On amendments Nos. 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, and 631: The following table shows the rates on wool wastes provided in the House bill, the Senate amendments, and the conference agreement:

Article	House bill (rate per pound)	Senate amendment (rate per pound)	Conference agreement (rate per pound)
Top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, and ring waste:	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
(a) Not carbonized	34	37	37
(b) Carbonized	41	37	37
Garnetted waste:			
(a) Not carbonized	26	26	26
(b) Carbonized	33	26	26
Noils:			
(a) Not carbonized	21	23	23
(b) Carbonized	28	30	30
Thread or yarn waste:			
(a) Not carbonized	18	25	25
(b) Carbonized	25	25	25
Card or burr waste:			
(a) Not carbonized	18	16	16
(b) Carbonized	25	23	23
All other wool wastes not specially provided for:			
(a) Not carbonized	18	24	24
(b) Carbonized	25	24	24
Shoddy:			
(a) Not carbonized	18	24	24
(b) Carbonized	25	24	24
Wool extract	25	24	24
Mungo:			
(a) Not carbonized	10	10	10
(b) Carbonized	17	10	10
Wool rags:			
(a) Not carbonized	8	18	18
(b) Carbonized	15	18	18
Flocks:			
(a) Not carbonized	8	8	8
(b) Carbonized	15	8	8

The House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendment No. 632: This amendment provides that wool and hair of the kinds provided for in the wool schedule, if carbonized, shall be subject to duty at the rate of 37 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 633: The House bill provided that if wool and hair of the kinds provided for in the wool schedule were advanced beyond the washed and scoured condition, but not further advanced than roving, they should be dutiable at the rate of 37 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment applies this rate in the case such wool or hair is not advanced beyond roving, but is advanced beyond both the washed and scoured condition, or beyond the washed condition, when not scoured, or beyond the scoured condition, when not washed; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 634, 635, and 636: The following table shows the rates provided in the House bill, the Senate amendments, and the conference agreement on yarn, wholly or in chief value of wool:

Valued at—	House bill	Senate amendments	Conference agreement
Not more than 50 cents per pound	27 cents per pound and 30 per cent.	40 cents per pound and 35 per cent.	40 cents per pound and 35 per cent.
More than 50 cents per pound but not more than $1 per pound.	40 cents per pound and 35 per cent.	do	Do.
More than $1 per pound but not more than $1.50 per pound.	40 cents per pound and 40 per cent.	40 cents per pound and 45 per cent.	40 cents per pound and 45 per cent.
More than $1.50 per pound	40 cents per pound and 45 per cent.	40 cents per pound and 50 per cent.	40 cents per pound and 50 per cent.

The House recedes on all three amendments.

On amendments Nos. 637 and 638: The House bill imposed the following duties on woven fabrics weighing not more than 4 ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool, valued at not more than 80 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 80 cents but not more than $1.25 per pound, 50 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $1.25 but not more than $2 per pound, 50 cents per pound and 55 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $2 per pound, 50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That if the warp of any of the foregoing is wholly of cotton, or other vegetable fiber, the duty on the fabric, valued at not more than $1 per pound, shall be 40 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $1 per pound, 40 cents per pound and 55 per cent ad valorem. Amendment No. 637 eliminates the lower bracket on such woven fabrics not having a cotton or vegetable fiber warp, thus subjecting all of such fabrics valued at not more than $1.25 per

pound to a duty of 50 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem. Amendment No. 638 subjects such woven fabrics having a warp of cotton or other vegetable fiber and valued at more than $1.50 per pound to a duty of 40 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem. The House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 639 and 640: The following table shows the rates provided in the House bill, the Senate amendments, and the conference agreement, on woven fabrics, weighing more than 4 ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool:

Valued at—	House bill	Senate amendments	Conference agreement
Not more than 60 cents per pound.	26 cents per pound and 40 per cent.	50 cents per pound and 50 per cent.	50 cents per pound and 50 per cent.
More than 60 cents per pound but not more than 80 cents per pound.	40 cents per pound and 50 per cent.	do	Do.
More than 80 cents per pound but not more than $1.25 per pound.	50 cents per pound and 50 per cent.	do	Do.
More than $1.25 per pound but not more than $1.50 per pound.	do	50 cents per pound and 55 per cent.	50 cents per pound and 55 per cent.
More than $1.50 per pound but not more than $2 per pound.	50 cents per pound and 55 per cent.	do	Do.
More than $2 per pound.	50 cents per pound and 60 per cent.	50 cents per pound and 60 per cent.	50 cents per pound and 60 per cent.

The House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 641: The House bill subjected woven felts and articles made thereof (including belts and belting, endless or otherwise), finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of wool, to the rates provided in paragraph 1109 (a) of the House bill, which rates varied from 26 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem to 50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem, depending upon value. The Senate amendment adds to the provision jackets and other articles of machine clothing, woven as units, wholly or in chief value of wool. The rates on all the articles in the amendment have been changed by amendments Nos. 639 and 640; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 642 and 643: The House bill imposed the following duty on blankets and similar articles (including carriage and automobile robes and steamer rugs), made of blanketing, wholly or in chief value of wool, not exceeding three yards in length, valued at not more than 50 cents per pound, 20 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents but not more than $1 per pound, 30 cents per pound and 36 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $1 but not more than $1.50 per pound, 33 cents per pound and 37½ per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $1.50 per pound, 40 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem. The House bill also provided that on such articles exceeding three yards in length the same duty should be paid as on woven fabrics of wool weighing more than 4 ounces per square yard. Senate amendment No. 642 makes certain that the duties specified in the paragraph will be applicable to such articles as units or in the piece, finished or unfinished, and amendment No. 643 eliminates the lower bracket and makes the duty of 30 cents and 36 per cent ad valorem applicable to all such articles valued at not more than $1 per pound. The House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 644: The House bill imposed duties on felts, not woven, wholly or in chief value of wool, valued at not more than 50 cents per pound, 20 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents but not more than $1.50 per pound, 30 cents per pound and 35 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment eliminates the first bracket of the House bill, thus making the rate of 30 cents per pound and 35 per cent ad valorem applicable to such felts valued at not more than $1.50 per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 645: This amendment makes certain that the rates of duty imposed upon hose, half hose, gloves, and mittens, wholly or in chief value of wool, shall apply to the unfinished as well as the finished article; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 646: The House bill imposed duties on clothing and articles of wearing apparel of every description, not knit or crocheted, manufactured wholly or in part, wholly or in chief value of wool, valued at not more than $2 per pound, 26 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $2 but not more than $4 per pound, 33 cents per pound and 45 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than $4 per pound, 50 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment eliminates the first bracket of the House bill, thus making the rate of 33 cents per pound and 45 per cent ad valorem applicable to such clothing and articles of wearing apparel valued at not more than $4 per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 647: The House bill imposed a duty of 40 cents per pound and 75 per cent ad valorem on bodies, hoods, forms, and shapes, for hats, bonnets, caps, berets, and similar articles, manufactured wholly or in part of wool felt, and an additional duty of 25 cents per article if pulled, stamped, blocked, or trimmed, including finished hats, bonnets, caps, berets, and similar articles. The Senate amendment eliminates the additional duty, limits the application of the subparagraph to articles wholly or in chief value of wool felt, and reduces to 33 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem the rates imposed by the House bill; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 648: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 cents per square foot but not less than 60 per cent ad valorem on oriental, Axminister, Savonnerie, Aubusson, and other carpets, rugs, and mats, not made on a power-driven loom; carpets, rugs, and mats, of oriental weave or weaves, made on a power-driven loom; chenille Axminister carpets, rugs, and mats, whether woven as separate carpets, rugs, or mats, or in rolls of any width; all the foregoing, plain or figured. The Senate amendment imposes a duty of 50 cents per square foot but not less than 45 per cent ad valorem on oriental, Axminister, Savonnerie, Aubusson, and other carpets, rugs, and mats, not made on a power-driven loom, plain or figured, whether woven as separate carpets, rugs, or mats, or in rolls of any width, and makes the rate 60 per cent ad valorem in the case of the other carpets and rugs covered in the paragraph; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 649: Under the House bill mixed fabrics containing more than 17 per cent of wool, but not in chief value thereof, are dutiable according to the component material of chief value. The Senate amendment makes these fabrics dutiable, in paragraph 1122, as follows: That proportion of the amount of the duty on the article, computed under this schedule, which the amount of wool bears to the entire weight, plus that proportion of the amount of the duty on the article, computed as if this paragraph had not been enacted, which the weight of the component materials other than wool bears to the entire weight. The House recedes with an amendment changing the word "article" to the word "fabric," in two places.

SCHEDULE 12.—SILK MANUFACTURES

On amendment No. 650: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 651: This amendment reduces from 50 to 45 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on spun silk or schappe silk yarn, or yarn of silk and rayon or other synthetic textile, and roving, bleached, dyed, colored, or plied; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 652: This amendment imposes a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem on woven fabrics in the piece not exceeding 30 inches in width, whether woven with fast or split edges, wholly or in chief value of silk, including umbrella silk or Gloria cloth. These fabrics under the House bill were dutiable at 55 per cent ad valorem. The amendment also decreases from 65 to 60 per cent the rate on any of the foregoing if Jacquard-figured, and on Jacquard-figured woven fabrics in the piece, wholly or in chief value of silk, not specially provided for; and the House recedes with an amendment restoring the 65 per cent rate on the Jacquard-figured.

On amendment No. 653: This amendment reduces from 70 to 65 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on silk velvets (other than ribbons), if the pile is wholly cut or wholly uncut; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 654: This amendment reduces from 75 to 70 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on silk velvets (other than ribbons), if the pile is partly cut; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 655: This amendment reduces from 65 to 60 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on silk clothing and articles of wearing apparel, not specially provided for; and the Senate recedes.

SCHEDULE 13.—MANUFACTURES OF RAYON OR OTHER SYNTHETIC TEXTILE

On amendment No. 656: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 657: The House bill imposed the following duties on rayon yarn, if singles, weighing 150 deniers or more per length of 450 meters, 45 per cent ad valorem; weighing less than 150 deniers, 50 per cent ad valorem; and, in addition, any of the foregoing plied shall be subject to an addi-

tional duty of 5 per cent ad valorem, and provided that none of the foregoing shall be subject to a less rate of duty than 45 cents per pound. The Senate amendment rewrites the House provisions to include, at the same rate as single yarns, filaments of rayon or other synthetic textile, exceeding 30 inches in length, single, or grouped. The amendment reduces the minimum specific duty to 40 cents per pound, and subjects yarns to an additional cumulative duty of 50 cents per pound if having more than 20 turns twist per inch. The House recedes with an amendment reinstating the minimum specific duty of 45 cents per pound in the case of yarns, but accepting the 40 cents minimum in the case of filaments, and reducing the additional cumulative duty on high-twist yarns to 45 cents per pound.

On amendment No. 658: This amendment is necessary by reason of the Senate action in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 659 and 660: The House bill imposed a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on filaments of rayon or other synthetic textiles, other than waste, whether known as cut fiber, staple fiber, or by any other name. Senate amendment No. 660 increases this rate to 25 per cent ad valorem, and amendment No. 659 limits the application of the provision to such filaments of rayon or other synthetic textile as do not exceed 30 inches in length; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 661 and 662: These amendments are necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 663: The House bill imposed a duty of 10 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem on rayon sliver or tops. The Senate amendment includes roving in this provision and changes the wording to conform to the Senate action in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 664: This amendment increases from 10 to 12½ cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on spun yarn of rayon; and changes the wording to conform to the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 665 and 666: These amendments are made necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 667: Under the House bill yarn of rayon or other synthetic textile put up for handwork, and sewing thread of rayon or other synthetic textile, are dutiable at 55 per cent ad valorem but not less than 45 cents per pound. The Senate amendment leaves the ad valorem rate unchanged, but reduces the minimum rate to 40 cents per pound; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 668: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 669: Under the House bill rayon or other synthetic textile in bands or strips not exceeding one inch in width, suitable for the manufacture of textiles, is dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem, but not less than 45 cents per pound. The Senate amendment leaves the ad valorem rate unchanged, but reduces the minimum rate to 40 cents per pound; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 670: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 671: Under the House bill woven fabrics in the piece, wholly or in chief value of rayon or other synthetic textile, not specially provided for, are dutiable at 45 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem and 10 per cent ad valorem additional if Jacquard-figured. The Senate amendment reduces the specific duty from 45 to 40 cents per pound, but leaves the ad valorem duty unchanged; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 672: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 673: Under the House bill, pile fabrics (including pile ribbons), wholly or in chief value of rayon or other synthetic textile, and all articles made or cut from such pile fabrics, are dutiable at 45 cents per pound, and, in addition, if the pile is wholly cut or wholly uncut, 60 per cent ad valorem, and, if the pile is partly cut, 65 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment reduces the specific rate on both classes of pile fabrics to 40 cents per pound, but leaves the ad valorem rate unchanged; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 674: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 675: Under the House bill fabrics with fast edges, not exceeding 12 inches in width, and articles made therefrom; tubings, garters, suspenders, braces, cords, tassels, and cords and tassels, of rayon or other synthetic textile, or of rayon or other synthetic textile and India rubber, not specially provided for, are dutiable at 45 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem and 10 per cent ad valorem additional if Jacquard-figured. The Senate amendment reduces the specific rate to 40 cents per pound, but leaves the ad valorem rate unchanged; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 676: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 677: Under the House bill knit fabric, in the piece, wholly or in chief value of rayon or other synthetic textile, is dutiable at 45 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment reduces the specific rate to 40 cents per pound, but leaves the ad valorem rate unchanged; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 678: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 679: Under the House bill gloves, mittens, hose, half-hose, underwear, outerwear, and articles of all kinds, knit or crocheted, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of rayon or other synthetic textile, are dutiable at 45 cents per pound and 65 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment reduces the specific rate to 40 cents per pound, but leaves the ad valorem rate unchanged; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 680: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 681 and 682: Under the House bill handkerchiefs and woven mufflers, wholly or in chief value of rayon or other synthetic textile, finished or unfinished, not hemmed, are dutiable at 45 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem; if hemmed or hemstitched, 45 cents per pound and 65 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendments reduce the specific rates to 40 cents per pound, but leave the ad valorem rates unchanged; and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 683: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 684 and 685: Under the House bill clothing and wearing apparel of rayon or other synthetic textile, not specially provided for, are dutiable at 45 cents per pound and 70 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendments reduce these rates to 40 cents per pound and 65 per cent ad valorem. The Senate recedes on amendment No. 684 (the specific rate), and the House recedes on amendment No. 685.

On amendments Nos. 686, 687, 688, and 689: These amendments are necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendments Nos. 690 and 691: Under the House bill manufactures of filaments, fibers, yarns, or threads, and textile products made of bands or strips (not exceeding 1 inch in width), of rayon or other synthetic textile, not specially provided for, are dutiable at 45 cents per pound and 70 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendments reduce these rates to 40 cents per pound and 65 per cent ad valorem. The Senate recedes on amendment No. 690 (the specific rate), and the House recedes on amendment No. 691.

On amendment No. 692: The House bill provided that the term "rayon" whenever used in this act means the product made by any artificial process from cellulose, a cellulose hydrate, a compound of cellulose, or a mixture containing any of the foregoing, which product is solidified into filaments, fibers, bands, strips, or sheets, whether such products are known as rayon, staple fiber, visca, or cellophane, or as artificial, imitation, or synthetic silk, wool, horsehair, or straw, or by any other name whatsoever. The Senate amendment does not change this definition, but applies it also to the term "other synthetic textile," which term the Senate, by numerous other amendments, uses in conjunction with the word "rayon" wherever it appears in the House bill. This amendment makes no change in the legal effect of the House bill; and the House recedes.

SCHEDULE 14.—PAPERS AND BOOKS

On amendment No. 693: This amendment eliminates the House provision for a countervailing duty on uncoated printing paper provided for in paragraph 1401; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 694 and 717: Paragraph 1402 relates to paper board, wallboard, pulpboard, cardboard, and leatherboard, not processed; and paragraph 1413, to the same products, processed. The Senate amendments more clearly define the processing terms used in the House bill and make them uniform in both paragraphs, without change in rates; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 695 and 696: These amendments increase from 25 to 30 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on manufactures of pulp, not specially provided for; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 697: The House bill imposed compound rates of duty on papers commonly or commercially known as tissue paper, and on certain other papers enumerated in paragraph 1404, according to weight per ream. The Senate amendment makes certain that the duties imposed shall apply to such articles whether white or printed; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 698: Under the House bill india and bible paper weighing 10 pounds or more and less than 18 pounds to the ream is dutiable at 4 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment makes such paper weighing between 18 and 20½ pounds per ream also subject to this rate; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 699: In the House bill paper wadding, and pulp wadding, and manufactures of such wadding are not specifically mentioned but are classified as crêpe paper at the rate of 6 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically enumerates such articles without change in rate; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 700: The House bill imposed a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem upon plain basic paper ordinarily used in the manufacture of paper commonly or commercially known either as blue print or brown print, and plain basic paper ordinarily used for similar purposes; and a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on sensitized paper commonly or commercially known either as blue print or brown print, and similar sensitized paper; and a duty of 5 per cent ad valorem on unsensitized basic paper, and baryta coated paper, to be sensitized for use in photography; and a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on sensitized paper, to be used in photography. The Senate amendment strikes out these duties and substitutes a duty of 3 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem on plain basic paper for albumenizing, sensitizing, baryta coating, or for photographic processes by using solar or artificial light; and a duty of 3 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem on albumenized or sensitized paper or paper otherwise surface coated for photographic purposes. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 701: The House bill imposed the following duties on transparencies, printed lithographically or otherwise, in not more than five printings (bronze printing to be counted as two printings), 40 per cent ad valorem; in more than five printings (bronze printing to be counted as two printings), 50 per cent ad valorem, with a proviso that all invoices shall state the number of separate printings actually employed in the production of the transparency. The Senate amendment eliminates the House classification and proviso and imposes a duty of 25 cents per pound on transparencies; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 702 and 703: Under the House bill ceramic decalcomanias, weighing not over 100 pounds per thousand sheets, are dutiable at $1.40 per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; weighing over 100 pounds per thousand sheets, 35 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendments reduce the specific rates, respectively, to $1.25 and 30 cents per pound, without change in the ad valorem rates; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 704, 705, and 706: The House bill fixed eight one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness as the dividing line for the assessment of duties on all articles not specially provided for in paragraph 1406. The Senate amendments make this dividing line twelve one-thousandths of 1 inch; and the House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendments Nos. 707, 708, and 709: The House bill imposed the following additional duties on all articles other than those hereinbefore provided for in paragraph 1406: If exceeding eight and not exceeding twenty one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness, if either die-cut or embossed, 1 cent per pound; if both die-cut and embossed, 2 cents per pound; exceeding twenty one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness, 10 cents per pound. The dividing line was changed from eight to twelve one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness by amendment No. 706, explained above, and amendments Nos. 707, 708, and 709 reduce the rates respectively to one-half of 1 cent, 1 cent, and 7½ cents per pound. The House recedes on amendments 707, 708, and 709 with amendments making the rates, respectively, three-fourths of 1 cent, 1½ cents, and 8¾ cents per pound.

On amendments Nos. 710 and 711: The House bill imposed a duty on paper envelopes, not specially provided for. Senate amendment 710 provides that these duties shall apply whether the envelopes are filled or unfilled, and whether the contents are dutiable or free; and amendment 711 further provides that when the contents of such envelopes are subject to an ad valorem rate of duty or a duty based in whole or in part upon the value thereof, the envelopes shall be dutiable at the rate applicable to their contents, but not less than the rates provided for the envelopes; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 712: The House bill imposed a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on paper commonly or commercially known as wall paper, composed in chief value of paper, printed, lithographed, dyed, or colored, but not wholly or partially covered with linseed oil cement, or flock. The Senate amendment strikes out the House text and imposes a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on hanging paper, not printed, lithographed, dyed, or colored; and of 1½ cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem on such paper if printed, lithographed, dyed, or colored; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 713: The House bill imposed a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on filtering paper. The Senate amendment changes this rate to 5 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 714: This amendment reduces from 30 to 20 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on uncoated and undecorated cover paper; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 715: This amendment provides that exported books of domestic manufacture, when returned to the United States, after having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means, shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, be dutiable only on the cost of materials added and labor performed in a foreign country; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 716: Under the House bill greeting cards, valentines, and other social and gift cards are dutiable at 35 per cent ad valorem; in the form of folders and booklets, 45 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment rewrites the House language, and provides that any of these items, with text, shall be dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem; without text, 30 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 717: See amendment No. 694. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 718: Under the House bill ribbon flycatchers are not specifically mentioned, but are classified as a manufacture of paper not specially provided for, at 35 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically names the article and imposes a duty thereon of 45 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 719: In the House bill, paper tubes, used for holding yarns or thread, are not specifically mentioned, but are classified in this paragraph as a manufacture of paper, not specially provided for, at 35 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically enumerates the articles and imposes thereon a duty of 2 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem, if parallel; and of 5 cents per pound and 35 per cent ad valorem, if tapered; and the House recedes with an amendment making the specific rates 1 cent and 3 cents per pound, respectively, and making no change in the ad valorem rates.

SCHEDULE 15.—SUNDRIES

The following amendments make clerical changes, and the House recedes: Nos. 720, 735, 739, and 807.

The following amendments make changes in paragraph, subparagraph, and clause numbers, letters, and references thereto, and the House recedes: Nos. 728, 766, 818, 843, and 844.

The following amendments make changes in paragraph numbers; and the Senate recedes: 789 and 792.

On amendment No. 721: The House bill imposed a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on molded, pressed, or formed articles in part of asbestos containing any binding agent, coating, or filler, other than hydraulic cement. The Senate amendment reduces the rate of duty to 25 per cent ad valorem, and excludes from the provisions of this subparagraph the foregoing articles containing synthetic resin as a binding agent, coating, or filler; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 722: Under the House bill golf tees are not specifically mentioned, but are included within the general terms of paragraph 1502 at 30 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically names this item, without change in rate of duty; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 723: The House bill imposed a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem on fabrics and articles not ornamented with beads, spangles, or bugles, nor embroidered, tamboured, appliquéd, or scalloped, composed wholly or in chief value of beads or spangles (other than imitation pearl beads, beads in imitation of precious or semiprecious stones, and beads in chief value of synthetic phenolic resin). The Senate amendment strikes out the word "phenolic" as applied to resin, making the exception applicable to beads composed of any synthetic resin; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 724: The House bill imposed a duty of 2 cents per inch and 20 per cent ad valorem on imitation solid pearl beads valued at not more than 5 cents per inch. The Senate amendment makes such beads dutiable at 60 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rates as follows: Valued at not more than one-fourth of 1 cent per inch, 60 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than one-fourth of 1 cent and not more than 1 cent per inch, one-half of 1 cent per inch and 60 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 1 cent per inch but not more than 5 cents per inch, 1 cent per inch and 40 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 725: The House bill imposed a duty of 4 cents per inch and 40 per cent ad valorem on iridescent imitation solid pearl beads, valued at not more than 10 cents per inch. The Senate amendment makes the rate of duty 90 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 726: The House bill imposed a duty of 75 per cent ad valorem on beads composed in chief value of synthetic phenolic resin. The Senate amendment strikes out the word "phenolic"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 727: This amendment strikes out the duty imposed by the House bill of 20 per cent on hat braids, wholly of ramie, and the duty of 40 per cent on manufactures of hat braids wholly of ramie. Amendment No. 729 transfers hat braids wholly of ramie, suitable for making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, or hoods to paragraph 1504 of the Senate bill at the rate of 15 per cent if not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained, and 25 per cent if bleached, dyed, colored, or stained. Amendment No. 731 transfers hats made of hat braid wholly of ramie to the rates provided for straw hats in subparagraph (b) of paragraph 1504 of the Senate bill. The House recedes on amendment No. 727.

On amendment No. 729: This amendment, besides its effect already referred to in connection with amendment No. 727, imposes upon braids and plaits, wholly or in chief value of ramie, suitable for making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, or hoods, a duty of 15 per cent if not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained, and 25 per cent if bleached, dyed, colored, or stained. The House recedes with a clarifying amendment.

On amendment No. 730: This amendment imposes upon hat braids, etc., wholly or in chief value of straw, hemp, etc. (including ramie), containing a substantial part of rayon or other synthetic textile but not in chief value thereof, a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 731, 732, and 733: The House bill imposed a duty of $4 per dozen and 50 per cent ad valorem on hats, bonnets, and hoods of straw, chip, paper, grass, palm leaf, willow, osier, rattan, real horsehair, cuba bark, or manila hemp, if blocked or trimmed, whether or not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained, and $4 per dozen and 60 per cent ad valorem if sewed. Senate amendment No. 731 adds ramie to the list of materials, and amendment No. 732 strikes out the specific duty on the blocked or trimmed, and makes the rate 78 per cent ad valorem. Amendment No. 733 strikes out the specific duty on the sewed, and makes the rate 88 per cent ad valorem. The House recedes on amendment No. 731 and recedes on amendment No. 732 with an amendment making the rate $3.50 per dozen and 50 per cent ad valorem, and the Senate recedes on amendment No. 733.

On amendment No. 734: This amendment specifically provides for hats, bonnets, and hoods wholly or in chief value of braids not provided for in paragraph 1504, if such braid is composed of a substantial part of rayon or other synthetic textile, but not wholly or in chief value thereof, and makes the rate of duty thereon 90 per cent ad valorem. Under the House bill such hats, bonnets, and hoods are dutiable under paragraph 1529 at 90 per cent. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 736: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on tooth and toilet brushes other than those specially provided for. The Senate amendment makes these brushes dutiable at 1 cent each and 50 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 737 and 738: These amendments reduce from 50 to 40 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on hair pencils in quills or otherwise; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 740: Under the House bill stoppers composed wholly or in chief value of cork, over three-fourths of an inch in diameter measured at the larger end, are dutiable at 25 cents per pound, and at 31 cents per pound if three-fourths of 1 inch or less in diameter measured at the larger end. The Senate amendment rewrites the House text, making a distinction between stoppers made of natural and those of artificial cork. If composed of natural cork, the rates are the same as in the House bill; if of artificial, composition, or compressed cork, the rates are reduced, respectively, to 10 and 12½ cents per pound; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 741: This amendment reduces from $2 to $1.50 per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on perforated cork penholder grips; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 742: This amendment reduces from 12½ to 10 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on disks, wafers, and washers, three-sixteenths of 1 inch or less in thickness, made from artificial, composition, or compressed cork; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 743 and 744: These are clarifying amendments; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 745: This amendment reduces from 2¾ cents to 1½ cents per board foot the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on cork insulation wholly or in chief value of cork, cork waste, or granulated or ground cork, in blocks, slabs, boards, or planks; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 2½ cents per board foot.

On amendment No. 746: This amendment reduces from 5 to 4 cents per pound the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on cork pipe coverings, cork fitting covers, and cork lags, wholly or partly manufactured, coated or uncoated; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 747: The House bill imposed the following duties: Dolls and doll clothing, composed in any part, however small, of any of the laces, fabrics, embroideries, or other materials or articles provided for in paragraph 1529 (a), 90 per cent ad valorem; dolls and toys, composed wholly or in chief value of any product provided for in paragraph 31, having any movable member or part, 1 cent each and 60 per cent ad valorem; not having any movable member or part, 1 cent each and 50 per cent ad valorem; parts of dolls or toys, composed wholly or in chief value of any product provided for in paragraph 31, 1 cent each and 50 per cent ad valorem; and on all other dolls, parts of dolls (including clothing), doll heads, and toy marbles, of whatever material composed, 70 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment strikes out the House text and makes dolls, parts of dolls, doll heads, toy marbles, toy games, toy containers, toy favors, and toy souvenirs, of whatever material composed, dutiable at 70 per cent ad valorem, and under a provision of amendment No. 748, doll clothing is excluded from the paragraph for separate assessment. The House recedes with an amendment reinstating the House text and rates and including toy games, toy containers, toy favors, and toy souvenirs at the 70 per cent rate.

On amendment No. 748: This amendment defines the term "toy" as an article chiefly used for the amusement of children, whether or not also suitable for physical exercise or for mental development, and further provides that doll clothing shall not be classified under this paragraph but shall be assessed separately. The House recedes with an amendment striking out the reference to doll clothing, in conformity with the action of the conferees on amendment No. 747.

On amendment No. 749: The House bill provided that none of the articles enumerated in the toy paragraph (par. 1513) should be subject to a less amount of duty than would be payable without regard to the paragraph, except that any article named therein composed wholly or in chief value of china, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthenware, or stoneware should be classified under the paragraph. The Senate amendment strikes out this proviso; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 750: This amendment imposes a duty of 1 cent per pound on garnet in grains, ground, pulverized, refined, or manufactured, which under the House bill was on the free list if in grains not ground, the other forms being dutiable at 30 per cent ad valorem. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 751: This amendment imposes a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on manufactures of which garnet is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 752: This amendment imposes a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem on any of the articles provided for in paragraph 1514 (relating to abrasives, etc.), if containing more

than specified percentages of certain alloying materials; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 753: This amendment increases from 8 cents per pound to 25 cents per pound the duty imposed by the House bill on firecrackers more than five-sixteenths of 1 inch outside diameter, or more than 1¾ inches in length; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 754: This amendment increases from 2 cents to 2¾ cents per thousand the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on friction or lucifer matches imported otherwise than in boxes containing not more than 100 matches each; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 755: Under the House bill, match splints and skillets for match boxes were not specially mentioned but were dutiable at 33⅓ per cent ad valorem as manufactures of wood, not specially provided for. The Senate amendment specifically enumerates these items, and makes the splints dutiable at 1 cent per thousand and the skillets at 12 cents per thousand; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 756: This amendment reduces from 40 to 30 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on percussion caps, cartridges, and cartridge shells empty; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 757: The House bill imposed a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on feathers and downs, on the skin or otherwise, crude or not dressed, colored, or otherwise advanced or manufactured in any manner, not specially provided for, and of 60 per cent ad valorem on feathers and downs dressed, colored, or otherwise advanced or manufactured in any manner, including quilts of down and other manufactures of down. The Senate amendment makes the duty 11 cents per pound on crude feathers and downs compressed to a density of not less than 10 pounds per cubic foot, and makes the rate 95 cents per pound on feathers and downs dressed, colored, or otherwise advanced or manufactured in any manner, whether compressed or not, and retains the House rate on quilts and other manufactures of down; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 758: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 759 and 760: The House bill imposed the following duties: Natural grasses, grains, leaves, plants, shrubs, herbs, and trees, and parts thereof, not specially provided for, when bleached, 50 per cent ad valorem; when colored, dyed, painted, or chemically treated, 75 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendments reduce these rates, respectively, to 25 and 50 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 761: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on plates, mats, and crosses of dressed dog, goat, or kid skins. The Senate amendment reduces this duty to 10 per cent and makes a clarifying amendment. The House recedes with an amendment restoring the rate of duty in the House bill and making a clarifying amendment.

On amendments Nos. 762 and 763: These are clarifying amendments; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 764: Under the House bill articles of wearing apparel wholly or partly manufactured, wholly or in chief value of dog, goat, or kid skins, not specially provided for, were dutiable a 50 per cent ad valorem under subparagraph (e) of paragraph 1519. The Senate amendment makes these articles dutiable at 15 per cent. The House recedes with an amendment making the rate 35 per cent.

On amendment No. 765: The House bill imposed a compound duty of 36 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem on press cloth of camel's hair. The Senate amendment strikes out the specific rate but retains the ad valorem; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 40 per cent ad valorem but not less than 25 cents per pound.

On amendments Nos. 767, 768, 769, and 770: Senate amendment No. 767 reduces from $1.50 to $1.25 per dozen the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on hats, caps, bonnets, and hoods, for men's, women's, boys', or children's wear, trimmed or untrimmed, including bodies, hoods, plateaux, forms, or shapes, for hats or bonnets, composed wholly or in chief value of fur of the rabbit, beaver, or other animals, valued at not more than $6 per dozen; amendment No. 768 reduces the rate on those valued at more than $6 and not more than $9 per dozen from $3 to $2.50 per dozen; amendment No. 769 reduces the rate on those valued at more than $24 and not more than $30 per dozen from $12 to $10 per dozen; and amendment No. 770 reduces the rate on those valued at more than $30 and not more than $48 per dozen from $13 to $11 per dozen. The House recedes on amendments Nos. 767 and 768, and the Senate recedes on amendments Nos. 769 and 770.

On amendment No. 771: Under the House bill silk or opera hats in chief value of silk are not specifically mentioned, but are dutiable under paragraph 1210 as silk wearing apparel not specially provided for, at 65 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment specifically names these hats, and imposes thereon a duty of $2 each and 75 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes with an amendment making the duty applicable only to men's hats.

On amendment No. 772: The House bill imposed a duty of 80 per cent ad valorem on jewelry wholly or in chief value of gold or platinum, and imposed a higher rate on jewelry composed of any other material and valued above 20 cents per dozen pieces. The Senate amendment makes dutiable under the 80 per cent rate instead of the higher rate, jewelry of which the metal part is wholly or in chief value of gold or platinum even though the gold or platinum is not the component material of chief value of the whole article. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 773: The House bill imposed on jewelry (other than that described in connection with the last amendment) a duty of 1 cent each and, in addition, three-fifths of 1 cent per dozen for each 1 cent the value exceeds 20 cents per dozen, and in addition thereto 50 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment changes the rate to 80 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 774: The House bill provided that none of the jewelry described in subparagraph (a) of paragraph 1527 should be subject to a less amount of duty than would be payable if the article was not dutiable under paragraph 1527. The Senate amendment strikes out this proviso, the effect of which is to make all the articles in subparagraph (a) dutiable at the various rates provided therein even though subject to a higher rate under some other paragraph. The Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 775 and 776: The House bill imposed a duty of 80 per cent on articles valued above 20 cents per dozen pieces, designed to be worn on apparel or to be carried on or about or attached to the person, such as and including buckles, card cases, cigarette cases, cuff buttons, match boxes, etc., if wholly or in chief value of gold or platinum, and imposed a higher rate on such articles wholly or in chief value of any other metal. The Senate amendments make dutiable under the 80 per cent rate instead of the higher rate, such articles of which the metal part is wholly or in chief value of gold or platinum, even though the gold or platinum is not the component material of chief value of the whole article. The House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 777: The House bill imposed a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on diamonds and other precious stones, rough or uncut, and not advanced in condition or value from their natural state by cleaving, splitting, cutting, or other process, whether in their natural form or broken, not set, and on diamond dust. Senate amendment No. 777 strikes out the House language, and amendment No. 919 transfers these items to the free list; and the House recedes on amendment No. 777.

On amendment No. 778: This amendment reduces from 20 to 10 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on pearls and parts thereof, drilled or undrilled, but not set or strung (except temporarily); and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 779: This amendment reduces from 20 to 10 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on diamonds, coral, rubies, cameos, and other precious stones and semiprecious stones, cut but not set, and suitable for use in the manufacture of jewelry; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 780: The House bill imposed on imitation half pearls not coated with fish-scale solution a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment strikes out the words "not coated with fish-scale solution" so that all imitation half pearls, whether or not coated with fish-scale solution, will be subject to the 20 per cent duty; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 781 and 782: The House bill provided that imitation solid pearls, unpierced, pierced or partially pierced, loose, or mounted, of whatever shape, color, or design, shall bear the same rate of duty as is applicable to imitation solid pearl beads. Senate amendment No. 781 includes within this provision iridescent imitation solid pearls, and amendment No. 782 makes a change in language for purposes of clarification; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 783: Under the House bill lace window curtains (other than those provided for in par. 920) were included within the lace and embroidery paragraph of the bill at 90 per cent ad valorem without specific enumeration. The Senate amendment specifically names these articles in the paragraph; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 784: The House bill excepted from the 90 per cent duty in paragraph 1529 (a) boots, shoes, or other footwear (including athletic or sporting boots and shoes), made wholly or in chief value of leather, not specially provided for, and such footwear the uppers of which are composed wholly or in chief value of wool, cotton, ramie, animal hair, fiber, rayon, silk, or substitutes, even though such articles are ornamented or embroidered, and also excepts the articles provided for in paragraphs 1702 and 1721 of the House bill. The Senate amendment makes the exception apply to all articles on the free list and to such footwear the uppers of which are composed wholly or in chief value of wool, cotton, ramie, animal hair, fiber, or silk, or substitutes. The House recedes with an amendment making the exception apply as in the House bill as well as to all articles on the free list.

On amendment No. 785: The House bill excepted from the 90 per cent duty imposed on lace articles and embroideries in paragraph 1529 (a), the handkerchiefs and body-supporting garments and wearing apparel to which such garments are attached, in part of lace, or embroidered, enumerated in subparagraphs (b) and (c) respectively, of the House bill. The Senate amendment removes the exception in the case of body-supporting garments; and the House recedes with an amendment making a necessary change in subparagraph reference.

On amendment No. 786: This amendment is necessary by reason of the action of the Senate in connection with amendment No. 692; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 787: This amendment removes from the 90 per cent ad valorem rate imposed in paragraph 1529 (a) on embroidered hose and half hose, such hose and half hose in chief value of cotton or wool if the embroidery is commonly known as clocking and does not exceed 1 inch in width or 6 inches in length, exclusive of the fork, and subjects them to the lower rates of duty provided in the cotton and wool schedules. The House recedes on this amendment with an amendment subjecting such hose and half hose to a duty of 75 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 788: This amendment imposes on laces, 3 inches or less in width, and on laces suitable for conversion into laces 3 inches or less in width, an additional duty of one-half of 1 cent per yard for each one-half inch, or fraction thereof, in width; and imposes on nets and netting certain additional specific duties per square yard, according to the number of holes per square inch. The Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 790 and 791: The House bill imposed a duty of 4 cents each and 40 per cent ad valorem on handkerchiefs wholly or in part of lace or embroidered, etc. Amendment No. 790 makes the rate on handkerchiefs of lace 90 per cent ad valorem. Amendment No. 791 makes the rate on embroidered handkerchiefs 90 per cent and imposes an additional duty of 1 cent each if such handkerchiefs are made with hand rolled or hand made hems. The Senate recedes on amendment No. 790. The House recedes on amendment No. 791 with an amendment imposing the following duties on both lace and embroidered handkerchiefs: If valued at not more than 70 cents per dozen, 3 cents each and 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 70 cents per dozen, 4 cents each and 40 per cent ad valorem; plus an additional duty of 1 cent each on such handkerchiefs valued at not more than 70 cents per dozen if made with hand rolled or hand made hems.

On amendment No. 793: The House bill imposed duties of 60 and 75 per cent ad valorem on body-supporting garments and on wearing apparel or articles to which a body-supporting garment is attached. The Senate amendment provides that when such wearing apparel or article is so attached, it shall not be subject to a less rate of duty than if it were imported separately; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 794: The House bill imposed a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem on elastic fabrics of whatever material composed, knit, woven, or braided, in part of india rubber, more than 12 inches in width. The Senate amendment removed the limitation as to width; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 795, 949, 967, and 968: The House bill imposed on hides and skins of cattle of the bovine species a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem, and duties of 12½, 15, and 20 per cent on various leathers made from such hides or skins. Leather made from the skins of other animals was made dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem, but if to be used in the manufacture of shoes, or if cut into shoe forms the duty was 10 per cent. The House bill also imposed a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on fancy leather of all kinds. Boots and shoes of leather were made dutiable at 20 per cent and boots or shoes with vegetable or animal fiber uppers were made dutiable at 35 per cent. Harness, saddles, and saddlery, and parts thereof (except metal parts), were made dutiable at rates of 15 per cent and 35 per cent. The Senate amendments transfer hides and skins of cattle of the bovine species and boots and shoes of leather to the free list. The Senate amendments also make chamois skins, pianoforte, pianoforte-action, player-piano-action leather, and enameled upholstery leather, and bag, strap, case, football, and glove leather, and seal, sheep, goat, and calf leather, other than shoe leather, dutiable at 20 per cent. All other leather is placed on the free list. Boots and shoes of animal or vegetable fiber uppers are made dutiable at 35 per cent. Harness valued at more than $70 per set and single harness and saddles valued at more than $40, and parts (except metal parts) for any of the foregoing are made dutiable at 35 per cent. The House recedes on amendment No. 795 with an amendment restoring the provisions of the House bill, making certain clarifying changes, and reducing from 25 per cent to 10 per cent the duty on vegetable-tanned rough leather made from goat or sheep skin (including those commercially known as India-tanned goat or sheep skins). The Senate recedes on amendments Nos. 949, 967, and 968.

On amendment No. 796: The House bill imposed a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on bags, baskets, belts, satchels, card-cases, pocketbooks, jewel boxes, portfolios, and other boxes and cases, not jewelry, wholly or in chief value of leather or parchment and manufactures of leather, rawhide, or parchment, or of which leather, rawhide, or parchment is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for, and a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on any of the foregoing permanently fitted and furnished with traveling, bottle, drinking, dining or luncheon, sewing, manicure, or similar sets. The Senate amendment reduces these rates, respectively, to 30 per cent ad valorem and 45 per cent ad valorem, and restores mocassins to this paragraph at 30 per cent ad valorem, which were dutiable under paragraph 1530 (e) of the House bill at 20 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 797: The House bill imposed the following duties on gloves wholly or in chief value of leather, which duties are based upon extreme length of the gloves (including the unfolded length of cuffs or other appendages): Men's gloves not over 12 inches in length, $6.50 per dozen pairs; women's and children's gloves not over 12 inches in length, $5.50 per dozen pairs; an additional duty of 50 cents per dozen pairs on such gloves for each inch or fraction thereof in excess of 12; and cumulative duties of $1 per dozen pairs when machine seamed but not overseamed; $5 per dozen pairs when seamed by hand; $3.50 per dozen pairs when lined with fabrics; $4 per dozen pairs when trimmed with fur; and $5 per dozen pairs when lined with leather or fur. The House bill also imposed a minimum duty of 50 per cent ad valorem and provided that glove tranks should be subject to 75 per cent of the duty provided for the gloves in the fabrication of which they are suitable. Gloves of horsehides or cowhides (except calfskins) are dutiable under the House bill at 25 per cent. The Senate amendment makes gloves of leather dutiable at the following rates: Men's gloves, $6 per dozen pairs; women's and children's gloves of sheep or lamb leather, not over 14 inches in length, $4 per dozen pairs, and if in excess of 14 inches in length, 25 cents per dozen pairs additional for each inch; women's and children's gloves (not of sheep or lamb leather) not over 14 inches in length, $5 per dozen pairs and 25 cents per dozen pairs for each inch in excess of 14. Under the Senate amendment the extreme length does not include the unfolded length of cuffs or other appendages. The Senate amendment also imposes cumulative duties of $2 per dozen pairs if lined with fabric and $4 per dozen pairs if lined with leather or fur. Gloves of horsehides or cattle hides (except calfskins) under the Senate amendment are dutiable at $1.50 per dozen pairs. Glove tranks are subject to 75 per cent of the duty provided for the gloves in the fabrication of which they are suitable. The House recedes with an amendment restoring the provisions of the House bill, but making the base rate on men's gloves $6 per dozen pairs.

On amendment No. 798: The House bill imposed a duty of 65 per cent ad valorem on artificial flies, snelled hooks, leaders or casts, finished or unfinished, and of 55 per cent ad valorem on fishhooks, fishing rods and reels, artificial baits, and all other fishing tackle and parts thereof, fly books, fly boxes, fishing baskets or creels, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for, except fishing lines, fishing nets, and seines. The Senate amendment rewrites the House text, subjecting all such articles to a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem. The House recedes with an amendment restoring the House classification, but imposing a duty of 55 per cent ad valorem on artificial flies, snelled hooks, leaders or casts, finished or unfinished, and on fishing rods and

reels, and parts thereof; and of 45 per cent ad valorem on all the other articles enumerated in the paragraph.

On amendment No. 799: The House bill imposed a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on all candles. The Senate amendment eliminates this specific provision, the effect of which is to make wax candles dutiable at 20 per cent ad valorem as manufactures of wax, not specially provided for, while other candles would be dutiable as a nonenumerated manufactured article at the same rate under paragraph 1558 of the Senate bill; and the House recedes with an amendment restoring the House language but changing the rate to 27½ per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 800: The House bill imposed a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on manufactures of chip roping. The Senate amendment eliminates this specific provision, the effect of which is to make this item dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem as a manufacture of chip not specially provided for; and the House recedes with an amendment restoring the House language but making the rate 25 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 801: Under the House bill floor coverings of sponge rubber were not specifically mentioned, but were dutiable at 40 per cent ad valorem in paragraph 1021 as floor coverings not specially provided for. The Senate amendment specifically names these articles, and imposes a duty thereon of 25 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 802, 803, and 804: The House bill imposed a duty on laminated products of which any synthetic resin or resinlike substance provided for in paragraph 28 (coal-tar products) is the chief binding agent. Amendment No. 802 extends these duties so as to apply to laminated products of which any synthetic resin or resinlike substance is the chief binding agent; and the House recedes. Amendment 803 is a clarifying amendment in respect of these duties; and the House recedes. The House bill imposed a duty of 50 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem on manufactures wholly or in chief value of any of the foregoing laminated products. Amendment 804 imposes the same duty on manufactures wholly or in chief value of any other product of which any synthetic resin or resinlike substance is the chief binding agent, thus including molded products as well as laminated products; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 805: The House bill imposed a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem on pipe organs or pipe-organ player actions and parts thereof. The Senate amendment provides that on pipe organs or pipe-organ player actions and parts thereof especially designed and constructed for installation and use in a particular church, or in a particular public auditorium at which it is not customary to charge an admission fee, which are imported for that specific use, and which are so installed and used within one year from the date of importation, the rate of duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 806: This amendment reduces from 60 to 40 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on chin rests for violins; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 808: This amendment reduces from 60 to 40 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on strings for musical instruments composed wholly or in part of catgut, other gut, oriental gut, or metal; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 809 and 1108: The House bill imposed a duty of $1.25 each and 35 per cent ad valorem on violins, violas, violoncellos, and double basses, of all sizes. Senate amendment No. 809 provides that this duty shall apply only to such of the articles named as are made after the year 1800; and amendment No. 1108 transfers to the free list those made in the year 1800 or before; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 810 and 811: The House bill imposed a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on all carillons, and parts thereof. Senate amendment No. 810 increases this rate to 25 per cent ad valorem; and amendment No. 811 provides that religious and educational societies and institutions, or individuals for philanthropic, charitable, or patriotic purposes, may import free of duty any carillon consisting of not less than 30 bells of different sizes and weights, and parts thereof, for installation and use in or on one building, and not for sale; and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 812 and 816: The House bill provided that any article chiefly used for the amusement of children, or any part of any such article, shall not be classified under the musical instruments paragraphs (1541 and 1542 of the Senate bill). The Senate amendments strike out these provisos in view of the new wording in the toy paragraph (see amendment No. 748), which accomplishes the same purpose; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 813: Under the House bill, dictophones are not specifically mentioned, but are dutiable at 30 per cent ad valorem under the provision for phonographs, gramophones, graphophones, and similar articles. The Senate amendment specifically enumerates dictophones, but makes no change in the duty; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 814 and 815: The House bill imposed a duty of 8 cents per thousand and 45 per cent ad valorem on needles for phonographs, gramophones, graphophones, and similar articles. Senate amendment No. 815 eliminates the specific rate but retains the ad valorem rate at 45 per cent, and amendment No. 814 specifically enumerates needles for dictophones; and the House recedes on amendment No. 814, and the Senate recedes on amendment No. 815.

On amendment No. 816: See amendment No. 812.

On amendment No. 817: This amendment increases from 25 to 40 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on sponges commercially known as sheepswool; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 30 per cent ad valorem.

On amendments Nos. 819, 820, and 822: These are clarifying amendments to make certain that the subparagraph is confined solely to works of art. The House recedes on all three amendments.

On amendment No. 821: Under the House bill statuary, sculptures, or copies, replicas, or reproductions of the same, not specially provided for, which are works of art, are dutiable at 20 per cent ad valorem. The Senate amendment limits the House provision to such of these articles as are valued at not less than $2.50 each, the effect of which is to make articles valued at less than $2.50 each dutiable according to the component material of chief value; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 823: Under the House bill paintings in oil, mineral, water, or other colors, pastels, and drawings and sketches in pen and ink, pencil, or water color, are free of duty if original, while if not original they are either dutiable under paragraph 1547 of the House bill at 20 per cent ad valorem as works of art, not specially provided for, or under other paragraphs according to the nature and description of the article. The Senate amendment imposes a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on any of the foregoing, whether or not works of art, suitable as designs for use in the manufacture of textiles, floor coverings, wall paper, or wall coverings; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 824 and 825: The House bill imposed a duty of 60 cents per gross and 35 per cent ad valorem on pencils of paper, wood, or other material not metal, filled with lead or other material, pencils of lead, crayon (including chalk crayons and charcoal crayons or fusains), not specially provided for. The Senate amendments reduce this rate to 45 cents per gross and 25 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes on both amendments with amendments making the rate 50 cents per gross and 30 per cent ad valorem.

On amendment No. 826: This amendment provides that on any of the pencils provided for in paragraph 1549 (a), valued at more than $5.75 per gross, the maximum duty shall be $1 per gross; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 827: Under the House bill black pencil leads not in wood or other material are dutiable at 6 cents per gross. The Senate amendment includes at this rate black leads for holders and black leads of graphite or of graphite and clay exceeding six one-hundredths of an inch in diameter. The House recedes with an amendment making clarifying changes but without change of the rate or classification provided in the Senate amendment.

On amendments Nos. 828 and 829: The House bill imposed a duty of 72 cents per dozen and 40 per cent ad valorem on mechanical pencils. The Senate amendments give mechanical pencils a separate classification and change the rate to 45 cents per gross and 40 per cent ad valorem; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 830: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on photographic dry plates, not specially provided for. The Senate amendment reduces this rate to 20 per cent ad valorem, and provides that when such dry plates are panchromatic the rate shall be 10 per cent; and the House recedes with an amendment making the rate 20 per cent ad valorem on such plates whether or not panchromatic.

On amendments Nos. 831, 832, and 833: The House bill imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on photographic films, sensitized but not exposed or developed, of every kind except motion-picture films having a width of 1 inch or more, and imposed a duty of four-tenths of 1 cent per linear foot on motion-picture films, sensitized but not exposed or developed, of the standard width of 1⅜ inches, while all other widths of 1 inch or more were dutiable in equal proportion thereto. The

Senate amendments eliminate the distinction between motion-picture films and other photographic films and make all sensitized but not exposed or developed films dutiable at two-tenths of 1 cent per linear foot of the standard width of 1⅜ inches, and other widths in proportion thereto; and the Senate recedes on all these amendments.

On amendments Nos. 834 and 988: The House bill imposed a duty of 2 cents per linear foot on all photographic-film negatives, in any form, for use in connection with moving-picture exhibits or for making or reproducing pictures for such exhibits, exposed but not developed. Senate amendment No. 834 excepts from the duty undeveloped negative moving-picture film of American manufacture exposed abroad for silent or sound news reel; and amendment No. 988 transfers this film to the free list; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendments Nos. 835 and 894: The House bill imposed a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem on cigarette books, cigarette book covers, and on cigarette paper in all forms, except cork paper. Senate amendment No. 835 strikes out the House provision, and amendment No. 894 transfers these items to the free list; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 836: This amendment reduces from 60 to 40 per cent ad valorem the rate of duty imposed by the House bill on umbrellas, parasols, and sunshades covered with material other than paper or lace, not embroidered or appliquéd; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 837, 838, and 839: The House bill imposed a duty of 75 per cent ad valorem on handles and sticks for umbrellas, parasols, sunshades, and walking canes, wholly or in chief value of synthetic phenolic resin. Senate amendment No. 838 eliminates the word "phenolic," and amendments Nos. 837 and 839 make clerical changes; and the House recedes on all these amendments.

On amendment No. 840: See amendment No. 577.

On amendment No. 841: The House bill imposed a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on bleached beeswax, while crude beeswax was free of duty under paragraph 1791 of the House bill as wax not specially provided for. The Senate amendment imposes a duty of 12 per cent ad valorem on crude beeswax, and reduces the rate on bleached beeswax to 25 per cent ad valorem; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 842: Under the House bill stamping and embossing materials of pigments, mounted on paper or equivalent backing and releasable from the backing by means of heat and pressure, are dutiable at 5 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem under paragraph 1405 as surface-coated papers. The Senate amendment specifically provides for these items in a separate classification and makes the rate theron three-eighths of 1 cent per hundred square inches; and the House recedes.

TITLE II.—FREE LIST

The following amendments make changes in paragraph numbers; and the Senate recedes: 853, 858, 859, 860, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, and 886.

The following amendments make changes in paragraph numbers; and the House recedes with amendments making further changes in paragraph numbers: 888, 891, and 892.

The following amendments make clerical changes; and the House recedes: 912, 924, and 1065.

On amendment No. 845: The House bill, in referring to our possession in Samoa, used the descriptive phrase "the island of Tutuila." The Senate amendment uses the phrase "American Samoa"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 846: See amendment No. 13. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 847: Under the House bill, milk cans were not specifically enumerated, but were dutiable under the basket clause of the metal schedule. The Senate amendment transfers this item to the free list; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 848 and 849: The House bill provided that horses, mules, asses, cattle, sheep, and other domestic animals which have strayed across the boundary line into any foreign country, or which are driven across such boundary line by the owner for temporary pasturage purposes only, together with the offspring, shall be dutiable unless brought back to the United States within eight months, in which case they shall be free of duty. Senate amendment No. 848 eliminates the provision for free entry of such animals as are driven across the boundary line, and amendment No. 849 limits the time within which strayed animals may be returned free of duty to three months. The Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 850: The House bill permits animals, poultry, and fish to be temporarily brought into the United States under bond for a period not exceeding six months, for the purpose of breeding, exhibition, or competition for prizes offered by any agricultural, polo, or racing association. The Senate amendment confines this privilege to animals and poultry; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 851: Under the House bill arrowroot starch was not specifically mentioned, but was dutiable under paragraph 85 of the House bill at 1½ cents per pound as starch not specially provided for. The Senate amendment transfers manufactured arrowroot, including starch and flour, to the free list; and the House recedes with an amendment making a clarifying change in language.

On amendment No. 852: See amendment No. 11. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 854: The House bill exempts from duty articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, when returned after having been exported without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means, but confines this exemption to such articles when imported by or for the account of the person who exported them from the United States. The Senate amendment strikes out this limitation, the effect of which is to extend the privilege to persons other than those by or for the account of whom the articles were exported; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 855: The House bill exempts from duty iron or steel drums of either domestic or foreign manufacture used for the shipment of acids or other chemicals which shall have been actually exported from the United States. The Senate amendment includes within this provision drums of other metal than steel or iron; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 856: The House bill exempts from duty bags of American manufacture exported filled with American products or exported empty and returned filled with foreign products, but confines this exemption to such domestic bags as may be imported by the exporter thereof. The Senate amendment strikes out this limitation, making such bags exempt from duty whether or not imported by the exporter thereof; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 857: The House bill permitted to certain persons, under certain conditions, the free importation of certain containers and coverings of American manufacture, but attached the condition that upon reimportation duty should be paid equal to any drawback allowed on exportation. The Senate amendment provides that if such coverings and containers are not unusual they shall be relieved from the repayment of drawback if used as coverings and containers of merchandise not subject to an ad valorem rate of duty; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 861: This amendment makes certain that plantains shall be admitted free of duty; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 867 and 868: Under the House bill bread is exempted from duty if yeast was the leavening substance used in its preparation. The Senate amendment further limits this provision to such bread as is light raised and is commonly known as bread, the effect of which is to make so-called Swedish bread and similar bread dutiable at 30 per cent ad valorem under paragraph 733 of the Senate bill; and amendment No. 868 makes bread dutiable in the case of imports from a country which imposes a tariff on bread imported from the United States; and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 879: See amendment No. 159. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 887: See amendment No. 244. The House recedes with an amendment making a change in paragraph number.

On amendments Nos. 889 and 890: See amendment No. 29. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 894: See amendment No. 835. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 900: Under the House bill cocoa or cacao beans are free of duty. The Senate amendment makes certain that shells of such beans shall also be free of duty; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 918: The House provision excludes sulphocyanides or thiocyanides, thiocyanates, and nitroprussides from this paragraph. The Senate provision also excludes these compounds and, in addition, excludes ferrocyanides, ferricyanides, and cyanates, the effect of which is to make them dutiable under paragraph 5 at 25 per cent; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 938 and 939: The House bill placed on the free list guano, basic slag, manures, and all other substances used chiefly for fertilizer, not specially provided for, but provided that no article specified by name in Title I should be free of duty under this provision. Senate amendment No. 939 extends the application of this paragraph to substances used

chiefly as an ingredient in the manufacture of fertilizers and strikes out the clause excepting articles specified by name in Title I. Amendment No. 938 makes the provisions of the paragraph applicable notwithstanding any other provision of the act. The House recedes on amendment No. 939 and recedes on amendment No. 938 with an amendment making a clarifying change.

On amendment No. 941: See amendment No. 36. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 943 and 944: Under the House bill gunpowder, sporting powder, and all other explosive substances not especially provided for, are free of duty, with a proviso that if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government imposes a duty on any article specified in the paragraph, when imported from the United States, an equal duty shall be imposed upon such article coming into the United States from such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government. Senate amendment No. 943 excepts from the provisions of this paragraph explosive substances wholly or in chief value of cellulose esters, and amendment No. 944 strikes out the countervailing duty provisions. The House recedes on amendment No. 943 and the Senate recedes on amendment No. 944.

On amendment No. 949: See amendment No. 795. The Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 967 and 968: See amendment No. 795. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 986: The House bill admitted free of duty nets or finished sections of nets for use in otter trawl fishing, if composed wholly or in chief value of manila or vegetable fiber. The Senate amendment limits this provision to such nets composed wholly or in chief value of manila. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 988: See amendment No. 834. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 990 and 991: The Senate amendments make certain that kapok seed and rubber seed shall be admitted free of duty; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 994: See amendments Nos. 445 and 446. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 996: The House bill exempted from duty fish the product of American fisheries (except cod, haddock, hake, pollock, cush, mackerel, and swordfish) landed in a foreign country and there not further advanced than beheaded, eviscerated, packed in ice, and frozen. The Senate amendment permits the removal of the fins; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 998: See amendment No. 121. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1000: The House bill admitted free of duty olive oil and palm kernel oil rendered unfit for use as food or for any but mechanical or manufacturing purposes. The Senate amendment includes within this provision rapeseed, sunflower, and sesame oil when so denatured; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1001: The House bill admitted free of duty Chinese and Japanese tung oil. The Senate amendment makes free of duty all tung oil; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1005: See amendment No. 355. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 1007: This amendment places on the free list pads for horses; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1011: See amendment No. 129. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 1030: The Senate amendment places on the free list scientific instruments, apparatus, and devices, of a kind not offered for sale in the United States by domestic producers and imported for research purposes by any college or university, and not for sale, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1042: The Senate amendment makes clear that both crude and refined sodium nitrate shall be free of duty; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1043: See amendment No. 160. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1044: This amendment transfers refined salt cake from the free list where it appears in the House bill to the dutiable list under paragraph 81 of the Senate bill; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1045: See amendment No. 158. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 1054: Under the House bill, statuary imported in good faith for presentation without charge to, and for the use of, any corporation or association organized and operated exclusively for religious purposes, is placed on the free list. The Senate amendment excepts from this provision casts of plaster of Paris, or of compositions of paper of papier-mâché; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1056: See amendment No. 204. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 1069: This amendment transfers from one place in the free list to another, alloys in chief value of tin not specially provided for; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1073: See amendment No. 181. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 1083: The Senate amendment exempts from duty, in the case of any individual returning from abroad, all professional books, implements, instruments, and tools of trade, occupation, or employment, taken by him out of the United States to foreign countries, without regard to their value; and the House recedes with an amendment making clerical changes.

On amendment No. 1084: The House bill provided for the admission free of duty of articles not exceeding $100 in value acquired abroad by residents of the United States for personal or household use or as souvenirs or curios not bought on commission or intended for sale. The Senate amendment provides that a resident of the United States shall not take advantage of this exemption within a period of 30 days from the last exemption claimed, and further provides that no courtesy of the port, free entry, or special privileges or preferences in the examination of merchandise or baggage shall be extended to any person whomsoever who is subject to the payment of customs duties; and the House recedes with an amendment striking out the proviso in respect of courtesy of the port, etc.

On amendment No. 1088: The House bill places all witherite on the free list. The Senate amendment limits the House provision to witherite, crude, unground, the effect of which is to make all other forms dutiable under paragraph 214 at 30 per cent ad valorem as an earthy or mineral substance not specially provided for; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1097: Under the House bill, Christmas trees were not specifically enumerated, but were dutiable at 10 per cent ad valorem under paragraph 1557 of the House bill as an unenumerated article. The Senate amendment places Christmas trees on the free list; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1100 and 1101: The House bill places on the free list original paintings in oil, mineral, water, or other colors, pastels, original drawings and sketches in pen, ink, pencil, or water colors, artists' proof etchings unbound, and engravings and woodcuts unbound, and original sculptures or statuary, including not more than two replicas or reproductions of the same, but provides that the words "painting," "sculpture," and "statuary" as used in this paragraph shall not be understood to include any articles of utility, nor such as are made wholly or in part by stenciling or any other mechanical process. Senate amendment No. 1100 includes within the operation of this limitation the terms "drawing" and "sketch," and amendment No. 1101 further excludes from the paragraph such articles for industrial use; and the House recedes on both amendments.

On amendment No. 1106: Under the House bill, all rugs and carpets were excepted from the provision for the free entry of works of art. The Senate amendment confines the exception to those made after the year 1700, the effect of which is to make those made during or prior to the year 1700 free of duty if works of art; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1107: The House bill places on the free list works of art (except rugs and carpets), collections in illustration of the progress of the arts, works in bronze, terra cotta, parian, pottery, or porcelain, artistic antiquities, and objects of art of ornamental character or educational value which shall have been produced more than 100 years prior to the date of importation. The Senate amendment makes this provision apply only to such articles as shall have been produced prior to the year 1830; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1108: See amendment No. 809. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 1110: The House bill placed on the free list Venetian glass mosaics which are works of art. The Senate amendment strikes out the House provision, the effect of which is to make these articles dutiable at 60 per cent ad valorem under paragraph 218 (f) of the Senate bill as an article composed wholly or in chief value of glass, not specially provided for; and the House recedes.

TITLES III AND IV.—SPECIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

On amendment No. 1113: This amendment restores the specific requirement of the existing marking law, omitted from the

House bill, that the marking must be in a conspicuous place; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1114: The House bill required the marking of every imported article and its immediate container, and the package in which imported, and delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury authority to make such exceptions as he deemed advisable. The Senate amendment strikes out this general authority in the Secretary of the Treasury to make exceptions and provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may except any article from the requirement of marking but only if the article is incapable of being marked, or can not be marked without injury, or if the expense is economically prohibitive of importation, or if the marking of the immediate container will reasonably indicate the country of origin of the article. The amendment also restores the requirement of existing law that the marking shall be as nearly indelible and permanent as the nature of the article will permit. The House recedes with amendments providing that the Secretary of the Treasury may except an article from the marking requirements if "he is satisfied that" the article is incapable of being marked, or can not be marked without injury, or except at an expense economically prohibitive, or that the marking of the immediate container will reasonably indicate the country of origin of the article.

On amendment No. 1115: The Senate amendment makes the penalties provided for violation of the marking provisions applicable to the covering or obscuring of any mark with intent to conceal the information given thereby; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1116: The House bill retained the existing law prohibiting the importation of certain obscene articles and articles of immoral use or tendency and extended the prohibition to cover books, papers, pamphlets, and other articles containing any matter advocating or urging treason, insurrection, or forcible resistance to any law of the United, States, or containing any threat to take the life of or inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States. The Senate amendment strikes out the entire section of the House bill but restores the prohibitions against importation, except that the matter regarding treason or insurrection is specifically limited to treason or insurrection against the United States, and the prohibition against matter containing any threat to take the life of or inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States is extended to cover such threats toward any person in the United States. In addition, the Senate amendment provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, notwithstanding the prohibitions against importation, admit the so-called classics or books of recognized and established literary or scientific merit, and that he may, in his discretion, admit such classics or books only when imported for noncommercial purposes. However, the Senate amendment specifically provides that the prohibited articles shall be held by the collector to await the action of the district court, and that no protest shall be taken to the United States Customs Court from the decision of the collector. Upon the seizure the collector is required to transmit information thereof to the district attorney of the proper district, who thereupon is to institute proceedings for the forfeiture, confiscation, and destruction of the book or matter seized. In any such proceedings a trial by jury may be demanded, and the same right of review is given as in ordinary actions or suits. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 1117: This amendment is discussed in connection with amendment No. 470; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1118: The House bill retained existing law prohibiting the importation of goods, wares, articles, and merchandise manufactured wholly or in part by convict labor. The Senate amendment extends the prohibition to goods, wares, articles, and merchandise "mined or produced"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1119: This amendment extends the prohibition against importation of convict-made goods, discussed under amendment No. 1118, to similar products of forced labor or indentured labor under penal sanctions; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1120: This amendment postpones until January 1, 1932, the effective date of the provisions prohibiting the importation of goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured by forced labor or indentured labor under penal sanctions. The House recedes with an amendment providing that such provisions shall in no case be applicable to goods, wares, articles, or merchandise so mined, produced, or manufactured which are not mined, produced, or manufactured in such quantities in the United States as to meet the consumptive demands of the United States. This will prevent the application of these provisions to articles such as rubber and tea, which are not produced in the United States, and articles as to which our domestic production does not satisfy our consumptive needs.

On amendment No. 1121: This amendment defines "forced labor," referred to in connection with amendments numbered 1119 and 1120, to mean work or service exacted under the menace of any penalty for its nonperformance and for which the worker does not offer himself voluntarily; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1122: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1123: This amendment extends the privilege of temporary free importation under bond for exportation within a limited period to include articles imported by illustrators and photographers for use solely as models in their own establishments, in illustrating catalogues, pamphlets, or advertising matter; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1124: The House bill contains an addition to existing law permitting refund of duties in the case of merchandise not conforming to sample or specification, if within 10 days after release from customs custody the merchandise is returned to customs custody for exportation. The Senate amendment extends this period to 30 days; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1125. The House bill provided that there shall be no allowance or drawback unless the completed article is exported (or shipped to the Philippine Islands) within five years after importation of the imported merchandise. The Senate amendment reduces this period to three years; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1126: This amendment empowers the Legislature of Porto Rico to impose duties upon coffee imported into Porto Rico, including coffee produced in a foreign country coming into Porto Rico from the United States. The duties, less the cost of collection, are to be covered into the treasury of Porto Rico, to be expended as required by law for the government and benefit thereof. The amendment also provides that the United States Customs and Postal Services shall assist the Porto Rican officials in the collection of such duties. The House recedes with amendments providing that the duties may be imposed upon coffee "grown" in a foreign country, instead of coffee "produced," in order that the authority will extend to coffee imported into the United States, processed, and then shipped to Porto Rico, and providing that the duties shall be collected in the manner now provided by law in the case of duties collected in Porto Rico.

On amendment No. 1127: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, with the advice and consent of the President, to enter into reciprocal agreements with foreign countries to provide for the entry free of duty in the respective countries of advertising matter sent to individual addresses. A specific exemption is made in the case of matter printed or produced in a foreign country advertising the sale of articles by persons carrying on business in the United States; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1136: This amendment directs the Tariff Commission to ascertain and report to Congress within eight months from the passage of the act the approximate average cost per barrel to oil refineries on the Atlantic seaboard over a 3-year period of domestic crude pertoleum and the present approximate cost per barrel of crude petroleum from Lake Maracaibo, Venezuela, delivered to the same points; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1137: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1142, 1143, and 1144: The House bill retains the provisions of existing law with respect to appeals from the findings of the Tariff Commission in cases involving unfair practices in the import trade. Such appeals may be taken to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals upon questions of law only, the findings of the commission as to the facts being conclusive if supported by evidence. The Senate amendments provide in effect for an appeal from the findings of the commission on questions both of law and fact; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1145: The House bill retains the provision of existing law which permits a review by the United States Supreme Court upon certiorari of a judgment of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in cases involving unfair practices in the import trade. The Senate amendment eliminates the provision relating to such review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, leaving the judgment of the United

States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals final and not subject to review; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1146: The Senate amendment provides that before any article is excluded from entry because of unfair practices in connection with its importation or sale the domestic manufacturer or producer who files a complaint with the commission, or whose rights are injured, shall furnish a bond to protect the persons who suffer damages because of such exclusion in the event the complaint is determined to be unfounded. Suits for recovery upon such bonds may be maintained in district courts of the United States; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1147: The House bill provides that the decision of the President as to the exclusion from entry of any article under section 337 shall be conclusive. The Senate amendment eliminates this provision; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1148: The House bill provides that in cases where the President has reason to believe that attempts are being made to enter articles in violation of section 337 but has not sufficient information to satisfy himself of the violation, he may request the Secretary of the Treasury to forbid entry pending investigation, but that the Secretary may permit entry under bond. The Senate amendment provides that in all such cases the articles shall be entitled to entry under bond; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1149: The Senate amendment defines the term "United States" as used in sections 337, 338, and 340 in order to make it clear that the benefits of such sections extend to Porto Rico; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1150: The Senate amendment restores the definition of "foreign country" contained in existing law, for the purpose of clarity; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1152: This amendment directs the Tariff Commission to convert the rates imposed by the present bill to rates based upon "domestic value," defined by the amendment as the wholesale selling price in the United States of such or similar imported merchandise, or, if none such, then an estimated value based on the wholesale selling price in the United States of comparable merchandise, with necessary adjustments for differences. The action of the commission is to be based upon importations during the period from July 1, 1927, to June 30, 1929, and the commission is directed to report back to Congress the result of its work as soon as practicable, but in no event later than January 1, 1932. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce are directed to furnish to the commission, upon request, any data or information in their respective departments relating to the importation, entry, appraisement, and classification of merchandise and the collection of duties thereon. The House recedes with an amendment extending the time within which the commission shall report until July 1, 1932.

On amendment No. 1153: The Senate amendment establishes the office of consumers' counsel to represent the interests of the consuming public in proceedings before the Tariff Commission; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1154: The Senate amendment makes it unlawful for any person to interfere with or influence any member or employee of the Tariff Commission in the execution of the functions of the commission, and imposes a penalty for violations; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1155: A similar amendment is discussed under amendment No. 1; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1158: The House bill made the determination of the appraiser that foreign or export value could not be ascertained final and conclusive, subject only to appeal to the Secretary of the Treasury. The Senate amendment eliminates this provision. The House recedes with an amendment providing, in lieu of the provision proposed by the House, that the decision of the appraiser that foreign value, export value, or United States value can not be ascertained shall be subject to review in reappraisement proceedings; but in any such proceeding, an affidavit executed outside of the United States shall not be admitted in evidence if executed by any person who fails to permit a Treasury attaché to inspect his books, papers, records, accounts, documents, or correspondence pertaining to the value or classification of the merchandise.

On amendments Nos. 1159 and 1160: These amendments make clerical changes; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1161: "United States value" is defined in existing law as the freely offered wholesale price of "such or similar" merchandise, in the principal market of the United States, with deductions for duty, a commission (not to exceed 6 per cent), or profits (not to exceed 8 per cent), and certain costs and expenses. The House bill enlarged this definition so as to permit (in any case where a United States value as now defined could not be ascertained) an estimated value based upon the domestic wholesale selling price of a domestic or imported article comparable in construction or use, with appropriate adjustments for differences between the imported article and the article used as a basis for the comparison. The Senate amendment restores the existing law; and the House recedes with an amendment changing the subdivision letter.

On amendments Nos. 1162 and 1163: These amendments make clerical changes; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1164: This amendment extends the provisions of existing law, continued in the House bill, authorizing overtime compensation for certain customs officers and employees assigned to duty in connection with lading or unlading at night or on Sunday or a holiday, to customs officers and employees assigned to duty at night or on Sunday or a holiday in connection with the entering or clearing of vessels or the issuing or recording of their marine documents or other instruments. The extra compensation is payable by the carrier in the same manner and upon the same terms and conditions as now provided by law in the case of the officers and employees now entitled to receive extra compensation; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1165: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1166: This amendment provides that if articles named under Title II of the act, imported in railroad freight cars from a contiguous foreign country, are subjected to inspection, all expense incident to the movement of the car to and from the place of inspection, unloading and reloading of the car, or expense otherwise made necessary by the inspection, shall be paid by the Government, provided the inspection disclosed no evidence of intention to evade the customs laws, or of a purpose to introduce articles the admission of which is punishable by law; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1167: Under existing law, the cost of equipment and repair parts or materials for, and repairs upon, vessels documented under the laws of the United States, purchased or made in a foreign country, are dutiable unless the owner or master furnishes good and sufficient evidence that the vessel, while in the regular course of her voyage, was compelled to put into a foreign port and purchase such equipment, parts, or materials, or make such repairs, to secure the safety of the vessel to enable her to reach her port of destination. The House bill extended this provision so as to permit an exemption if the equipment or material was purchased or the expense of repairs incurred to maintain the vessel in a seaworthy condition, or to repair damages suffered or to replace equipment damaged or worn out during the voyage, or to maintain such vessel in a sanitary and proper condition for the carriage of cargo or passengers. The Senate amendment restores existing law except that the exemption may be granted only if the equipment or repairs are to secure the "safety and seaworthiness" of the vessel to enable her to reach her port of destination; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1168: The House bill authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to provide by regulations for such exceptions from or additions to the requirements as to the contents of the invoice as he might deem advisable. The Senate amendment eliminates this provision; and the House recedes with an amendment restoring the provision for making exceptions but striking out the authority to provide for additions.

On amendment No. 1169: The House bill provides that invoices for merchandise shipped to the United States from the Philippine Islands or any of its other possessions may be certified by the collector of customs or the person acting as such, or by his deputy. The Senate amendment specifies the other possessions to which this provision is applicable, but omits Porto Rico, which is a customs collection district and is treated as part of the United States for tariff purposes; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1170: The House bill provided that a person making entry on a duplicate bill of lading should be the sole consignee. The Senate amendment makes this provision applicable with respect to a person making entry on a carrier's certificate. This was made necessary by the action of the Senate (amendment No. 1175) permitting entry on a carrier's certificate. The House recedes, in accordance with the action of the conferees on amendment numbered 1175.

On amendment No. 1172: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1173: The House bill provides that the requirements as to production of the original bill of lading shall not apply in the case of an entry on a duplicate bill of lading. The Senate amendment extends the exception to entry on carrier's certificate (see amendment No. 1175). The House recedes, in accordance with the action of the conferees on amendment numbered 1175.

On amendment No. 1174: This amendment subjects to a penalty of $50 any person making entry who fails to comply with the law requiring the attachment as a part of the entry or the inclusion therein of an accurate statement specifying, in terms of the official statistical enumeration, the kinds and quantities of all merchandise imported and the value of the total quantity of each kind of article; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1175: The House bill retained the provisions of existing law relating to entry upon the original bill of lading but provided an alternative method, permitting entry on a duplicate bill of lading signed or certified to be genuine by the issuing carrier. The House bill further provided that no merchandise so entered should be released from customs custody except to such carrier but that the person so making entry should be liable for the payment of all additional and increased duties. The Senate amendment preserves in substance the House provision except that the duplicate bill of lading must be signed or certified by the carrier bringing the merchandise to the port at which entry is to be made, instead of the issuing carrier, and the provision making the person who makes entry liable for all additional and increased duties is omitted. The Senate amendment added a third method for making entry, namely, by a person certified by the carrier to be the owner or consignee of the merchandise or an agent thereof. The Senate amendment further provides that merchandise shall be released from customs custody only to or upon the order of the carrier bringing the merchandise to the port at which entry is made, except that merchandise in a bonded warehouse shall be released only to or upon the order of the warehouse proprietor; and that if entry is upon an original bill of lading it shall be returned to the person making entry. The collector is relieved of all liability in respect of the delivery of merchandise released from customs custody in accordance with the above provisions; and if recovery should be had in any suit or proceeding against a collector in respect of release of merchandise, in the performance of his official duty, and if the court certifies that there was probable cause or that the collector acted under orders of the Secretary of the Treasury or other proper officer, no execution shall issue but the amount recovered shall be paid out of the Treasury. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1176 and 1177: Under existing law and the House bill a consignee is not liable for any additional or increased duties if he files the so-called owner's declaration. The Senate amendments provide in addition that the consignee shall not be liable for any other obligation or liability stipulated in any bond given at the time of entry if he files a supplemental bond of the owner conditioned that he will assume the liability of the consignee under the latter's bond; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1178: Under the House bill there could be no amendment of entry after the invoice or the merchandise comes under the observation of the appraiser, assistant appraiser, examiner, or examiner's clerk, or any person acting as such; except that in the case of articles dutiable under paragraph 27 or 28 amendment of entry may be made at any time before the invoice or the merchandise comes under the observation of the appraiser. The Senate amendment adopts existing law which permits amendment in any case at any time before the invoice or the merchandise has come under the observation of the appraiser; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1180: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1181: This amendment, which strikes out the requirement of notice of appraisement where the appraisement is made on a basis of value different from the basis stated in the entry, and the exception subjecting the ordinary reappraisement proceedings to the provisions relating to review of the appraiser's decision by the Secretary of the Treasury, was made necessary by the action of the Senate (amendment No. 1158) giving finality to the appraiser's decision in certain cases. The House recedes, in accordance with the action of the conferees on amendment No. 1158.

On amendment No. 1182: The House bill provides that the judge of the United States Customs Court shall determine the dutiable value of the merchandise. The judge is guided by the same definition of value as the appraiser and to avoid confusion the Senate amendment strikes out the word "dutiable"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1183: This amendment changes the designation "special agents" to "customs agents"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1184: The House bill required the appraiser to report the value of the merchandise within 120 days after entry but provided that the Secretary of the Treasury might, upon application, grant such extension as he deemed necessary. The Senate amendment strikes out this provision; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1185 and 1186: These amendments make clerical changes which are necessary in connection with amendment No. 1184; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1187 and 1188: The House bill permits entry at a higher value because of advances by the appraiser in similar cases pending on request for review by the Secretary of the Treasury. These amendments, made necessary by the action of the Senate (amendment No. 1158) relating to finality of the appraiser's decision, strike out the House provision; and the House recedes, in accordance with the action of the conferees on amendment No. 1158.

On amendment No. 1189: The House bill permits liquidation in accordance with the final appraisement in the case of entry pending reappraisement if the action was taken in good faith, after due diligence on the part of the importer. The Senate amendment eliminates the requirement of due diligence; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1190: The House bill made the entered value the final appraised value in case of failure of the appraiser to make return within the period prescribed. The Senate amendment, in conformity with the action of the Senate (amendment No. 1184) striking out the time limit on the appraiser's return, strikes out the House provision; and the House recedes, in accordance with the action of the conferees on amendment No. 1184.

On amendments Nos. 1191, 1192, and 1193: These amendments make clerical changes, necessary by reason of the Senate action (amendment No. 1184) striking out the time limit on the appraiser's return; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1194, 1195, 1196, and 1197: The House bill authorizes allowance in the estimation and liquidation of duties where the importer abandons to the United States, within 10 days after entry in case of merchandise not sent to the appraiser's stores, or within 10 days after release in the case of examination packages, any merchandise representing 5 per cent or more of the total value of merchandise of the same class or kind entered in the invoice and, within the 10-day period, delivers the portion so abandoned to such place as the collector directs. The effect of the Senate amendments is to increase this period to 30 days; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1198: This amendment permits authorized representatives of American labor organizations or associations, in respect of merchandise in the manufacture or production of which members of such organizations or associations take part, to complain, appeal, or protest in respect of the appraisement or classification of merchandise in the same manner as American manufacturers, producers, and wholesalers; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1199: This amendment transfers all functions of the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the appointment and fixing of the compensation of clerks and other employees of the United States Customs Court, and with respect to the official records, papers, office equipment, and other property of such court, to the Attorney General, and transfers to the Department of Justice all unexpended amounts allotted for the expenses of operation of the United States Customs Court from any appropriation for collecting the revenue from customs; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1200: The effect of this amendment is to exclude the time during which a protest is pending from the computation of the 2-year period within which reliquidation may be had on account of fraud; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1201: The House bill authorized the detail to the District of Columbia from the field force of the Customs Service of not to exceed eight persons in connection with the enforcement of the act. The Senate amendment increases the number to 10; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1202 and 1203: These amendments make clerical changes; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1204. Under existing law and the House bill the importation of merchandise bearing an American trademark owned by a citizen or corporation of the United States and registered by a person domiciled in the United States is prohibited unless written consent of the owner of the trademark is produced at the time of making entry. The Senate

amendment eliminates the provision relating to the consent of the owner, the effect of which is to absolutely prohibit the importation of such merchandise; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1205: This amendment prohibits the importation of merchandise of foreign manufacture if the merchandise, or the package in which it is inclosed, bears a notice of patent under the laws of the United States; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1206 and 1207: These amendments make clerical changes; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1208 and 1209: These amendments make it certain that the injunction proceedings contained in the present law and the House bill for violation of the prohibition against importation of merchandise bearing an American trademark shall not be extended to the case of merchandise bearing American patent notice (see amendment No. 1205); and the Senate recedes, in conformity with the action of the conferees on amendments Nos. 1204 and 1205.

On amendment No. 1210: The House bill added a new provision prohibiting the importation of wild mammals or birds, or parts or products thereof, from any country having restrictive laws or regulations in respect of the taking, killing, possession, or exportation to the United States of any such wild mammals or birds, or the exportation to the United States of any part or product thereof, unless accompanied by the certification of the American consul for the district in which is located the port or place from which the mammal or bird was exported from such country, that such articles have not been acquired or exported in violation of the laws or regulations of the country from which they come. Exceptions are made in the case of prohibited importations, articles imported for scientific or educational purposes, and migratory game birds taken during the open season by bona fide sportsmen. The Senate amendment strikes out the House provision (see discussion under amendment No. 1211); and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1211: This amendment restores in substance the language of the House bill stricken out by Senate action in amendment No. 1210 (with certain changes in phraseology), except that the matter restored refers to laws of a foreign country restricting exportation generally and does not specify exportation to the United States. Since it is clear that a general restriction on exportation would include exportation to the United States, the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1212: Under existing law and the House bill merchandise may be entered, under Treasury regulations, at the port of arrival, for transportation in bond without appraisement to any other designated port, there to be entered in accordance with the provisions relating to entry generally. The Senate amendment strikes out this provision and provides for the transportation in bond, by a bonded carrier, without entry or appraisement, to the designated port, and specifically declares that no entry paper, manifest, or other similar document shall be required to be filed by the importer or consignee in connection with such transportation; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1213, 1215, 1216, 1218, 1219, 1222, and 1224: The warehouse period for all merchandise is fixed in the House bill and existing law at three years. The effect of these amendments is to reduce the period for which grain may be stored in bonded warehouses from 3 years to 10 months. All the legal consequences resulting during or after the 3-year period in the case of other merchandise will, in the case of grain, under the Senate amendments, result during or after, respectively, the 10-month period; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1214, 1217, and 1220: An amendment similar to these amendments is discussed under amendment No. 1; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1221: The House bill limits the time within which "loss, theft, injury, or destruction" of merchandise in bonded warehouse must occur in order that there may be abatement or refund of duties in respect thereof. There is no provision in the bill for abatement or refund in case of loss or theft in bonded warehouse, and this amendment clarifies the language of the House provision accordingly by striking out the words "loss" and "theft"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1223: The House bill provided that no abatement or refund shall be made in respect of the injury or destruction of merchandise in bonded warehouse occurring after the expiration of three years from the date of importation, or in any case after the expiration of 24 hours after issuance of a permit for removal. The Senate amendment strikes out the latter limitation; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1225: Under existing law if any merchandise is found on board of or after having been unladen from any vessel or vehicle, which is not included or described in the manifest or does not agree therewith, the master of the vessel or the person in charge of the vehicle is liable to a penalty equal to the value of the merchandise so found or unladen. The House bill extended this liability to the owner of the vessel or vehicle. The Senate amendment strikes out the provision imposing the penalty upon the owner; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1226: Under existing law if any merchandise described in the manifest is not found on board the vessel or vehicle the master or other person in charge is subject to a penalty of $500. The House bill extended this liability to the owner of the vessel or vehicle. The Senate amendment strikes out the provision imposing the penalty upon the owner; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1227: Under existing law (sec. 594, tariff act of 1922) and the House bill (sec. 594) a common-carrier vessel is not liable to seizure or forfeiture to recover penalties for violation of the customs laws unless it appears that the owner or master of the vessel was at the time of the alleged illegal act a consenting party or privy thereto. The House bill provided that where the merchandise found on board or after being unladen, unmanifested, is smoking opium, the penalty of $25 per ounce for which the master or owner is liable shall constitute a lien upon the vessel which may be enforced by a libel in rem, notwithstanding the above provision as to common carriers. The Senate amendment makes an exception and provides that the master or owner of a common-carrier vessel shall not be liable to the penalty, and the vessel not held subject to the lien, if it appears to the satisfaction of the court that neither the master nor any of the officers nor the owner knew, and could not, by the exercise of the highest degree of care and diligence, have known, that the opium was on board; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1228: This amendment provides that for the purposes of the act smoking opium and other narcotic drugs not possessed by a person registered and lawfully authorized to possess the same shall be considered excisable merchandise upon which the duties have not been paid, or which has been brought into the United States contrary to law; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1229: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1230 and 1231: The effect of these amendments is to authorize the court, in forfeiture proceedings under the customs laws, upon request of the Secretary of the Treasury, to provide in its decree for the delivery to the Secretary of the Treasury of the vessel, vehicle, merchandise, or baggage forfeited, for sale by the Secretary of the Treasury in any customs district in which the sale thereof may be permitted; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1232: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1233 and 1234: These amendments change the designation "special agent" to "customs agent"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1235: The House bill makes a permanent and indefinite appropriation for the payment of awards of compensation to informers. The Senate amendment strikes out this provision and restores existing law, which provides that such awards shall be paid from moneys appropriated for that purpose, requiring estimates in advance and specific appropriation. The House recedes with an amendment providing that such awards shall be paid from any appropriations available for the collection of the revenue from customs.

On amendment No. 1236: The House bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury by regulations to require the production of landing certificate in the case of merchandise exported from the United States. The Senate amendment extends this authority to cargo destined to ports in the United States other than the port of entry at which the vessel first arrived; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1237: The 1922 act, in addition to the specific powers conferred by the act, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to make such rules and regulations as "may be necessary" to carry out the provisions of the act. Under the regulation section of the House bill the Secretary was authorized to make such rules and regulations as "he may deem necessary." The Senate amendment restores the language of the existing law; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1238: Under the House bill the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to make general regulations to carry out the act was extended to include regulations "to protect the customs revenue." The Senate amendment eliminates this provision; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1239: Under existing law the Secretary of the Treasury may revoke the license of a customhouse broker subject to a statutory review of the Secretary's decision

by the United States district court. The House bill authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to provide for suspension or revocation but gave no statutory court review. The Senate amendment permits the broker to obtain a review of the Secretary's decision as to revocation or suspension in the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals; and the House recedes with an amendment providing that the review shall be by the United States Customs Court.

On amendment No. 1240: The House bill requests the President to make a survey, by such agency or agencies as he may designate or appoint, of bases of valuation for assessment of duties, particularly with a view to determining the extent to which values in the United States may properly be used as a basis, and to submit a report to Congress with such recommendations for legislation as he deems advisable, including such formulæ as he may propose for adjusting the rates of duty imposed by this act to conform to any change in basis he may recommend. The Senate amendment directs the Tariff Commission to make the investigation and broadens its scope, requiring a detailed consideration of existing customs practice, specific difficulties met with, and the indicated remedies. In addition, the Treasury Department is requested to make a complete investigation of undervaluation under the tariff act of 1922. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1241: The House bill authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to the air commerce act of 1926, to provide by regulations for the application to civil air navigation of any of the provisions of the act or regulations promulgated thereunder relating to customs administration. The Senate amendment extends this provision to include authority in the Secretary of Commerce to provide in like manner for the application of the provisions or regulations relating to the entry and clearance of vessels; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1242: The House bill amended the customs reorganization act of March 4, 1923, so as to authorize the payment of the travel and subsistence expenses of the families of customs officers and employees on official transfers in foreign countries, and the expense of transporting the remains of customs officers and employees who die while in, or in transit to, foreign countries in the discharge of official duty, to this country for interment, and the ordinary and necessary expenses of such interment. The Senate amendment (a) rephrases and clarifies this provision without reenacting the provisions of the 1923 act, so as to avoid any possible doubt of the application of the subsistence expense act of 1926, which has superseded the 1923 act in some respects. The Senate amendment (b) also removes the limitation on the amount of household effects and personal property for the transfer of which allowance may be made on official transfers of customs officers and employees. Under existing law no allowance may be credited for travel or shipping expenses incurred on a foreign ship by a customs officer or employee except upon proof satisfactory to the Comptroller General of the necessity of incurring such expenses. The Senate amendment (c) requires the crediting of allowances in such cases if the Secretary of the Treasury certifies to the Comptroller General that transportation on such foreign ship was necessary to protect the revenue. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 1243: Section 195 of the Judicial Code provides that final decisions of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, in cases appealed from the Customs Court, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court upon application by either party, in any case in which a constitutional or treaty question is involved, or in any other case if the Attorney General files a certificate to the effect that the case is of such importance as to render expedient its review by the Supreme Court. The Senate amendment repeals this limitation, the effect of such repeal being to permit either party to apply in his own discretion; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1244: The effect of this amendment is to make uncertified checks, United States notes, and national bank notes receivable in payment of customs duties; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1245: This amendment provides that "customs attachés" shall hereafter be known as "Treasury attachés"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1246: This amendment authorizes the appointment of an additional deputy commissioner of customs; and the House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 1247, 1249, 1250, and 1251: These make changes in section numbers; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1248: The House bill repealed the provisions of existing law requiring that importation packages of cigars shall contain not less than 3,000. The Senate amendment strikes out this repealing provision; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1252: This amendment changes the year specified in the short title from "1929" to "1930"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1253: The Senate amendment provides for the suspension by the President of the duties upon imported articles whenever the United States Customs Court finds that full conditions of unrestrained competition among domestic producers and distributors of such articles do not prevail. Complaints may be filed in such court by any citizen of the United States or by the consumer's counsel (see amendment No. 1153) alleging that such conditions of competition do not prevail with respect to the production, distribution, or sale of any dutiable articles. Upon the filing of any such complaint the court causes notice to be given by publication through the Treasury Decisions and Commerce Reports that it will hold a hearing on a specified date when relevant testimony and argument may be offered. Following the hearing the court reports its findings to the President. If the findings show that such conditions of competition do not prevail the President is required to issue a proclamation within one month suspending the duties upon the articles in question. The suspension continues until it is established before the court, and the court finds, that such full conditions of competition have been restored. The court is given power to make reasonable rules and regulations governing its procedure. The Senate recedes.

W. C. HAWLEY,
ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
ISAAC BACHARACH,
Managers on the part of the House.

[H. Rept. No. 1893]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the following numbered amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, namely: Amendments numbered 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 65, 66, 67, 364, 371, 374, 375, 377, 379, 380, 381, 383, 385, 386, 387, 885, 893, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 940, 942, 945, 946, 947, 948, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 987, 989, 992, 993, 995, 997, 999, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1006, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1031, 1032, 1033, 1034, 1036, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1046, 1047, 1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1055, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1064, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1082, 1085, 1086, 1087, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1093, 1094, 1095, 1096, 1098, 1099, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, 1109, 1111, 1112, 1128, 1129, 1130, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1134, 1135, 1138, 1139, 1140, 1141, 1151, 1156, 1157, 1171, and 1179, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 364, 885, 893, 903, 904, 1004, 1006, 1095, 1128, 1134, 1138, 1139, 1141, and 1156.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 65, 66, 67, 374, 375, 377, 379, 380, 381, 383, 385, 386, 387, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 901, 902, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 940, 942, 945, 946, 947, 948, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 1091, 1093, 1129, 1132, and 1133, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 371: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 371, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 401. Timber hewn, sided, or squared, otherwise than by sawing, and round timber used for spars or in building wharves; sawed lumber and timber not specially provided for; all the foregoing, if of fir, spruce, pine, hemlock, or larch, $1 per thousand feet, board measure, and in estimating board measure for the purposes of this paragraph no deduction shall be made on account of planing, tonguing, and grooving: *Provided*, That there shall be exempted from such duty boards, planks and deals of fir, spruce, pine, hemlock or larch, in the rough or not fur-

ther manufactured than planed or dressed on one side, when imported from a country contiguous to the Continental United States, which country admits free of duty similar lumber imported from the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 969: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 969, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1709"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 970: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 970, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1710"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 971: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 971, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1711"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 972: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 972, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1712"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 973: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 973, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1713"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 974: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 974, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1714"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 975: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 975, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1715"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 976: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 976, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1716"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 977: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 977, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1717"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 978: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 978, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1718"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 979: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 979, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1719"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 980: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 980, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1720"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 981: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 981, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1721"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 982: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 982, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1722"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 983: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 983, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 1723. Muzzle-loading muskets, shotguns, rifles, and parts thereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 984: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 984, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1724"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 985: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 985, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1725"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 987: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 987, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1726"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 989: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 989, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1727"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 992: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 992, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1728. Nux vomica, gentian, sarsaparilla root, belladonna, henbane, stramonium, and ergot"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 993: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 993, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1729"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 995: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 995, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 997: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 997, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1731"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 999: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 999, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1732"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1002: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1002, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1733"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1003: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1003, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1734"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1008: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1008, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1735"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1009: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1009, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1736"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1010: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1010, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1737"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1012: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1012, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1738"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1013: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1013, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1739"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1014: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1014,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1015: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1015, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1741"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1016: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1016, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1742"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1017: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1017, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1743"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1018: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1018, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1744"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1019: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1019, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1745"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1020: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1020, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1746"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1021: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1021, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1747"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1022: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1022, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1748"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1023: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1023, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1749"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1024: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1024, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1025: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1025, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1751"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1026: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1026, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1752"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1027: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1027, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1753"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1028: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1028, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1754"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1029: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1029, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1755"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1031: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1031, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1756. Sea herring, smelts, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1032: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1032, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1757. Cowpeas not specially provided for, and sugar"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1033: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1033, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1758"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1034: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1034, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1759"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1036: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1036, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1761"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1037: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1037, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1762"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1038: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1038, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1763"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1039: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1039, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1764"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1040: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1040, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1765"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1041: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1041, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1766"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1046: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1046, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1767"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1047: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1047, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 1768. Spices and spice seeds:

"(1) Cassia, cassia buds, and cassia vera; cloves; clove stems; cinnamon and cinnamon chips; ginger root, not preserved or candied; mace; nutmegs; black or white pepper; and pimento (allspice); all the foregoing, if unground.

"(2) Anise; caraway; cardamom; coriander; cummin; and fennel."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1048: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1048, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1769"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1049: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1049, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1770"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1050: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1050, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1771"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1051: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1051, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1772"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1052: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1052, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1773"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1053: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1053, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1774"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1055. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1055, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1775"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1057: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1057, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1776"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1058: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1058, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1777"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1059: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1059, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1778"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1060: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1060, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1779"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1061: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1061, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1062: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1062, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1781"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1063: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1063, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1782"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1064: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1064, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1783. (a) Impure tea, tea waste, and tea siftings and sweepings, for manufacturing purposes in bond, pursuant to the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea,' approved March 2, 1897, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

"(b) Tea."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1066: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1066, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1784"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1067: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1067, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1785"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1068: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1068, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1786"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1070: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1070, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1787"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1071: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1071, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 1788. Triffles, fresh, or dried or otherwise prepared or preserved."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1072: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1072, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1789"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1074: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1074, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1075: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1075, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1791"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1076: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1076, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1792"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1077: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1077, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1793"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1078: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1078, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1794"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1079: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1079, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1795"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1080: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1080, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1796"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1081: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1081, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1797"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1082: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1082, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1798"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1085: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1085, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1799"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1086: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1086, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1087: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1087, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1801"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1089: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1089, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1802" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1090: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1090, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1803"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1094: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1094, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1804"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1096: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1096, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1805"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1098: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1098, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1806"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1099: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1099, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1807"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1808"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1809"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1105, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1811"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAR. 1812. Gobelin tapestries used as wall hangings."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1813"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1112, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "1814"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1130: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1130, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert a comma and the following: "but in no event for longer than 90 days after the effective date of this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert: "No person shall be eligible for appointment as a commissioner unless he is a citizen of the United States, and, in the judgment of the President, is possessed of qualifications requisite for developing expert knowledge of tariff problems and efficiency in administering the provisions of Part II of this title. Not more than three of the commissioners shall be members of the same political party, and in making appointments members of different political parties shall be appointed alternately as nearly as may be practicable" and a period; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "$11,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1140, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 336. Equalization of costs of production: (a) Change of classification or duties.—In order to put into force and effect the policy of Congress by this act intended, the commission (1) upon request of the President, or (2) upon resolution of either or both Houses of Congress, or (3) upon its own motion, or (4) when in the judgment of the commission there is good and sufficient reason therefor, upon application of any interested party, shall investigate the differences in the costs of production of any domestic article and of any like or similar foreign article. In the course of the investigation the commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings. The commission is authorized to adopt such reasonable procedure and rules and regulations as it deems necessary to execute its functions under this section. The commission shall report to the President the results of the investigation and its findings with respect to such differences in costs of production. If the commission finds it shown by the investigation that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize the differences in the costs of production of the domestic article and the like or similar foreign article when produced in the principal competing country, the commission shall specify in its report such increases or decreases in rates of duty expressly fixed by statute (including any necessary change in classification) as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences. In no case shall the total increase or decrease of such rates of duty exceed 50 per cent of the rates expressly fixed by statute.

"(b) Change to American selling price: If the commission finds upon any such investigation that such differences can not be equalized by proceeding as hereinbefore provided, it shall so state in its report to the President and shall specify therein such ad valorem rates of duty based upon the American selling price (as defined in section 402 (g)) of the domestic article, as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences. In no case shall the total decrease of such rates of duty exceed 50 per cent of the rates expressly fixed by statute, and no such rate shall be increased.

"(c) Proclamation by the President: The President shall by proclamation approve the rates of duty and changes in classification and in basis of value specified in any report of the commission under this section, if in his judgment such rates of duty and changes are shown by such investigation of the commission to be necessary to equalize such differences in costs of production.

"(d) Effective date of rates and changes: Commencing 30 days after the date of any presidential proclamation of approval the increased or decreased rates of duty and changes in classification or in basis of value specified in the report of the commission shall take effect.

"(e) Ascertainment of differences in costs of production: In ascertaining under this section the differences in costs of production, the commission shall take into consideration, in so far as it finds it practicable:

"(1) In the case of a domestic article: (A) The cost of production as hereinafter in this section defined; (B) transportation costs and other costs incident to delivery to the principal market or markets of the United States for the article; and (C) other relevant factors that constitute an advantage or disadvantage in competition.

"(2) In the case of a foreign article: (A) The cost of production as hereinafter in this section defined, or, if the commission finds that such cost is not readily ascertainable, the commission may accept as evidence thereof, or as supplemental thereto, the weighted average of the invoice prices or values for a representative period and/or the average wholesale selling price for a representative period (which price shall be that at which the article is freely offered for sale to all purchasers in the principal market or markets of the principal competing country or countries in the ordinary course of trade and in the usual wholesale quantities in such market or markets); (B) transportation costs and other costs incident to delivery to the principal market or markets of the United States for the article; (C) other relevant factors that constitute an advantage or disadvantage in competition, including advantages granted to the foreign producers by a government, person, partnership, corporation, or association in a foreign country.

"(f) Modification of changes in duty: Any increased or decreased rate of duty or change in classification or in basis of value which has taken effect as above provided may be modified or terminated in the same manner and subject to the same conditions and limitations (including time of taking effect) as is provided in this section in the case of original increases, decreases, or changes.

"(g) Prohibition against transfers from the free list to the dutiable list or from the dutiable list to the free list: Nothing

in this section shall be construed to authorize a transfer of an article from the dutiable list to the free list or from the free list to the dutiable list, nor a change in form of duty. Whenever it is provided in any paragraph of Title I of this act, or in any amendatory act, that the duty or duties shall not exceed a specified ad valorem rate upon the articles provided for in such paragraph, no rate determined under the provisions of this section upon such articles shall exceed the maximum ad valorem rate so specified.

"(h) Definitions: For the purpose of this section—

"(1) The term 'domestic article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term 'foreign article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country.

"(2) The term 'United States' includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia.

"(3) The term 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions).

"(4) The term 'cost of production,' when applied with respect to either a domestic article or a foreign article, includes, for a period which is representatitve of conditions in production of the article: (A) The price or cost of materials, labor costs, and other direct charges incurred in the production of the article and in the processes or methods employed in its production; (B) the usual general expenses, including charges for depreciation or depletion which are representative of the equipment and property employed in the production of the article and charges for rent or interest which are representative of the cost of obtaining capital or instruments of production; and (C) the cost of containers and coverings of whatever nature, and other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing the article in condition packed ready for delivery.

"(i) Rules and regulations of President: The President is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out his functions under the provisions of this section.

"(j) Rules and regulations of Secretary of Treasury.—The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles of the class or kind of articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (b) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry.

"(k) Investigations prior to enactment of act.—All uncompleted investigations instituted prior to the approval of this act under the provisions of section 315 of the tariff act of 1922, including investigations in which the President has not proclaimed changes in classification or in basis of value or increases or decreases in rates of duty, shall be dismissed without prejudice; but the information and evidence secured by the commission in any such investigation may be given due consideration in any investigation instituted under the provisions of this section."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1151: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1151, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 339. Effect of reenactment of existing law: Notwithstanding the repeal by section 651 of the laws relating to the United States Tariff Commission and their reenactment in sections 330 to 338, inclusive, with modifications, the unexpended balances of appropriations available for the commission at the time this section takes effect shall remain available for the commission in the administration of its functions under this act; and such repeal and reenactment shall not operate to change the status of the officers and employees under the jurisdiction of the commission at the time this section takes effect. No investigation or other proceeding pending before the commission at such time (other than proceedings under section 315 of the tariff act of 1922) shall abate by reason of such repeal and reenactment, but shall continue under the provisions of this act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1157, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(4) In the case of an article with respect to which there is in effect under section 336 a rate of duty based upon the American selling price of a domestic article, then the American selling price of such article."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1171: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1171, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert "and in subdivision (j) of section 336 of this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1179: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1179, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Furniture described in paragraph 1811 shall enter the United States at ports which shall be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury for this purpose. If any article described in paragraph 1811 and imported for sale is rejected as unauthentic in respect to the antiquity claimed as a basis for free entry, there shall be imposed, collected, and paid on such article, unless exported under customs supervision, a duty of 25 per cent of the value of such article in addition to any other duty imposed by law upon such article."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. C. HAWLEY,
ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
ISAAC BACHARACH,
Managers on the part of the House.

REED SMOOT,
JAMES E. WATSON,
SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, specified in the accompanying conference report, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following amendments make changes in paragraph numbers, and the House recedes with amendments making further changes in paragraph numbers: 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 984, 985, 987, 989, 993, 995, 997, 999, 1002, 1003, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1033, 1034, 1036, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1046, 1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1055, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1070, 1072, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1082, 1085, 1086, 1087, 1089, 1090, 1094, 1096, 1098, 1099, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, 1111, and 1112.

The following amendments made changes in references to paragraph numbers, and the House recedes: 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 65, 66, 67, 374, 375, 377, 379, 380, 381, 383, 385, 386, 387, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 902, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 913, 915, 916, 917, 920, 921, 922, 923, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 935, 936, 937, 940, 942, 945, 946, 947, 948, 951, 952, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 963, 965, and 966.

On amendments Nos. 364, 885, 903, 904, 1004, and 1006: Amendment No. 364 imposes on silver-bearing ores and mattes a duty of 30 cents per ounce on the silver contained therein and on silver bullion or base bullion, silver dross, reclaimed silver, scrap silver, all alloys or combinations containing more than 5 ounces of silver per ton, not specially provided for, a duty of 30 cents per ounce on the silver contained therein, with a proviso that this duty shall not apply to minted coins of the United States, or circulating minted coins of a foreign government in the possession of an individual not in excess of $100 in exchange value. Amendments Nos. 885, 903, 904, 1004, and 1006 make necessary changes in the free list; and the Senate recedes on all these amendments.

On amendments Nos. 371, 1091, 1093, and 1095: Amendment No. 371 imposes on timber hewn, sided, or squared otherwise than by sawing, and round timber used for spars or in building wharves; sawed lumber and timber not specially provided for; all the foregoing, if of fir, spruce, pine, hemlock, or larch; railroad ties, and telephone, telegraph, trolley, and electric-light poles of any wood, a duty of $1.50 per thousand feet board measure, but the amendment further provides that there shall be exempted from such duty boards, planks, and deals of fir, spruce, pine, hemlock, or larch, in the rough or not further manufactured than planed or dressed on one side, when imported from a country contiguous to the continental United States, which country admits free of duty similar lumber im-

ported from the United States. Amendments Nos. 1091 and 1093 make changes in the free list to carry out the imposition of this duty and amendment No. 1095 strikes from the free list railroad ties and telephone, telegraph, trolley, and electric-light poles of any wood. The House recedes on amendments Nos. 1091 and 1093 and recedes on amendment No. 371 with an amendment making the rate $1 per thousand feet board measure and striking out the duty on railroad ties and telephone, telegraph, trolley, and electric-light poles of any wood. The Senate recedes on amendment No. 1095.

On amendment No. 885: See amendment No. 364. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 893: This amendment places on the free list Roman, Portland, and other hydraulic cement and cement clinker imported by or for the use of, or for sale to, a State, county, parish, city, town, municipality, or political subdivision of government thereof, for public purposes; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 901: The House bill placed coffee on the free list. This amendment excepts from free entry coffee imported into Porto Rico in the event that a duty is imposed thereon under authority of section 319, which section is inserted in Title III of the bill by amendment No. 1126, upon which the House has receded with certain amendments. The managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of this amendment, but were unable to recede on account of their inability to agree with the managers on the part of the Senate on the paragraph number, due to the fact that certain substantive amendments (e. g., amendment No. 893, the free-list provision as to cement) were in disagreement, and the correct numbering of this paragraph could not be determined until those substantive amendments were disposed of. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 903: See amendment No. 364. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 904: See amendment No. 364. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 914: The House bill exempted from duty metallic mineral substances in a crude state, and metals unwrought, whether capable of being wrought or not, not specially provided for. The Senate amendment confines the exemption to metallic mineral substances in a crude state, such as drosses, skimmings, residues, brass foundry ash, and flue dust, not specially provided for. The managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of this amendment, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 919: The House bill placed upon the free list glaziers' and engravers' diamonds, unset, and miners' diamonds. This amendment also inserts on the free list diamonds and other precious stones, rough or uncut, and not advanced in condition or value from their natural state by cleaving, splitting, cutting, or other process, whether in their natural form or broken. Amendment No. 777 (upon which the House has receded) strikes these articles out of the dutiable list. In accordance with this action the managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of the amendment No. 919, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 934: The House bill provided for the free importation, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Agriculture, of game animals and birds for stocking purposes when imported by United States or State game officials. The Senate amendment extends this provision to such animals and birds imported by other persons, and also permits the free importation of game animals and birds killed in foreign countries by residents of the United States and imported by them for noncommercial purposes. The managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of this amendment, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 950: This amendment places grindstones upon the free list, such stones having been stricken from the dutiable list by amendment No. 249, upon which the House has receded. In accordance with this action, the managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of amendment No. 950, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 953: This amendment places on the free list horses and mules imported for immediate slaughter, which by amendment No. 430 (upon which the House has receded) are excepted from duty under the agricultural schedule. In accordance with this action, the managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of amendment No. 953, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 962: The House bill named as an item on the free list "Junk, old." Most of the articles coming within this designation having been placed on the dutiable list by the House bill or Senate amendments agreed to, or being free under some other paragraph of the free list, the Senate amendment strikes out these words and substitutes the phrase "Waste rope" as being for all substantial purposes the only item left to come under the designation of "Junk, old." The managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of this amendment, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 964: This amendment places on the free list kieserite, which by amendment No. 103 (upon which the House has receded) are excepted from duty under the chemical schedule. In accordance with this action, the managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of amendment No. 964, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 983: This amendment places on the free list muzzle-loading firearms and parts thereof, which by amendment No. 318 (upon which the House has receded) are excepted from duty under the metals schedule. In accordance with this action, the managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of amendment No. 983, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes with an amendment changing the paragraph number.

On amendment No. 992: The Senate by amendments Nos. 73 and 74, having stricken out of the dutiable provisions of the chemical schedule gentian, sarsaparilla root, belladona, digitalis, henbane, stramonium, and ergot, by amendment No. 992 inserted these articles on the free list. On amendments No. 73 and 74 the House agreed to striking from the dutiable list these articles with the exception of digitalis, which under the House bill was dutiable at 25 per cent and which by the action of the conferees on amendment No. 73 was retained in the chemical schedule at 20 per cent. In accordance with this action, the House recedes on amendment No. 992 with amendments striking digitalis from the items inserted on the free list by this amendment and changing the paragraph number. The managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored this action, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number.

On amendment No. 1004: See amendment No. 364. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1006: See amendment No. 364. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1031: This amendment places on the free list sea herring, fresh or frozen, whether or not packed in ice, and whether or not whole, which under the House bill were dutiable under paragraph 717 (a). The managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of this amendment, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes with an amendment changing the paragraph number.

On amendment No. 1032: This amendment places on the free list cowpeas not specially provided for. Senate amendment No. 505 (upon which the House has receded) limited the application of the duties placed by the House on cowpeas to black-eye cowpeas. Amendment No. 1032 also places on the free list chickpeas or garbanzos in pursuance of amendment No. 513 (upon which the Senate has receded) which removed these articles from the dutiable list. In accordance with this action, the House recedes on amendment No. 1032 with amendment striking chickpeas or garbanzos from the items inserted on the free list by this amendment, and changing the paragraph number. The managers on the part of the House at the first

conference favored this action, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number.

On amendment No. 1047: This amendment places on the free list certain spices and spice seeds which the Senate by amendments Nos. 543 to 550, inclusive, and Nos. 552 to 554, inclusive (upon which the House has receded), struck from the dutiable list. In accordance with this action, the managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of amendment No. 1047, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes with an amendment changing the paragraph number.

On amendment No. 1064: This amendment places on the free list impure tea, tea waste, and tea siftings and sweepings, for manufacturing purposes in bond, the Senate having by amendment No. 28 (upon which the House has receded) stricken these articles from the dutiable list. In accordance with this action, the managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of amendment No. 1064, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes with an amendment changing the paragraph number.

On amendment No. 1071: This amendment places on the free list truffles, fresh, or dried or otherwise prepared or preserved, the Senate having by amendment No. 511 (upon which the House has receded) stricken these articles from the dutiable list. In accordance with this action, the managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of amendment No. 1071, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes with an amendment changing the paragraph number.

On amendment No. 1091: See amendment No. 371. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 1093: See amendment No. 371. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 1095: See amendment No. 371. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1109: This amendment places on the free list Gobelin tapestries used as wall hangings, which under the House bill were dutiable according to the component material of chief value. The managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored recession on the part of the House on the substance of amendment No. 1109, but, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, were unable to agree on the paragraph number. The House recedes with an amendment changing the paragraph number.

On amendment No. 1128: The Senate amendment provides that whenever the Federal Farm Board finds it advisable to issue export debentures with respect to any agricultural commodity in order to carry out the policy of the agricultural marketing act the board shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary is then required to issue such debentures at such times as the Federal Farm Board shall prescribe to farmers, cooperative associations, stabilization corporations, or other persons with respect to such quantity of the agricultural commodity or manufactured food products thereof or products manufactured from cotton or tobacco as such person may from time to time export from the United States to any foreign country. The Secretary of the Treasury is to compute the amount of the debenture issued to any person at the debenture rate for the commodity or product in effect at the time of such exportation. Debenture rates are fixed at one-half the rate of duty in effect with respect to imports of the commodities covered by such debentures except that in the case of cotton the debenture rate is to be 2 cents per pound so long as no import duty is imposed upon cotton. The amendment also provides for certain percentages of reduction in debenture rates in case the production of any debenturable agricultural commodity during any crop year has exceeded the average annual production of such commodity for the preceding five years. There is also a provision for making proof that the commodities to be exported and with respect to which debentures are claimed were produced in the United States and have not previously been exported therefrom. The export debentures are transferable by delivery and are to be received at their face value by customs collectors in payment of duties collectible against articles imported by the bearer. In order to prevent speculation in debentures the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized by regulations to provide for their redemption from money derived from the payment of customs duties at a rate of not less than 98 per cent of the face value of the debentures. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1129: The House bill reorganized the Tariff Commission and provided that there should be seven commissioners instead of six. The Senate amendment reduces the number of commissioners to six; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1130: The House bill provided that each present member of the Tariff Commission should continue to serve until his successor takes office. The Senate amendment provides that such members shall not continue to hold office longer than 90 days after the effective date of the act; and the House recedes with an amendment clarifying the language.

On amendment No. 1131: The House bill eliminated the provisions of existing law making the commission bipartisan and provided that no person should be eligible for appointment as a commissioner unless he was a citizen of the United States and in the judgment of the President was "possessed of qualifications requisite for developing expert knowledge of tariff problems and efficiency in administering the provisions of Part II of this title."

The Senate amendment strikes out the House provision relating to qualifications of the commissioners, restores the provisions of existing law relating to the bipartisan character of the commission, and adds a provision that in all its official functions the commission shall act judicially and shall not give any consideration to partisanship or party policy in the determination of matters submitted to it.

The House recedes with an amendment restoring the provision of the House bill relating to the qualifications of the commissioners and adds a provision that not more than three of the commissioners shall be members of the same political party, and that in making appointments members of different political parties shall be appointed alternately as nearly as may be practicable.

On amendments Nos. 1132 and 1133: The House bill provided that the President should designate the terms of office of the first seven commissioners appointed after the date of enactment of the act so that the terms would expire one at the end of each of the first seven years after such date. The terms of office of their successors were fixed at seven years. The Senate amendments substitute six years for seven years in both of these cases to correspond to the reduction in the number of commissioners from seven to six made by amendment 1129; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 1134: This amendment provides that in designating the chairman and vice chairman of the commission, commissioners of different political parties shall be designated alternately; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1135: The House bill fixed the salaries of commissioners at $12,000 a year. The Senate amendment reduces their salaries to $10,000 a year. The House recedes with an amendment fixing the salaries of the commissioners at $11,000 a year.

On amendment No. 1138: The Senate amendment provides that whenever Congress has a tariff measure under consideration, the Tariff Commission shall furnish to Members of Congress, upon request therefor, any information at its command pertaining to the cost of production of domestic manufactured articles; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1139: The Senate amendment provides that the Tariff Commission shall inquire into certain specified matters in connection with any investigation of differences in costs of production and include in its report a summary of the facts with respect thereto; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1140: Section 336 of the House bill retained the power conferred upon the President by section 315 of the tariff act of 1922 to increase or decrease the rates of duty fixed by statute, after investigation by the Tariff Commission and within certain specified limits, whenever readjustments are shown to be necessary as a result of changed business conditions. The principle to which the President must conform in exercising this power was changed under the House bill from the equalization of differences in costs of production of domestic and foreign articles as provided by existing law to the equalization of differences in conditions of competition between such articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. In order to aid the commission in making its investigations, certain factors are specified which are to be taken into consideration in ascertaining whether the domestic and foreign articles are on a competitive level in the domestic market. Certain definitions are also included in the text of the House bill to aid the commission in carrying out its provisions.

The Senate amendment proposes a substitute for section 336 of the House bill. It takes away from the President the power to readjust rates of duty and provides that investigations may be made by the Tariff Commission, either upon its own motion or upon application of any interested party showing good and sufficient reason therefor, to ascertain the differences in the cost of production of domestic and foreign articles. If the commission finds that the rates of duty fixed by law do not equalize such differences, the commission then makes a report to the President and Congress of the increases or decreases it finds to be necessary to equalize such differences. The President is required to transmit to Congress the report of the commission submitted to him, together with his reommendations. Until Congress acts, however, no change in any statutory rate of duty becomes effective with respect to any article investigated by the commission. Certain factors are specified that are to be considered by the commission in ascertaining differences in costs of production.

The House recedes with an amendment which substitutes a new section for both the House text and the Senate amendment. Under this section the Congress, instead of depending upon the President to provide for investigations of the differences in costs of production of domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles, directs the Tariff Commission to act as its agent in undertaking the investigations. Such investigations are to be undertaken in the following cases: (1) Upon request of the President, (2) upon resolution of either or both Houses of Congress, (3) upon its own motion, or (4) when in the judgment of the commission there is good and sufficient reason therefor, upon application of any interested party. The commission is to hold public hearings at which parties interested may be present, produce evidence, and be heard, and is authorized to adopt such reasonable procedure, rules, and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out its functions in connection with such investigations. Upon the completion of any such investigation the commission reports to the President the results thereof, together with its findings with respect to such differences in costs of production. If the commission finds it shown by the investigation that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize the differences in the costs of production of the domestic article and like or similar foreign articles when produced in the principal competing country, the commission specifies in its report to the President such increases or decreases in rates of duty, including any necessary changes in classification, as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences. However, the provision of existing law which limits the total increase or decrease in a rate of duty to 50 per cent of the rate expressly fixed by statute is retained, i. e., the total rate applicable to an imported article as a result of a presidential proclamation or proclamations shall at no time be more than 50 per cent higher or lower than the rate expressly fixed by the then current tariff laws.

In the event that the commission finds upon any such investigation that such differences can not be equalized by proceeding in the manner above indicated, it so states in its report to the President and specifies therein such ad valorem rates of duty based upon the American selling price of the domestic article as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences. In such cases, however, the commission is limited to a total decrease in the rate of duty not exceeding 50 per cent of the rate expressly fixed by statute, and no such statutory rate is to be increased. This provision corresponds to the present law.

The President shall by proclamation approve the rates of duty and the changes in classification or in basis of value specified in the report of the commission, if in his judgment such rates and changes are shown by the investigation of the commission to be necessary to equalize the differences in cost of production. The President may not modify a rate, classification, or basis of value so specified by the commission. If the President adjudges that such specified rates or charges are not so shown to be necessary to equalize such differences, he is not required to act upon the commission's report, and the specified rates or changes do not take effect. On the other hand, if the President makes a proclamation approving the rates or changes specified by the commission, they will take effect commencing 30 days after the date of such proclamation and will supersede the rates, classifications, or bases of value then fixed by law with respect to the articles covered by the proclamation when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the island of Guam.

The section also provides that any increased or decreased rate of duty or change in classification or in basis of value which has taken effect as above provided may be modified or terminated in the same manner and subject to the same conditions and limitations (including time of taking effect) as is provided in the case of original increases, decreases, or changes.

The provisions of existing law prohibiting the transfer of an article from the dutiable list to the free list or from the free list to the dutiable list and prohibiting a change in the form of duty have been retained. There is also retained the provision of existing law that whenever it is provided that a duty or duties shall not exceed a specified ad valorem rate, the rate determined under this section shall not exceed such ad valorem rate.

Certain factors are set out for the guidance of the commission in ascertaining differences in costs of production under the section. For example, transportation costs and other costs incident to delivery to the principal market or markets of the United States for the article are to be considered by the commission. This applies to both foreign articles and domestic articles. In the case of a domestic article, however, the cost of production alone is to be considered by the commission, whereas in the case of a foreign article the cost of production is to be first considered, but if the commission finds that such cost is not readily ascertainable, the commission may accept as evidence in lieu thereof, or as supplemental thereto, the weighted average of the invoice prices or values of the article for a representative period and/or the average wholesale selling prices of the article for a representative period in the principal market or markets of the principal competing country or countries. Other relevant factors that constitute an advantage or disadvantage in competition may also be considered by the commission, including, in the case of a foreign article, advantages granted to a foreign producer by a government, person, partnership, corporation, or association in a foreign country. The commission is not restricted to the factors specified in ascertaining differences in costs of production. The specified factors are merely general guides to be used by the commission in so far as it finds it practicable to do so.

Certain definitions are included for the purpose of facilitating the application of the section by the President and the commission. Included in the definitions is that of cost of production. The cost of materials, labor costs, and other direct charges incurred in the production of the article and in the processes or methods employed in its production, the usual general expenses, including charges for depreciation or depletion, rent and interest charges, the cost of containers and coverings, and other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing the article in condition packed ready for delivery, are specified as being among the elements of cost, but these elements are not exclusive. The costs of production are to be ascertained for a period which is representative of conditions in production of the article.

The House bill also included definitions as to what constituted a like or similar foreign article and as to what constituted the principal competing country with respect to any class of foreign articles. These definitions are omitted from the text of the bill as agreed to in conference, thus leaving it to the sound discretion of the commission to determine the elements of likeness or similarity and to determine the extent to which quantity, value, quality, and other factors as to any class of foreign articles shall be considered in ascertaining the principal competing country with respect to such articles.

The remaining provisions of the section authorize the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the proper application of the section and also provide for the dismissal of all uncompleted investigations under section 315 of the tariff act of 1922, but leave the commission free to consider any information or evidence secured by it in any such investigation.

On amendment No. 1141: The Senate amendment provides that in the case of investigations under section 336 of natural resources and products manufactured therefrom the commission shall take into consideration the question of depletion and the facts relating to the available remaining supply of the natural resource, its important grades, species, or varieties. The commission is also required to give due weight to the necessity of reaching conclusions in conformity with wise and sound policies of conservation; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1151: The House bill in sections 330 to 338, inclusive, incorporated all the provisions of the existing law relating particularly to the United States Tariff Commission, and in section 339 declared that those sections should be construed as a reenactment of the existing law in so far as not inconsistent therewith. The Senate amendment provides likewise that those sections should constitute a reenactment of the existing law, but, in addition, specifically provides that such

reenactment should not affect unexpended balances of appropriations, or the status of the officers and employees of the commission, or pending investigations or other proceedings. The House recedes with an amendment making clerical changes.

On amendment No. 1156: This amendment makes a clerical change; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 1157: The House bill provided that if there be any similar competitive article manufactured or produced in the United States in respect of which the President has made a finding under the flexible tariff provisions that a change of classification or rate of duty will not equalize competitive conditions, the value of the imported merchandise should be the American selling price of the domestic article. The Senate amendment, which strikes out this provision, was made necessary by the action of the Senate (amendment No. 1140) with respect to the flexible tariff provisions. The House recedes with an amendment conforming to the action of the conferees on amendment No. 1140.

On amendment No. 1171: The Senate amendment strikes out a reference (excepting from the general rule as to entry of merchandise) to entry and declaration of merchandise of a class or kind upon which a finding has been made under the flexible tariff provisions relating to values based on American selling price. The Senate amendment was made necessary by the action of the Senate (amendment No. 1140) on the flexible tariff. In accordance with the action of the conferees on amendment No. 1140, the House recedes with an amendment making a clerical change.

On amendment No. 1179: This amendment provides that antique furniture shall enter the United States at ports which shall be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that if any article described in the "antique" paragraph of the free list and imported for sale is rejected as unauthentic with respect to the antiquity claimed as a basis for free entry, a penalty of 25 per cent of the value of the article shall be imposed. If any such article is passed as authentic, the question of its authenticity shall not thereafter be raised by the Government in any proceeding brought for the purpose of collecting the penalty. The House recedes with an amendment providing for a duty of 25 per cent instead of a penalty, and striking out the provision preventing raising of the question of authenticity, ordinary customs procedure being applicable in such cases. The managers on the part of the House at the first conference favored this action. However, since amendment No. 1179 contains a cross reference to the "antique" paragraph by number, and since the action on amendment No. 1105 determines the proper number of that paragraph, and since amendment No. 1105, for the reason given above in connection with amendment No. 901, was in disagreement, the managers on the part of the House at the first conference were unable to agree on this amendment.

W. C. HAWLEY,
ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
ISAAC BACHARACH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized under the rule to control one hour and a half.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we now approach the final vote on the tariff measure, the consideration of which was begun almost 17 months ago.

The purpose of this measure is to provide relief for agriculture and to so readjust rates on items in other schedules as to afford them the necessary protection which changing conditions, new competitions, and new methods of manufacture have necessitated.

The platforms of both the great political parties promised such provision. It was a major feature in the campaign of 1928, and the House and Senate have endeavored faithfully to translate into legislative language the promises made to the American people.

There has been throughout the world a revival of interest in the protective tariff since the World War. The magnificence of our country, its ability to pay so large a proportion of its war expenses yearly, to levy large sums of money in taxes, and to obtain other sums of money from its people in the form of loans, to dispense to other governments in loans vast sums of money to aid them in the conduct of the war, led other nations to inquire whence we had attained this strength, whence came this power that left us after the shock of the war, after withdrawing millions of our people from industrial enterprises, after spending many billions of money, with an unshaken industrial system, an uninterrupted course in our public and private affairs, and with our financial structure sound and secure. So competition has grown recently in the world.

We have in this country the greatest of markets.

Our domestic trade annually is $90,000,000,000—more than the public wealth of several of the greater nations. Consequently all other nations of the world look to this market as the most favorable place in which to sell their products, and they continually select the articles they can produce in quantity for the purpose of attacking those which are least protected by the United States.

We have in this country the highest paid labor. In the major industries alone the workers employed are paid $11,000,000,000 a year, their wages being more than the public revenue of many countries.

And so I could, if time permitted, enlarge upon this subject of the strength, importance, and desirability, from the standpoint of other nations, of this market. [Applause.]

We have never intended in our legislation to exclude imports from our markets, or to leave out of our program an export trade; but we have always considered that the duty of the American Congress is primarily to the American people, to protect them in their home markets. We are the only body on earth that can care for their interests. [Applause.] A nation that does not take care of its own fails greatly in its duty toward them.

The nationals of other countries have no natural right to trade in our markets. Foreign trade is a privilege accorded by treaties under the comity of nations.

Our foreign trade, imports and exports, amounts to about $9,000,000,000 yearly. It has grown under the existing tariff law to double its former amount. About two-thirds of our imports come in free of duty and one-third are dutiable. The average rate of duty which this act imposes on all imports, both free and dutiable, is less than 16 per cent. A foreign nation that is not willing in this great market which the brains, enterprise, energy, and scientific ability of our people and the toil of our millions of industrious and intelligent wage earners has built up to pay the duties we impose into the Treasury of the American people and to compete with us on a fair basis to help keep this market at its standard has no just cause for complaint if its trade with us does not prosper. [Applause.]

Imports into this country consist of both free and dutiable articles. Of course, no duties are levied on articles imported on the free list, which amount in value to two-thirds of our imports. Taking into consideration both free and dutiable imports, the weighted average ad valorems obtained by dividing the total value of all imports into the duties collected, under the several protective tariff acts are as follows:

	Per cent
McKinley Act of 1890	23.01
Dingley Act of 1897	25.47
Payne Act of 1909	19.32
Fordney Act of 1922	13.83
Act of 1930	15.97

The act of 1930 is, therefore, lower than all others on dutiable and free imports combined excepting the Fordney Act.

The protection provided in the act is nation-wide. We have not regarded party affiliation or party tendency in any part of the country. That very excellent part of our Nation known as the South has been recognized in the act on an equal footing with every other section of the country. [Applause.] And there appear in this act many items for their benefit and protection that never appeared in any preceding act, not even a Democratic bill.

Agriculture has been given more especial attention than any other of our industries. We have given it the highest rates in our tariff history, and justly so in my opinion. The reason for that I need not enlarge upon. Every other section of the country has had its needs considered. The Committee on Ways and Means, which gave initial consideration to the legislation, did not grant every request that was asked. I think if a count were made, approximately half of those that were suggested, more or less in full, were rejected. We set certain standards as tests and measurements of the justification and necessity for a tariff duty. If the facts and figures did not warrant any duty and support it, it was not granted. Every duty in this bill has stood the test of scientific investigation, both by the Tariff Commission in the ascertainment of the facts and by the committees of the two Houses, and the comment and criticism of the membership of the bodies themselves. I believe it is the most scientific act that has ever been presented to an American Congress [applause], and when adopted will promote the growth and development of this country as every preceding tariff act based on a protective policy has done.

In 1865 we were a Nation of about 32,000,000 people, with a wealth of about $16,000,000,000. In the last 65 years the population has multiplied to 120,000,000 or more. Our wealth has been increased, no one knows how many billions, above

$300,000,000,000. Somewhere in our domestic policy there is a strong foundation on which such great development has been built. In looking back over history whenever we have based our domestic prosperity upon a protective tariff we have grown and developed with universal prosperity and comfort to all our people, so that we live better, we eat more, we dress more expensively, live in better houses than the people of any other country. But when we have abandoned this safe foundation and have accepted the advice and counsel of our Democratic friends, woe has overtaken the people of the country.

Now, it is alleged that this act contains rates higher than any heretofore passed by the Congress. In the first place, out of 3,218 enumerated items, there being about 25,000, including all those in the basket clauses, 2,171 were not changed at all. Sixty-six per cent of the items remain unchanged. Eight hundred and eighty-seven of the items, or about 27 per cent, have increased rates, 47 of those being transfers from the free list to the dutiable list. But it should be remembered that in counting the number in which there are increased rates many of the increases are due to a change in the basic rate. For instance, in wool we changed the base rate from 31 to 34 cents on the clean content of the wool. That necessitated a change in the compensatory rate on the yarns, cloths, and fabrics made of wool. More than half the changes in rates of duty in the wool schedule were due to that change in the base rate, and this statement of the effect of changing the base rate and the necessity for compensatory duties would apply in practically every other schedule.

On 235 items the duties were decreased, 75 being transferred from the dutiable list to the free list. Using the imports for the year 1928 as a base, the average ad valorem on the $1,400,000,000 of imports that came in that year was 38.75 per cent. Using the same imports and applying the rates in the pending bill to them, the average ad valorem on such imports would be 41.14 per cent, or an increase in the present bill over the average ad valorem of the existing law of 2.39 per cent. This increase is chiefly due to the material advance in rates of farm products for the relief of agriculture.

Civilization is a living and consequently a growing process in human progress. Economic conditions constantly change. The progress of the years necessitate amendments in legislation of every kind, tariffs included. Their provisions may be outgrown in whole or in part or become insufficient for the purposes for which enacted or inapplicable under changed circumstances. Economic changes occur with increasing rapidity and our relations to industries abroad alter continually. No tariff law written to serve a given time can ever permanently serve our country's best interests unchanged.

This is an act with medium rates. I have here a statement of the preceding acts for tariff legislation. Under the McKinley Act the average for its entire history of four years was 48.39 per cent. Under the Dingley Act, from 1897 to 1909, or 12 years, the average was 46.49 per cent. There, for a period of 16 years, the average ad valorem was about 47 per cent. Those are the basic acts in our protective-tariff history, and everyone here can remember the growth of prosperity, the development of the country, and the increase of our foreign trade when these acts were in force.

The assertion that this act proposes the highest rates of duty in our history is not justified by the facts. Since 1890 six tariff acts have been put on the statute books, four by the Republicans and two by the Democrats. The statistics used are furnished by the Tariff Commission.

Under the Republican protective tariffs the weighted average ad valorems on dutiable imports are as follows for the whole period each was in force:

	Per cent
McKinley Act, 1890 to 1894	48.39
Dingley Act, 1897 to 1909	46.49
Payne Act, 1909 to 1913	40.73
Fordney Act, 1922 to 1930	38.22

For the purpose of comparing the average ad valorems under the act with those of the previously existing law, the dutiable imports for the year 1928 are used in the computations.

	Per cent
Fordney Act for the year 1928	38.75
Pending act based on dutiable imports for the year 1928	41.14

That is, the average ad valorem under the pending bill, based upon 1928 dutiable imports, is 7.25 per cent below the average of the McKinley Act, 5.35 per cent below that of the Dingley Act, 0.41 per cent above the Payne Act, and 2.39 per cent above the ad valorems of the Fordney Act for the year 1928.

Under each of the above acts the country enjoyed an increasing and continued prosperity. Whether the rates were higher or lower than those now proposed, each served its purpose well. It is in the memory of all that the Underwood free trade act resulted in national distress. The rates in the pending act occupy a middle ground. The average of the rates of the four protective tariff acts is 43.46 per cent, or 2.24 per cent above those now proposed. The act does not contain the highest rates in our protective history but is lower than the average under all Republican protective tariff acts. As each of these promoted our general prosperity and provided for the support of our people on their higher standards of living, the pending act, having the same purpose, will undoubtedly have the same results.

There is no special virtue accruing to a tariff because the rates are high or low. Low rates in the past have proven economic blunders. But the rate that is effective in safeguarding the interests of our people is the right rate. It modernizes existing law and adapts it to the conditions of to-day.

Mr. TREADWAY. Would the gentleman mind an interruption?

Mr. HAWLEY. No.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentleman intend to explain on what items this increase comes?

Mr. HAWLEY. I have that.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think it would be very important.

Mr. HAWLEY. The average ad valorem for the four protective tariff periods that have preceded this act, adding up all the imports and dividing them into all the duties, gives an average for the Republican protective tariff period of 43.46 per cent, or 2.24 per cent higher than the average of duties proposed in this act.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is based upon the foreign valuation, I take it?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; on imports, as that is the basis we use, dividing the total amount of duties collected by the total value of dutiable imports. But all having the same basis for calculation, the comparisons are accurate.

Mr. CRISP. Would the gentleman mind an interruption?

Mr. HAWLEY. No.

Mr. CRISP. I do not get it clear in my mind as to whether, in making your calculation, you are taking into consideration the goods that will come in free.

Mr. HAWLEY. No. I am referring to dutiable imports only, except when I made a reference to the average of the ad valorems for both the dutiable and free imports. I am speaking now only of dutiable imports. I shall put into the RECORD a complete statement of the schedules brought down to the present minute by the Tariff Commission, showing the value of the dutiable imports in the several schedules, the actual and computed duties, showing the ad valorem rates under the 1922 law and under the act of 1930 as applied to these same imports, the computed duties, and the average ad valorems, which give the result I have just stated as the average ad valorem under the present act of 41.14 per cent.

In the summary table below there is presented for comparative purposes a tabulation by schedules of equivalent ad valorem rates of duty for the dutiable list of each act calculated independently of the other act. The figures for the act of 1922 are, therefore, the same, with possible minor changes, as those to be found in Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States for the calendar year 1928. The figures for the tariff act of 1930 are the rates of duty for all dutiable items in that act applied to the import statistics of 1928, with the exception of the value of certain items, summarized in the table, to which the rates in the act of 1930 could not be applied.

It will be observed that whereas the ad valorem equivalent rate for the tariff act of 1922 given in the previous summary upon the basis of comparable items in the two acts is 33.22 per cent, the ad valorem equivalent upon the basis of actual imports and duties collected in 1928 was 38.75 per cent. The act of 1930 upon the basis of comparable items shows an ad valorem equivalent of 40 per cent and upon the basis of the dutiable list alone of that act applied to 1928 imports shows an ad valorem equivalent of 41.14 per cent.

Attention is called to the fact that the summary table presented below showing the dutiable list of each act calculated independently of the other act is not directly related to the detailed tabulations in the body of this document. Such details for the tariff act of 1922 are to be found in the published statistics of the Department of Commerce for the year 1928. The supporting details for the tariff act of 1930 would be the same list with adjustments for free-list items made dutiable in the tariff act of 1930 and for certain groups of items in the published statistics to which the new rates can not be applied.

Imports, duties, and equivalent ad valorem rates, by schedules, for the dutiable list of the Tariff Act of 1922 and for the dutiable list of the Tariff Act of 1930, calculated upon the basis of 1928 imports

Schedules	Dutiable imports entered for consumption during the calendar year 1928 under the Tariff Act of 1922			Dutiable list under the Tariff Act of 1930, based upon 1928 imports			
	Value, dutiable imports	Actual or computed duties	Equivalent ad valorem rates	Value of dutiable imports (comparable)	Value of dutiable imports (noncomparable)[1]	Computed duties on comparable imports	Equivalent ad valorem rates
			Per cent				*Per cent*
1. Chemicals, oils, and paints	$93, 161, 563	$27, 688, 949	29. 72	$82, 418, 402		$29, 748, 153	36. 09
2. Earths, earthenware, and glassware	53, 486, 931	25, 849, 304	48. 33	55, 806, 856	$1, 113, 104	29, 985, 159	53. 73
3. Metals and manufactures of	129, 601, 301	45, 602, 599	35. 19	118, 405, 164	11, 762, 717	41, 537, 266	35. 08
4. Wood and manufactures of	16, 917, 211	4, 191, 356	24. 78	47, 034, 289		5, 519, 370	11. 73
5. Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of	174, 759, 643	118, 572, 109	67. 85	174, 759, 643		134, 939, 588	77. 21
6. Tobacco and manufactures of	62, 318, 624	39, 314, 791	63. 09	62, 318, 624		40, 371, 197	64. 78
7. Agricultural products and provisions	282, 417, 950	64, 124, 204	22. 71	309, 398, 797		108, 514, 018	35. 07
8. Spirits, wines, and other beverages	1, 347, 013	523, 045	38. 83	1, 433, 616		680, 069	47. 44
9. Manufactures of cotton	48, 300, 609	19, 451, 364	40. 27	48, 300, 609		22, 422, 198	46. 42
10. Flax, hemp, jute, and manufactures of	133, 207, 491	24, 191, 702	18. 16	133, 207, 491		25, 500, 925	19. 14
11. Wool and manufactures of	116, 343, 426	57, 636, 641	49. 54	116, 343, 426		69, 609, 241	59. 83
12. Manufactures of silk	32, 440, 182	18, 348, 161	56. 56	32, 440, 182		19, 181, 350	59. 13
13. Manufactures of rayon	16, 077, 417	9, 285, 380	57. 75	11, 425, 596	4, 651, 821	6, 125, 965	53. 62
14. Paper and books	21, 927, 120	5, 485, 073	25. 02	20, 666, 437	1, 260, 683	5, 385, 775	26. 06
15. Sundries	216, 635, 842	81, 802, 045	37. 76	315, 340, 027	21, 980, 172	89, 698, 307	28. 45
Total	1, 398, 942, 323	542, 066, 723	38. 75	1, 529, 299, 159	[1] 40, 768, 502	[2] 629, 218, 581	41. 14

[1] Not included because conference rates could not be applied.

[2] Does not include duties on noncomparable items.

Not all of the changes made in the duties were increases. In four schedules the duties were reduced. In the very important and large one of metal, in wood, in rayon, and the very large schedule on sundries. The metal schedule is reduced 0.11 of 1 per cent, the wood schedule 13 per cent, the rayon schedule 4.13 per cent, and the sundries schedule is reduced 9.31 per cent, and Doctor CROWTHER said that must have been an oversight. The average ad valorem, based upon dutiable imports, for these four schedules, which include one-third of the imports, have a weighted average of 29 per cent on these four schedules, and that average under the existing law is 37 per cent. The reduction is, therefore, a little over 8 per cent in these four very important schedules, which produce articles of wide, general, and common use. As to the other schedules, the rate is increased from 39.61 under the present law to 47 per cent under the bill, or an increase of 7.38 per cent. Taking the weighted average between the two, on the increases on the one side and the decreases on the other, together with imports and duties collected, we again get the result that the increase in the bill is 2.39 per cent over the existing law. I have this matter set out in tabular form for the convenience of anyone who desires to refer to it and verify the figures if they so desire.

SOME SCHEDULES REDUCED, OTHERS INCREASED

An inspection of the following table shows changes in ad valorem rates in the several schedules as follows, based on imports for the year 1928:

Ad valorem rates in specified acts

	Ad valorems		Increase	Decrease
	1922 act	1930 act		
Schedule 1	29. 72	36. 09	6. 37	
Schedule 2	48. 33	53. 78	5. 45	
Schedule 3	35. 19	35. 08		0. 11
Schedule 4	24. 78	11. 73		13. 05
Schedule 5	67. 85	77. 21	9. 36	
Schedule 6	63. 09	64. 78	1. 69	
Schedule 7	22. 71	35. 07	12. 36	
Schedule 8	38. 83	47. 44	8. 61	
Schedule 9	40. 27	46. 42	6. 15	
Schedule 10	18. 16	19. 14	. 98	
Schedule 11	49. 54	59. 83	10. 29	
Schedule 12	56. 55	59. 13	2. 58	
Schedule 13	57. 75	53. 62		4. 13
Schedule 14	25. 02	26. 06	1. 04	
Schedule 15	37. 76	28. 45		9. 31
Weighted average	38. 75	41. 12		

Based upon the dutiable imports for 1928, the metal, wood, rayon, and sundries schedules include one-third of the dutiable imports, at a weighted average ad valorem of 29 per cent. Under existing law it is 37.17 per cent. The reduction is 8.17 of the per cents of the ad valorem. For all the other schedules the present average is 39.62 per cent; in the bill it is 47.03 per cent, or an increase of 7.41 in the per cents of the ad valorem. The weighted average between the decrease and increase given above is 2.39 increase in the per cents of the ad valorem in the present act over previously existing law.

It has been said that the increases in the ad valorems will increase the cost of living. Of this increase of 2.39 per cent, 1.48 per cent is due to agricultural increases and 0.91 per cent due to all the other schedules. That is an increase of about 1½ per cent in agriculture and less than 1 per cent for all the other schedules. This is further borne out by the statement of the Tariff Commission that 68 per cent of the increases are related to agriculture and 32 per cent to all other industries. It may be that this will increase the cost of living, and it will to the extent that the duties are effective, but anyone who has studied tariff history knows that a duty may be fully effective or it may be only partially effective, and it may not be effective at all at different times under varying conditions of the market. It was undoubtedly the determinate purpose of Congress to materially revise the agricultural schedule upward. This was a part of the general program for the rehabilitation and prosperity of that industry. This act affords agriculture greater protection than was ever contained in any preceding law, and so far as a tariff can remedy its existing depression the bill provides every available relief.

The Tariff Commission reports that if the rates of duty in the tariff act of 1930 were applied to the imports for the year 1928 they would produce an increase in duties of $106,567,597, of which $72,181,314, or 67.7 per cent, is attributable to increases in rates on agricultural items, and $34,386,628 to all other increases. On the basis of increased duties collectible, agriculture will receive 1.62 per cent of the general increase of 2.39 per cent, and all other 0.77 of a per cent.

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

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. The intention of the tariff was to place agriculture upon a parity with industry.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does this ad valorem of 1.49 place agriculture upon a parity with industry?

Mr. HAWLEY. Taking all the agricultural articles included in the various schedules in which agricultural articles appear, agriculture is on a parity, in my judgment, with the others. I will discuss the matter of increased costs of living later.

I simply want to say that no body of people in this country is more interested in any increase in the cost of living than the wage earners, numbering 27,000,000, and with their families, more than half the people of the United States, and yet these wage earners have said to us many times that they were perfectly willing to approve, and do approve, the increases in the agricultural schedules. But they also asked for such a readjustment of the other schedules as will insure their continued employment in the occupations in which they belong.

COST OF LIVING

What effect will the pending tariff bill have on the consumer? Except persons who render no service or who produce nothing, there is no exclusive consumer class, all others are both consumers and producers. If a producer is to continue, a profitable market sufficient to consume what he has to sell is a necessity of the first importance. Our wage earners outnumber the other consumers, but they are essential and essentially producers. They are the first to be affected when conditions arise under which their services can no longer be availed of, or when em-

ployment is discontinued. No matter how high the rate of wages is, its annual value to the worker is based on the number of days employed. Even unemployment for a few days only in the year will offset many times any increase in cost of living that may occur to the wage earner when the pending bill becomes law. One of the distinctive features of the bill is its purpose to enlarge opportunities for labor and to maintain stability of employment.

From past history of protective tariffs it will be observed that prices vary with supply and demand, under our competitive system, and the condition of the markets will be a primary factor in determining the rise or decline in prices and the extent to which duties are effective. A duty is only one factor in the selling price.

There is neither historical nor economic justification for the wild statements that the duties proposed will cost consumers great sums. Such statements are issued to prejudice the legislation in the public mind, but without regard to the economic facts.

Tariff rates do not automatically add themselves to the prices of American-made articles. A price may be increased to the full amount of the duty, or by a part of it, or not at all, depending upon the conditions of the market, whose future operations no one can forecast. Prices may even decline. This is a common experience under mass production. Protection is intended to establish and maintain industries in this country, induce mass production and afford a stable market. Success depends upon mass rather than limited production. Tin plate and aluminum wares are good illustrations. When duties were imposed upon these articles it was argued by our opponents that prices would be greatly increased. The fact is that you can now buy American tin and aluminum wares of better quality and heavier weight cheaper here than anywhere else.

The proper test of the effect of a protective tariff on consumers is made by offsetting any additional cost against benefits derived, and in which all participate. Such a test taken over a period of time will show advantage on the side of benefits. If space afforded, it would be easy to multply instances to show the accuracy of this observation.

This outcry that costs to American consumers will be increased at all times by the full amount of the duties, and probably much further increased by what is vaguely referred to as "pyramiding" has always been raised, but this has not been our experience, for if this were true, each protective tariff act would not have multiplied production, increased employment, consumed enormous quantities of raw materials, fostered trade and commerce at home and abroad, sustained extensive and costly systems of public and private improvements, and, in a word, promoted and maintained the general prosperity.

A tariff is a guardian ready to afford protection in time of need.

Let us consider. If we remove our protective tariff, we subject our agriculture, industries, and labor to a competition based on lower national standards abroad. Our markets will be flooded with articles produced at lower costs, of which labor is the largest factor, by labor receiving less than one-third our own wage scales, or agricultural products grown at much smaller expense, and in each case by people having much lower standards of living. Whatever supplants American products in the home market deprives our own people of the opportunities for production, manufacture, and employment.

The purpose of protection is to make our country self-contained and self-sustaining; to afford our agriculture, industry, and labor such priority in the American market as will result from equalizing, by rates of duties, the lower costs of production abroad with the legitimately higher costs at home. This policy in the past has multiplied our national wealth, developed our resources, maintained our higher standards of living, and afforded our wage earners unprecedented remuneration for their labor. It has made this a land of opportunity for brains, industry, and ability of every kind. It has the prestige of proved success. It is necessary that every branch of human activity be expanded to provide for our rapidly increasing population.

Foreigners trade with us for the advantages such trade will afford them. When our markets are open without restriction, they charge what the traffic will bear, as our experience has shown when a free-trade policy has been followed by this country. Under the Underwood Act many articles sold at retail for prices greater than that for which they now sell. There is a glamour attached to a salesman's statement, impressively made, that "this is an imported article," implying that it is preferable and better for that reason, while the fact is that our products, speaking generally, are equal to, or better than, those made anywhere in the world. Further, all the profits derived from the sales as foreign articles in the United States go abroad for the benefit of other peoples at the expense of our own. Protection takes part of such profits and places them in our Treasury for the public use and benefit; it builds and sustains our own activities, with both profits and wages accruing to Americans.

And why not? The American market is our own. We made it by industry, invention, brains, and toil. It is an inheritance of this generation to the use of which it is entitled but is not warranted in impairing its value to the generations succeeding. If we act injudiciously, we may be like Esau who sold his birthright for a mess of pottage and later desired to regain it but could not, although he sought it carefully with tears.

Objection to the pending bill, raised in the press and elsewhere, so far as I have observed, has not concerned itself with a scientific study of the rates proposed, their necessity, or the adjustments they effect to meet present-day conditions. There has been no scientific and informed discussion of the rates on their merits to show that the facts and conditions do not warrant alterations. Instead, extravagant hypotheses have been proposed and astounding conclusions alleged to have been derived therefrom. For instance, it has been asserted that to ascertain the cost to American consumers resulting from duties imposed calculations of this kind must be made:

First. The duties must be calculated on all imports. Yet, duties are not always added to the prices of the imported goods. They sell at prices the market will bear. The duties may be in whole or in part absorbed by the foreign producer.

Second. Then calculate the duties on the total of American products which are on the dutiable list.

Third. Add the two amounts so obtained together and multiply by 2. Why by 2 rather than by some other figure is not explained. Such a calculation is put forth as a scientific analysis for tariff; yet long years of experience prove the utter fallacy of the assumption. Gradually we have built up our industries, whose increase in production compared with our requirements has led to a steady decline in price levels. This is one of the purposes and results of mass production. If the above weird proposal was sound, the cost to consumers would have been increased for the year 1929, 80 per cent on all dutiable articles, whether of imported or domestic production. Yet, it would be easy to multiply instances where not only such increases did not occur, but where the prices have actually declined. It was alleged that the duty on aluminum provided in the 1922 act would cause commodities made therefrom to be included in the precious-metal list, whereas the fact is that you can buy aluminum ware of better quality and heavier in weight not only cheaper than heretofore but cheaper than that for which the imported article can be bought. The sugar duty was increased in 1922, and yet sugar is cheaper than ever in our history.

As another illustration, under the Dingley Act of 1897, there was a duty on hides of 15 per cent ad valorem, various rates on leathers and 25 per cent on shoes; under the Payne Act of 1909, there was a duty of 10 per cent on shoes, hides being free; all were made free in the Fordney Act of 1922. In the period of 16 years the two first named were in force, shoes were cheaper by far than they have been since 1922.

Another error in the estimated cost to the consumer is the assumption that all purchases are made yearly. Many articles are used two or more years and the increased costs due to duties, if any, should be divided by the years they are in use.

SOME STATISTICS ON FOREIGN TRADE

As to the effect upon foreign trade, imports have always increased when Republican tariffs have replaced Democratic tariffs. Under the Dingley Act, which replaced the Wilson Act, the annual average of imports for the entire period each was in force increased from $760,000,000 to $998,000,000, or 31 per cent. Likewise, the average annual increase under the Fordney Act, which superseded the Underwood Act, was from $2,871,000,000 to $4,052,000,000, or 41 per cent. Our export trade has similarly enlarged. This act is intended to promote an all-American prosperity. Our industrious and enterprising people have made not only the greatest of nations but have created the greatest of markets. Our domestic trade is ten times our foreign trade, and approximates $90,000,000,000 annually. Our prosperity measures the extent of our ability to provide for our own people, absorb imports, and sell articles abroad. Proper protection for American products and labor greatly increases the prosperity and well-being of our own people and materially develops our foreign trade. History will undoubtedly again repeat itself if the pending bill becomes law.

The story of the relation between free and dutiable imports is told by the following table:

Popular name of law	Years in effect	Average free	Average dutiable	Per cent imports free	Per cent imports dutiable	Equivalent ad valorem rates on dutiable imports
McKinley	1890-1894	$408, 177, 925	$369, 977, 534	52. 45	47. 55	48. 39
Wilson	1894-1897	375, 896, 679	384, 139, 056	49. 45	50. 55	41. 29
Dingley	1897-1909	451, 487, 111	546, 942, 476	45. 25	54. 78	46. 49
Payne-Aldrich	1909-1913	851, 700, 598	768, 916, 178	52. 55	47. 45	40. 73
Underwood	1913-1922	1, 903, 267, 743	968, 210, 792	66. 28	33. 72	26. 97
Fordney-McCumber	1922-1930	2, 585, 796, 022	1, 466, 016, 593	63. 82	36. 18	38. 22

Although the average ad valorem under the Fordney Act was 38.75 per cent and that of the Underwood Act 26.97 per cent, or a difference of 11.78 per cent, the relation between dutiable and free imports was nearly the same.

	Total imports	Total exports	Duties collected	Per cent ad valorem on dutiable articles
1927	$4, 184, 742, 000	$4, 865, 376, 000	$591, 946, 000	39. 9
1928	4, 091, 444, 000	5, 128, 356, 000	565, 501, 000	40. 4
1929	4, 400, 126, 000	5, 241, 262, 000	602, 698, 000	41. 7

Imports in 1929 exceeded those for 1927 by $215,384,000 and exports for 1929 were greater than those for 1927 by $375,886,000. The ad valorem for 1929 was 1.8 per cent higher than for 1927. Our foreign trade was $591,270,000 more in 1929 than in 1927.

	Imports dutiable	Imports free	Per cent free	Per cent dutiable
1927	$1, 483, 187, 000	$2, 685, 138, 000	64. 4	35. 6
1928	1, 399, 304, 000	2, 678, 633, 000	65. 6	34. 4
1929	1, 444, 696, 000	2, 886, 591, 000	66. 7	33. 3

That is, two-thirds of the imports in value come in duty free.

FOREIGN TRADE

Before we undertook the preparation of this act and continuing down to this hour, other nations have not only evinced a great interest in the legislation but have been more than willing to lend us a helping hand through diplomatic representations, through agents and agencies and expensive lobbies in the United States, through financial institutions, and through concerns with large investments in activities connected with foreign trade. While other nations in times past have interested themselves in behalf of their nationals, for which they are to be commended, the presentation in this case has assumed a new character. It was even asked that foreign representatives be heard by the committee on questions of rates. While we sought for and welcomed information from every source, a legislative committee is not an international conference. The words "reprisal tariffs" have been used as if this were some new thing. It may have a new intent now, but it has appeared when previous tariff acts were in course of preparation. Tariffs of all kinds, especially protective tariffs, are world-wide, with high and even prohibitive duties, for the benefit of the citizenry of other countries, and adaptable to their needs. There has been especial activity in tariff legislation since the World War, but an examination of recent foreign tariffs indicates that they were not constructed as measures to offset the tariffs of other countries, in the sense of reprisals, but rather to meet the economic needs of the several nations of the world.

That is, I believe the statesmen abroad act with wisdom and discretion in legislating for and administering the domestic affairs of their nations. And by way of comment let me say countervailing duties for unfair trade practices do not have the objection that attaches to the idea of reprisal tariffs.

During the World War the magnificent structure and might of this country was impressively shown the nations of earth. Our Government collected annually taxes in unheard-of amounts, paid a large fraction each year of its war costs, borrowed almost fabulous sums from its own people, loaned to our allies with sovereign magnificence, expended immense sums, withdrew millions of men and women from the constructive pursuits of peace and employed them in the destructive purposes of war, and then emerged from the struggle with our financial and economic structure unshaken and the temple of our liberties unprofaned.

No other nation had this experience, but since they have searched to find the secret of such strength. A nation that grows from a population of 32,000,000 to 120,000,000 in some three score of years, which augments its wealth from $16,000,000,000 some twenty times in the same period, whose industries thrive, whose people prosper and enjoy in a higher degree the excellencies of life, where labor is better remunerated, is a nation that cares for its own. And that care, legislatively expressed, is our protective tariff, other nations profiting by our experience. Their tariffs since the war are evidence.

But so far as we are concerned, a factor, not new, but now more urgently pressed, is seeking entrance to our council table when tariffs are being made. It is described as "international mindedness." It means that the tariff should no longer be considered as a domestic question, but as an international policy. A large number of great industrial enterprises, supported by immense aggregations of wealth in financial institutions, backed by more than $20,000,000,000, has invaded the outside world in search of the wealth that may be extracted therefrom by low-paid labor and desires to find market in this country for its products. It has even been suggested that they should be admitted duty free or at reduced rates. In order to increase their export trade in articles manufactured here, it is urged that our rates of duty be generally scaled downward to obviate reprisal tariffs so that our exports can obtain favorable rates abroad. That is, that we abandon the policy of giving all our producers and labor fair opportunity in the American market, in favor of another policy that will, to favor a few, admit foreign products to our markets at an advantage over American. The attack is not so much on the present bill as on the principle of adequate protection to which we have always adhered.

In view of the great investments made abroad by American capital, the unusual interest of other nations can be readily discovered. They desire the enterprises so financed in their borders to prosper, and the articles manufactured to find profitable market, for the enrichment of their states and the employment of their people. This is an intelligent and commendable policy on their part. That tariff rates too low here, while benefitting them, might injure us, is not their responsibility. It is for the United States to care for its own, and the present act is such care.

The discussion, by those in opposition, in the press, by propagandists, by foreign interests, by the export trade, by importing concerns and other agencies, is emphasizing more than heretofore the extension of our foreign trade. No one questions the advisability of foreign trade. We sell abroad products other nations require, and import articles we do not produce, and other articles are regulatory of prices in this country, although our domestic competition is the decisive factor in determining prices.

American capital sees opportunities to make greater profits in manufacture with low-paid foreign labor.

A considerable number of large concerns and industries are supporting the propaganda for the development of trade abroad, and in order to foster such extension are demanding the lowering of our duties in order to obtain more favorable rates from foreign countries.

The construction of manufacturing plants in all parts of the world by American capital for the purpose of manufacturing articles to be sold abroad as well as here supplies other people with articles that might have been made here and exported to such countries. Trade expansion that might have so developed has been forestalled by their own action. There can be no question of the right of investments abroad, but they are made by private initiative and not under public sanction. The investors assumed their own risks and certainly must have understood what they were doing.

We are under no obligation to secure their profits, or the interest on investments or loans abroad, by subjecting others of our own people to economic losses.

I can appreciate the desire of other peoples to sell in this market, which is the greatest and richest of all. Our yearly trade approximates $90,000,000,000, an amount greater than the public wealth of many nations. Trade with us is greatly to their advantage.

I must confess that I adhere to our time-honored policy of considering what is best for our people and their interests in this country as our primary responsibility. We have grown rich and great by protecting the home market and developing home trade.

PROCEDURE

All witnesses who appeared at the hearings were heard for or against any proposed modification of a rate. The fact that rates were both raised and lowered indicates that nothing was taken for granted. The details of the Summary of Tariff Information furnished by the Tariff Commission were given continual and intensive study, and in this the committees were assisted by experts of the Tariff Commission, of the Departments of the Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, and Justice, and by representatives of the Customs Court. Before any modification was accepted, the necessity and correctness of a suggested rate was investigated several times. Classifications were changed in a number of the schedules to obtain a more logical arrangement. The making of a protective tariff is both an economic and a scientific problem, in the solution of which many factors are to be considered. It may be of interest to indicate some of them:

1. Can the article be produced in this country in quantities sufficient to provide a material part of our consumptive requirements?
2. Can it be produced for a per unit cost within economic reason?
3. At what cost do competing foreign countries produce the article?
4. How do the wages paid in this country compare with those paid abroad?
5. What are our total requirements of the article; how much do we produce; how much is imported; and to what extent can production and imports be increased?
6. Delivery charges to principal markets.
7. The condition of the American industry or industries for which a change in rates is proposed.
8. Do the facts collected from every available source present a tariff problem?
9. Are the conditions complained of due to foreign competition or to some domestic situation, such as incompetent management, antiquated methods or equipment, inefficient marketing, or other matters the producer himself can remedy?
10. If the facts warrant a change in rates, what new rate or rates shall be proposed?
11. If the rate on a raw or base material is to be changed, what shall the compensatory duties on articles manufactured therefrom be?
12. Are the compensatory rates so computed adequate to provide for the industry, or shall there be added thereto a further amount which is a distinctively protective element?
13. The amounts imported as compared with our requirements and our production.
14. Are the articles seasonable or staple?
15. The public interest.

All these and other considerations were given full weight and effect, after most careful consideration, in determining upon a rate. I cite them to indicate that rates do not depend upon what may be asked, but what is proven to be just and necessary. A very large number of proposed changes were rejected as not warranted by the facts and conditions.

DUTIES ON PRODUCTS OF AGRICULTURAL ORIGIN IN TARIFF ACT OF 1930 COMPARED WITH THOSE IN TARIFF ACT OF 1922

In order to comply with the request of Members of Congress and supply information desired by them, I asked the Tariff Commission to furnish me with the data given in the tabulation below, comparing rates for agricultural commodities in the tariff act of 1922 with those in the tariff act of 1930.

This list includes only the items for which the rates of duty in the act of 1930 are increased over the rates in the act of 1922. In compiling these tables the experts have included all raw and crude agricultural products excepting a few items, such as chocolate and rice fibre, which are not produced in the United States. In addition to the raw agricultural products, there are also included articles such as linseed oil and leather. Since agricultural products generally in the raw or crude state are not ready for consumption, but must be processed to make them usable or preserve them for future use, this processing increases the quantities the market will absorb and so furnishes the farmers the opportunity to sell a larger production, and is consequently a direct benefit to them, both as to quantities sold and moneys received.

On the other hand, the list does not include articles further advanced in manufacture, such as shoes, paints, cloth and clothing. In many instances the form of the duty has been changed from specific to ad valorem rates. In this case the percentage increase has been made on the basis of average import values for 1928.

Any person, however, desiring to study only the increases in raw or agricultural materials can select them from the tabulation.

It will be noted that there are many agricultural items in various schedules, other than Schedule 7, which is known as the Agricultural Schedule.

Several farm crops, such as wheat, corn, etc., are grown in quantities in excess of the domestic demand, with a consequent tendency to reduce the prices received by the grower. One of the distinctive features of the new tariff act is its promotion of the growing of crops now produced in quantities insufficient for domestic requirements, to replace the surplus crops. This will result in a distinct advantage to agriculture.

The tabulation also shows both the amount by which the duty is increased and the percentage of such increase. In the case of items transferred from the free to the dutiable list, it is not possible to compute the percentage of the increase.

Tariff rates on agricultural commodities: Increases in 1930 act over 1922 act

SCHEDULE 1

Commodity	Rate of duty in 1922 act	Rate of duty in 1930 act	Amount by which duty is increased in 1930 act	Per cent of increase
Oleic acid or red oil	1½ cents per pound	20 per cent ad valorem		69.92
Casein or lactarene (pound)	2½ cents per pound	5½ cents per pound	3 cents	120.00
Stearic acid	1½ cents per pound	25 per cent ad valorem		88.25
Butyl acetate	25 per cent ad valorem	7 cents per pound		113.36
Compounds of casein, known as galolith or any other name: In finished or partly finished articles, n. s. p. f. (pound).	40 cents plus 25 per cent.	40 cents plus 50 per cent	25 per cent	55.37
Edible gelatin, valued at less than 40 cents per pound (pound)	3½ cents plus 20 per cent.	5 cents plus 20 per cent	1½ cents	18.80
Inedible gelatin (glue, glue size) valued at less than 40 cents per pound (pound)	1½ cents plus 20 per cent.	2 cents plus 25 per cent	½ cent plus 5 per cent	27.30
Inedible gelatin valued at more than 40 cents per pound (pound)	7 cents plus 20 per cent	8 cents plus 25 per cent	1 cent plus 5 per cent	21.82
Pectin	20 per cent	25 per cent	5 per cent	25.00
Casein glue	25 per cent	30 per cent	do	20.00
Wool grease, containing more than 2 per cent free fatty acids (pound)	½ cent	1 cent	½ cent	100.00
Wool grease, containing 2 per cent or less, not medicinal (pound)	1 cent	2 cents	1 cent	100.00
Wool grease, medicinal, including Adeps lanoe (pound)	do	3 cents	2 cents	200.00
Oils, vegetable: Linseed or flaxseed and combinations and mixtures (pound)	3.3 cents	4½ cents	1.2 cents	36.36
Soybean oil (pound)	2½ cents	3½ cents, but not less than 45 per cent.	1 cent	40.00
Starch:				
Potato starch (pound)	1¾ cents	2½ cents	¾ cent	42.86
All other starches, n. s. p. f. (pound)	1 cent	1½ cents	½ cent	50.00
Dextrine made from potato starch or potato flour (pound)	2¼ cents	3 cents	¾ cent	33.33⅓
Dextrine, n. s. p. f., burnt starch, dextrine substitutes (pound)	1¼ cents	2 cents	do	60.00
Soluble or chemically treated starch (pound)	do	do	do	60.00
Olive oil edible, weighing with container, less than 40 pounds (pound)	7½ cents	9½ cents	2 cents	26.67
Palm kernel oil (pound)	Free	1 cent	1 cent	
Sesame oil (pound)	Free	3 cents	3 cents	

Tariff rates on agricultural commodities: Increases in 1930 act over 1922 act—Continued

SCHEDULE 5

Commodity	Rate of duty in 1922 act	Rate of duty in 1930 act	Amount by which duty is increased in 1930 act	Per cent of increase
Sugar:				
Raw, world (pound)	2.2 cents	2.5 cents	0.3 cent	13.64
Raw, Cuba (pound)	1.76 cents	2 cents	0.24 cent	13.64
Refined, world (pound)	2.39 cents	2.65 cents	0.26 cent	10.88
Blackstrap molasses, under general tariff (gallon)	0.167 cent	0.03 cent per pound total sugars [1]	0.16 cent	9.58
Maple sugar and maple sirup:				
Maple sugar (pound)	4 cents	8 cents	4 cents	100.00
Maple sirup (pound)	do	5½ cents	1.5 cents	37.50
Dextrose, testing not above 99.7 per cent, and dextrose sirup	1.5 cents	2 cents	0.5 cent	33.33
Sugarcane (ton)	$1	$2.50	$1.50	150.00

[1] Equivalent to 0.183 cent per gallon. Rates per gallon based on 52 per cent total sugars.

SCHEDULE 6

Commodity	Rate of duty in 1922 act	Rate of duty in 1930 act	Amount by which duty is increased in 1930 act	Per cent of increase
Cigar wrapper tobacco: [1]				
Unstemmed—				
Under general tariff (pound)	$2.10	$2.275	17.5 cents	8.33
From Cuba (pound)	$2.10—20 per cent	$2 275—30 per cent	14 cents	8.33
Stemmed (pound)	$2.75	$2.925	17.5 cents	6.36

[1] Includes filler tobacco when mixed or packed with more than 35 per cent of wrapper tobacco.

SCHEDULE 7

Commodity	Rate of duty in 1922 act	Rate of duty in 1930 act	Amount by which duty is increased in 1930 act	Per cent of increase
Live cattle:				
Weighing less than 700 pounds	1½ cents	2½ cents	1 cent	66.67
Weighing 700 pounds, but less than 1,050 pounds	do	3 cents	1½ cents	100.00
Weighing more than 1,050 pounds	2 cents	do	1 cent	50.00
Beef (pound)	3 cents	6 cents	3 cents	100.00
Veal (pound)	do	do	do	100.00
Dried blood albumen:				
Light	Free	12 cents	12 cents	
Dark	do	6 cents	6 cents	
Sheep and lambs (head)	$2	$3	$1	50.00
Goats (head)	do	do	do	50.00
Meats, mutton and lamb:				
Mutton, fresh (pound)	2½ cents	5 cents	2½ cents	100.00
Lamb, fresh (pound)	4 cents	7 cents	3 cents	75.00
Swine (pound)	½ cent	2 cents	1½ cents	300.00
Fresh pork (pound)	¾ cent	2½ cents	1¾ cents	233.33
Ham, bacon, and shoulders (pound)	2 cents	3¼ cents	1¼ cents	62.50
Pickled, salted, and other cured pork (pound)	do	do	do	62.50
Lard (pound)	1 cent	3 cents	2 cents	200.00
Lard compounds and substitutes (pound)	4 cents	5 cents	1 cent	25.00
Reindeer meat, venison, and other game, n. s. p. f. (pound)	do	6 cents	2 cents	50.00
Canned beef (pound)	20 per cent	6 cents, not less than 20 per cent	3.56 cents	145.75
Other canned meats	do	do	3.42 cents	132.10
Prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f. (pound)	do	do	3.60 cents	150.35
Other fresh or dry cured sausage (pound)	do	do	2.66 cents	79.85
Beef and veal, pickled or cured (pound)	do	do	3.64 cents	153.95
Edible offal (livers, sweetbreads, etc.) (pound)	do	do	3.16 cents	111.85
Meats, fresh, n. s. p. f. (pound)	do	do	3.72 cents	162.45
Milk and cream:				
Whole milk	2½ cents [1]	6½ cents	4 cents	160.00
Sour milk and buttermilk (gallon)	1 cent	2 1/20 cents [2]	1.05 cents	105.00
Cream (gallon)	20 cents [3]	56.6 cents	36.6 cents	183.00
Condensed or evaporated milk and related products:				
Cream powder (pound)	7 cents	12½ cents	5.33 cents	76.19
Condensed, etc.—				
Sweetened (pound)	1½ cents	2¾ cents	1.25 cents	83.33
Unsweetened (pound)	1 cent	1 9/10 cents	0.8 cent	80.00
All other (pound)	1⅜ cents	2.53 cents	1.155 cents	84.00
Whole milk powder (pound)	3 cents	6 1/12 cents	3.083 cents	102.77
Skim milk powder (pound)	1½ cents	3 cents	1½ cents	100.00
Malted milk and compounds, mixtures, and substitutes for milk and cream.	20 per cent	35 per cent	15 per cent	75.00
Butter (pound)	8 cents [4]	14 cents	6 cents	75.00
Oleomargarine and other butter substitutes (pound)	do	do	do	75.00
Cheese and substitutes (pound)	5 cents, not less than 25 per cent.[5]	7 cents, not less than 35 per cent	2 cents, not less than 10 per cent.	40.00
Birds, live, poultry: Live poultry (pound)	3 cents	8 cents	5 cents	166.67
Birds, dressed or undressed:				
Poultry, dressed or undressed (pound)	6 cents	10 cents	4 cents	66.67
Game birds, dressed or undressed (pound)	8 cents	do	2 cents	25.00
Game birds, canned	35 per cent	do		37.51

[1] Rate on fresh milk changed by presidential proclamation from 2½ to 3¾ cents per gallon, effective June 13, 1929.
[2] Rate includes skim milk and buttermilk.
[3] Rate on cream changed by presidential proclamation from 20 to 30 cents per gallon, effective June 13, 1929.
[4] Rate on butter changed by presidential proclamation from 8 cents to 12 cents per pound, effective Apr. 5, 1926.
[5] Rate on Emmenthaler or Swiss cheese changed by presidential proclamation from 5 cents per pound, not less than 25 per cent ad valorem to 7½ cents per pound and not less than 37½ per cent ad valorem, effective July 8, 1927.

Tariff rates on agricultural commodities: Increases in 1930 act over 1922 act—Continued

SCHEDULE 7—continued

Commodity	Rate of duty in 1922 act	Rate of duty in 1930 act	Amount by which duty is increased in 1930 act	Per cent of increase
Eggs of poultry in the shell, frozen whole eggs, yolks and whites, and dry whole eggs, yolks, and whites (albumen):				
Eggs in the shell (dozen)	8 cents	10 cents	2 cents	25.00
Whole eggs, egg yolks, and egg albumen, frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved (pound).	6 cents [1]	11 cents	5 cents	83.33
Wheat (bushel of 60 pounds)	30 cents [2]	42 cents	12 cents	40.00
Wheat flour, semolina, etc	78 cents [3]	104 cents	26 cents	33.00
Buckwheat (100 pounds)	10 cents	25 cents	15 cents	150.00
Corn (flint type) (bushel)	15 cents	do	10 cents	66.67
Cracked corn (bushel)	do	do	do	66.67
Corn meal, flour, grits, etc. (100 pounds)	30 cents	50 cents	20 cents	66.67
Oats (bushel)	15 cents	16 cents	1 cent	6.66
Rice paddy or rice having outer hull on (pound)	1 cent	1¼ cents	¼ cent	25.00
Uncleaned rice or rice free of the outer hull, etc. (pound)	1¼ cents	1½ cents	do	20.00
Cleaned rice (pound)	2 cents	2½ cents	½ cent	25.00
Rice flour, meal, polish, bran, and broken rice (pound)	½ cent	⅝ cent	⅛ cent	25.00
Soybean oil cake and soybean oil cake meal and all other vegetable oil cake and oil cake meal (pound).	Free	3/10 cent	3/10 cent	
Cherries, maraschino, prepared or preserved (pound)	40 per cent	9½ cents+40 per cent	9½ cents	103.02
Apricots, dried (pound)	½ cent	2 cents	1½ cents	300.00
Cherries, sulphured, or in brine, stemmed or pitted (pound)	2 cents [4]	9½ cents	7½ cents	375.00
Vinegar (proof gallon)	6 cents	8 cents	2 cents	33.33
Orange and lemon peel, prepared or preserved in any manner (pound)	5 cents	do	3 cents	60.00
Citron, candied or otherwise prepared or preserved (pound)	4½ cents	6 cents	1½ cents	33.00
Figs, fresh, dried, or in brine (pound)	2 cents	5 cents	3 cents	150.00
Figs, preserved or prepared in any manner	35 per cent	40 per cent	5 per cent	14.29
Dates, fresh or dried, with pits removed (pound)	1 cent	2 cents	1 cent	100.00
Dates, fresh or dried, in packages weighing not more than 10 pounds	do	7½ cents	6½ cents	650.00
Lemons (pound)	2 cents	2½ cents	½ cent	25.00
Limes, general tariff (pound)	1 cent	2 cents	1 cent	100.00
Grapefruit (pound)	do	1½ cents	½ cent	50.00
Olives in brine, ripe (gallon)	20 cents	30 cents	10 cents	50.00
Dried ripe olives (pound)	4 cents	5 cents	1 cent	25.00
Mangoes (pound)	35 per cent	15 cents		(5)
Pineapples in bulk, general tariff (each)	¾ cent	1⅙ cents	5/12 cent	55.56
Pineapples in crates (crate)	28.13 cents [6]	50 cents	21.87 cents	77.75
Plums, dried (pound)	½ cent	2 cents	1½ cents	300.00
Alligator pears (pound)	35 per cent	15 cents		(5)
All other fruit, fresh, dried, or preserved	do	40 per cent	5 per cent	14.29
Tulips, lily, and narcissus bulbs, and lily of the valley pips (1,000)	$2	$6	$4	200.00
Crocus bulbs (1,000)	$1	$2	$1	100.00
Almonds, not shelled (pounds)	4¾ cents	5½ cents	¾ cents	15.79
Almonds, shelled (pound)	14 cents	16½ cents	2½ cents	17.86
Almonds, otherwise prepared or preserved (pound)	35 per cent	18½ cents		(5)
Walnuts, prepared and preserved (pound)	35 per cent	15 cents		(5)
Walnut paste (pound)	25 per cent	do		(5)
Almond paste, general tariff (pound)	14 cents	18¼ cents	4½ cents	32.14
Chestnuts, including marrons, candied, etc. (pound)	Free	25 cents	25 cents	
Cream or Brazil nuts, shelled (pound)	1 cent	4½ cents	3½ cents	350.00
Cream or Brazil nuts, unshelled (pound)	do	1½ cents	½ cent	50.00
Filberts, unshelled (pound)	2½ cents	5 cents	2½ cents	100.00
Filberts, shelled (pound)	5 cents	10 cents	5 cents	100.00
Peanuts, not shelled (pound)[7]	3 cents	4¼ cents	1¼ cents	41.67
Peanuts, shelled (pound)[7]	4 cents	7 cents	3 cents	75.00
Walnuts, of all kinds, unshelled (pound)	do	5 cents	1 cent	25.00
Walnuts, of all kinds, shelled (pound)	12 cents	15 cents	3 cents	25.00
Pecans, unshelled (pound)	3 cents	5 cents	2 cents	66.67
Pecans, shelled (pound)	6 cents	10 cents	4 cents	66.67
Edible nuts, n. s. p. f., unshelled (pound)	1 cent	2½ cents	1½ cents	150.00
Edible nuts, n. s. p. f., shelled (pound)	do	5 cents	4 cents	400.00
Flaxseed or linseed (bushel of 56 pounds)[8]	40 cents	65 cents	25 cents	62.50
Soybeans (pound)	½ cent	2 cents	1½ cents	300.00
Grass seeds:				
Orchard grass (pound)	2 cents	5 cents	3 cents	150.00
Sweet clover (pound)	do	4 cents	2 cents	100.00
Alfalfa (pound)	4 cents	8 cents	4 cents	100.00
Alsike clover (pound)	do	do	do	100.00
Crimson clover (pound)	1 cent	2 cents	1 cent	100.00
Red clover (pound)	4 cents	8 cents	4 cents	100.00
White clover (pound)	3 cents	6 cents	3 cents	100.00
Ladino clover (pound)	2 cents	do	4 cents	200.00
Other clover, n. s. p. f. (pound)	do	3 cents	1 cent	50.00
Hairy vetch (pound)	do	do	do	50.00
Spring (common) vetch (pound)	1 cent	1½ cents	½ cent	50.00
Blue grass (pound)	2 cents	5 cents	3 cents	150.00
Tall oat grass (pound)	do	do	do	150.00
Bent grass (pound)	do	40 cents	38 cents	1,900.00
Rye grass (pound)	do	3 cents	1 cent	50.00
Other garden and field seeds:				
Cabbage (pound)	10 cents	12 cents	2 cents	20.00
Radish (pound)	4 cents	6 cents	do	50.00
Turnip (pound)	do	5 cents	1 cent	25.00
Rutabaga (pound)	do	do	do	25.00
Green beans (pound)	½ cent	3½ cents	3 cents	600.00
Dried beans (pound)	1¾ cents	3 cents	1¼ cents	71.42
Cashew nuts, shelled or unshelled (pound)	1 cent	2 cents	1 cent	100.00
Sugar beets (ton)	80 cents long ton	80 cents short ton		12.00
Canned beans (pound)	2 cents	3 cents	1 cent	50.00
Blackeyed cowpeas (pound)	1¾ cents	do	1¼ cents	71.42
Mushrooms, canned	45 per cent	10 cents on drained weight plus 45 per cent.	5 cents	[9] 56.24
Mushrooms, fresh or dried	do	10 cents plus 45 per cent	10 cents	28.67
Peas, green (pound)	1 cent	3 cents	2 cents	200.00
Chick-peas, fresh (pound)	Free	2 cents	do	
Peas, dried (pound)	1 cent	1¾ cents	¾ cent	75.00

[1] Rates on whole egg, egg yolk, and egg albumen, frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f., changed by presidential proclamation from 6 cents to 7½ cents per pound, effective Mar. 2, 1929.

[2] Rates on wheat changed by presidential proclamation from 30 cents to 42 cents per bushel on Apr. 6, 1924.

[3] Rates on wheat flour, semolina, etc., changed by presidential proclamation from 78 cents to 104 cents per bushel on Apr. 6, 1924.

[4] Rate on cherries, sulphured, or in brine, stemmed or pitted, changed by presidential proclamation from 2 cents to 3 cents, effective Jan. 2, 1928.

[5] Not calculable as imports not separately stated.

[6] The rate of 22½ cents per crate of 1.96 cubic feet, act of 1922, is equivalent to 28.13 cents per crate of 2.45 cubic feet, as specified in act of 1930.

[7] Unshelled. Changed by presidential proclamation from 3 to 4½ cents, February 18, 1929, shelled, from 4 to 6 cents.

[8] Changed by presidential proclamation from 40 to 56 cents, June 13, 1929.

[9] Drained weight is equivalent to approximately one-half of total weight.

Tariff rates on agricultural commodities: Increases in 1930 act over 1922 act—Continued

SCHEDULE 7—continued

Commodity	Rate of duty in 1922 act	Rate of duty in 1930 act	Amount by which duty is increased in 1930 act	Per cent of increase
Peas, split (pound)	1¼ cents	2½ cents	1¼ cents	100.00
Chick-peas, dried (pound)	Free	1¾ cents	1¾ cents	
Onions [1]	1 cent	2½ cents	1½ cents	150.00
White potatoes (100 pounds)	50 cents	75 cents	25 cents	50.00
Tomatoes in natural state	½ cent	3 cents	2½ cents	500.00
Canned tomatoes	15 per cent	50 per cent	35 per cent	233.33
Tomato paste	40 per cent	do	10 per cent	25.00
Turnips (100 pounds)	12 cents	25 cents	13 cents	108.33
Vegetables in their natural state:				
Celery	25 per cent	2 cents		48.08
Peppers (pound)	do	3 cents		310.88
Eggplant (pound)	do	do		331.64
Cucumbers (pound)	do	do		106.68
Horseradish (pound)	Free	do	3 cents	
Squash (pound)	25 per cent	2 cents		58.08
Lettuce (pound)	do	do		99.68
Cabbage (pound)	do	do		470.43
Vegetables, n. s. p. f. (pound)	do	50 per cent	25 per cent	100.00
Sauerkraut	35 per cent	do	15 per cent	42.86
Acorn and dandelion roots:				
Otherwise prepared (pound)	3 cents	4 cents	1 cent	33.33
Chicory, crude (pound)	1½ cents	2 cents	½ cent	33.33
Hay	$4 long ton	$5 short ton	$1.60	40.00
Straw	$1 long ton	$1.50 short ton	68 cents	68.00
Broomcorn	Free	$20 short ton	$20	
Lupulin (pound)	75 cents	$1.50	75 cents	100.00
Mustard seed, whole (pound)	1 cent	2 cents	1 cent	100.00
Mustard, ground or prepared in bottles or otherwise (pound)	8 cents	10 cents	2 cents	25.00
Cotton having a staple of 1⅛ inches or more in length	Free	7 cents	7 cents	
Cherries, dried, desiccated, or evaporated	2 cents	6 cents	4 cents	200.00
Fig paste (pound)	35 per cent	5 cents		[2]
Fruits, candied, crystallized or glacé, apricots, figs, dates, peaches, pears, plums, prunes, prunellas, berries, and other fruits, n. s. p. f.	do	40 per cent	5 per cent	14.29
Capsicum or red pepper or cayenne pepper:				
Unground (pound)	2 cents	5 cents	3 cents	150.00
Ground (pound)	5 cents	8 cents	do	60.00
Paprika:				
Unground (pound)	2 cents	5 cents	do	150.00

[1] Changed by President's proclamation from 1 to 1½ cents per pound on Jan. 21, 1929.
[2] Import statistics not separately reported.

SCHEDULE 8

Commodity	Rates of duties in 1922 act	Rates of duties in 1930 act	Amount by which duties are increased in 1930 act	Per cent increase
Concentrated juice of citrus fruits fit for beverage purposes (gallon)	Free	70 cents	70 cents [1]	

[1] On content of unconcentrated natural fruit juices.

SCHEDULE 10

Commodity	Rates of duties in 1922 act	Rates of duties in 1930 act	Amount by which duties are increased in 1930 act	Per cent increase
Flax, unmanufactured:				
Straw (ton)	$2	$3	$1	50.00
Flax, not hackled (pound)	1 cent	1½ cents	½ cent	50.00
Flax, hackled (pound)	2 cents	3 cents	1 cent	50.00
Flax, tow (pound)	¾ cent	1 cent	¼ cent	33.33
Flax, noils (pound)	do	do	do	33.33
Hemp, unmanufactured:				
Not hackled (pound)	1 cent	2 cents	1 cent	100.00
Hackled (pound)	2 cents	3½ cents	1½ cents	75.00
Tow (pound)	1 cent	2 cents	1 cent	100.00

SCHEDULE 11

Commodity	1922		Rate 1930 clean content	Amount by which duty is increased in 1930 act	Increase
	Rate of duty in 1922 act	Equivalent rate per pound of clean content			
Wool for manufacture:					
Carpet wools, dutiable—	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Per cent*
In grease (pound)	12	23	24	1.0	4.35
On skin (pound)	11	22	22		
Washed (pound)	18	24	24		
Scoured (pound)	14	27	27		
Wool sorted or matchings not scoured (pound)	[1] 12-24	24	25	1.0	4.17
Clothing and combing wool:					
In grease (pound)	31	31	34	3.0	9.68
Washed (pound)	31	31	34	3.0	9.68
On skin (pound)	30	30	32	2.0	6.67
Scoured (pound)	31	32	37	5.0	15.62
Mohair:					
In grease (pound)	31	31	34	3.0	9.68
Washed (pound)	31	31	34	3.0	9.68
On skin (pound)	30	30	32	2.0	6.67
Scoured (pound)	31	32	37	5.0	15.62

[1] 12 cents per pound in the grease, 18 cents per pound washed, 24 cents per pound scoured.

Tariff rates on agricultural commodities: Increases in 1930 act over 1922 act—Continued

SCHEDULE 15

Commodity	Rate of duty in 1922 act	Rate of duty in 1930 act	Amount by which duty is increased in 1930 act	Per cent of increase
Brooms	15 per cent	25 per cent	10 per cent	66.67
Hides and skins, raw—cattle skins:				
Dry or dry salted (over 12 pounds)	Free	10 per cent	do	
Wet salted (over 12 pounds)	do	do	do	
Buffalo hides (bovine not for rawhide articles):				
Dry or dry salted	do	do	do	
Wet salted	do	do	do	
Kip skins:				
Dry or dry salted (6 to 12 pounds)	do	do	do	
Wet salted (12 to 25 pounds)	do	do	do	
Calf skins:				
Dry and dry salted (less than 6 pounds)	do	do	do	
Wet salted (less than 12 pounds)	do	do	do	
Chamois leather	20 per cent	25 per cent	5 per cent	25.00
Leather for pianoforte, pianoforte action	do	do	do	25.00
Glove leather, finished in the white or in the crust	do	do	do	25.00
Seal, sheep, goat, and calf leather, dressed and finished, other than shoe leather.	do	30 per cent	10 per cent	50.00
Upper leather:				
Grains and finished splits	Free	15 per cent	15 per cent	
Wax and rough splits	do	do	do	
Calf and kip	do	do	do	
Sheep and lamb, upper and lining	do	10 per cent [1]	10 per cent	
Goat and kid, including glazed	do	do	do	
Lining leather, calf and kip only	do	15 per cent	15 per cent	
Patent upper leather	do	do	do	
Upper leather, n. s. p. f.	do	do	do	
Sole leather	do	12½ per cent	12½ per cent	
Leather cut into shoe uppers, vamps, etc., n. s. p. f.	do	15 per cent [2]	15 per cent	
Leather cut into soles	do	12½ per cent	12½ per cent	
Rough tanned leather:				
Skins for morocco, tanned but unfinished	do	25 per cent	25 per cent	
Rough tanned leather, n. s. p. f.	do	15 per cent	15 per cent	
Harness leather	do	12½ per cent	12½ per cent	
Belting leather	do	do	do	
Pigskin leather	do	10 per cent or 25 per cent	10 per cent or 25 per cent.[1]	
Free leather, n. s. p. f.	do	15 per cent	15 per cent	

[1] 30 per cent if fancy leather.

[2] 10 per cent if not bovine, 30 per cent if fancy.

TABLES SHOWING BENEFITS TO FARMER

In connection with the agricultural increases, I have inserted a number of tables, but I desire to call attention to just one.

I have had prepared by experts an answer to the inquiry whether the advantage the farmer obtains from the tariff equalizes or exceeds the cost to him of articles that are dutiable that he buys. I have had this information carefully compiled, and I will print it in the RECORD.

The first shows the facts for a farm of two hundred and thirty-odd acres in the southern part of Ohio, operating in general farming, but producing chiefly stock for market. There is first given the farm receipts, item by item, the amounts and the duties on them, making the total duty obtained by the farmer, if they are fully effective—and, of course, we can only assume in either case that they are fully effective—$1,206. Then follows a detailed list of the farm expenses, food and provisions, clothing, household operating expenses, and everything the farm consumed during the year, which shows that on all these items, if the duties were fully effective, the farmer would pay $182, while his benefit would be $1,206.

I have the same tabulation for a farm in Iowa, which shows that on such a farm——

Mr. SIROVICH. Has the gentleman comparative tables to show the difference between this tariff and the old tariff?

Mr. HAWLEY. No; not here, but I am having such a comparison compiled to be printed for the use of Members.

Mr. SIROVICH. I mean on the same basis.

Mr. HAWLEY. I have not had that table computed. This farm in Iowa, a general farm, would get a benefit of $1,679 and pay duties on articles purchased for the use of the farm and the household of $171 if the duties in both instances were fully effective.

During the progress of the legislation it has been contended that the average ad valorem for agriculture is lower than the average ad valorem for industry. Taking into consideration all the agricultural items in all the schedules, the average ad valorem for agriculture in the bill is higher than that for the manufacturing schedules.

It has also been urged that the protection to the farmer was offset in a large degree by the amount of duties he pays on manufactured articles which he purchases. I have had prepared by experts a detailed statement of the amount of duties on the products a farmer will sell and also the amount of the duties on the articles he will buy.

The first is taken from a study of 300 farms in southern Ohio made by the Department of Agriculture, giving first a list of the products sold and then a list of the purchases made, with duties reckoned on the rates in the pending bill.

AN OHIO FARM

The data for this farm were furnished by the Department of Agriculture. The owner and operator of this farm was one of the more successful of over 300 studied by the Department of Agriculture in southern Ohio for the year 1926.

The farm family consisted of the farmer, his wife, a daughter 18 years of age, and a son 12 years of age.

This farm consisted of acres divided as follows: 16 acres in corn, 10 acres in wheat, 6 acres in oats, 30 acres in hay, 3 acres in soybeans, 3 acres in apples, 155 acres in pasture.

Dairy and poultry were the two chief sources of income. The number of livestock kept were as follows: 3 horses, 10 cows, 20 other cattle, 4 brood sows, 215 chickens.

Farm receipts

Article	Unit of quantity	Value	Quantity	Rate of duty	Amount of duty
Farm sales:					
Heifers	Pound	$522	8,700	3 cents per pound	$261.00
Calves	do	220	2,000	2½ cents per pound	50.00
Bulls	do	50	1,500	3 cents per pound	45.00
Steers	do	100	1,450	do	43.50
Hogs	do	300	3,600	2 cents per pound	72.00
Hens	do	135	562	8 cents per pound	44.96
Milk	Gallon	540	3,900	6½ cents per gallon	253.50
Eggs	Dozen	1,500	4,320	10 cents per dozen	432.00
Straw	Ton	36	3	$1.50 per ton	4.50
Total		3,403			1,206.46
Other receipts:					
Breeding fees		32			
Appraiser		170			
Total		202			1,206.46
Grand total		3,605			1,206.46

Expenses

Article	Unit of quantity	Value	Quantity	Rate of duty	Amount of duty
FARM					
Dutiable:					
Mixed feed	Ton	$120.00	3	10 per cent ad valorem	$9.00
Salt	100 pounds	5.00	5	11 cents per hundredweight.	.55
Chicken mash	Ton	204.00	4	10 per cent ad valorem	15.20
Clover seed	Bushel	33.00	1½	8 cents per pound	7.20
Timothy seed	do	7.00	2	2 cents per pound	1.80
Soybeans	do	3.00	2	do	2.40
Baling wire	Pound	12.00	300	½ cent per pound	1.50
Auto tires		50.00		10 per cent ad valorem	2.50
Pigs	Number	134.00	19	2 cents per pound	7.60
Chicks	do	75.00	500	4 cents each	20.00
Total		643.00			67.75
Free.					
Bones	100 pounds	5.00	1	Free	
Oyster shell	do	6.00	6	do	
Fertilizer	Ton	104.00	4	do	
Twine	Pounds	3.00	20	do	
Gasoline and oil.		75.00			
Total		193.00			
Other:[1]					
Farm improvements.		60.00			
Labor		75.00			
Machinery repairs.		15.00			
Dwelling repairs.		30.00			
Other building repairs.		15.00			
Fence repairs		35.00			
Feed grinding		5.00			
Horse shoeing		10.00			
Threshing		17.00			
Auto repairs		12.00			
Auto tags		4.00			
Telephone		28.00			
Insurance		20.00			
Taxes		272.00			
Total		598.00			
Grand total		1,434.00			67.75
FOOD AND PROVISIONS					
Beef	Pound	39.10	170	6 cents per pound	10.20
Fish	do	2.64	12	2 cents per pound	.24
Oysters (fresh)	Quart	2.50	2½	8 cents per pound	.40
Wheat flour	Pound	48.00	1,200	$1.04 per 100 pounds	12.48
Buckwheat flour	do	1.20	30	½ cent per pound	.15
Beans	Bushel	4.80	1	3 cents per pound	1.80
Vinegar	Gallon	1.20	3	8 cents per gallon	.24
Sirup	do	1.40	2	¼ cent per gallon	.01
Apples	Bushel	7.50	15	25 cents per bushel	3.75
Peaches	do	2.00	2	½ cent per pound	.48
Cherries	do	3.75	1½	2 cents per pound	1.68
Oranges	Dozen	4.00	10	1 cent per pound	.40
Lemons	do	1.60	4	2½ cents per pound	.25
Prunes	Pound	4.32	24	2 cents per pound	.48
Raisins	do	3.60	24	do	.48
Oatmeal	Boxes	5.20	52	80 cents per hundredweight.	.42
Noodles	do	1.50	15	3 cents per pound	.22
Cornstarch	Package	.30	3	1½ cents per pound	.04
Rice	Pound	2.88	36	2½ cents per pound	.90
Crackers	do	13.00	52	30 per cent ad valorem	1.95
Cookies	do	1.04	4	do	.15
Salad dressing	Jar	3.90	26	25 per cent ad valorem	.49
Peanut butter	Pint	1.00	4	do	.25
Sugar	Pound	41.00	512½	$2.12 per 100 pounds	10.86
Cocoa	do	2.40	12	3 cents per pound	.36
Extracts	Bottle	3.00	6	25 per cent ad valorem	.38
Spices and pepper	Pound	1.40	2	5 cents per pound	.10
Salt	do	1.50	100	1 cent per hundredweight.	.11
Soda	Boxes	.60	12	¼ cent per pound	.03
Baking powder	do	3.00	12	25 per cent ad valorem	.38
Yeast	Package	4.50	50	20 per cent ad valorem	.50
Candy, gum, etc		2.50		40 per cent ad valorem	.50
Total		216.33			50.68
Bananas	Dozen	3.00	10	Free	
Tapioca and sago	Boxes	.60	6	do	
Bread	Loaf	5.20	52	do	
Coffee	Pound	15.60	52	do	
Total		24.40			
Grand total		240.73			50.68

[1] Some of these items, such as, farm improvements and repairs, may include expenditures for materials which may or may not be dutiable. The original data do not show labor and materials separately for these items of expense.

Expenses

CLOTHING

Article	Purchased value	Quantity	Rate of duty	Amount of duty
		Number		
Aprons, cloth	$2.25	15	25 per cent	$0.20
Dresses:				
Cotton cloth	6.00	5	do	.52
Wool cloth	6.00	1	50 pents per pound+60 per cent.	2.26
Silk cloth	9.25	2	55 per cent	1.78
Silk dress	10.00	1	60 per cent	1.80
Coats and capes	25.00	1	33 cents per pound+45 per cent.	4.93
Raincoats	5.00	1	37½ per cent	.66
Hats:				
Spring and summer	11.50	2	$4 per dozen+50 per cent	2.34
Winter	6.00	1	$1.25 per dozen+25 per cent.	.83
Slips	1.50	2	37½ per cent	.20
Bloomers	3.00	3	55 per cent	.58
Stockings:				
Silk	8.96	8	60 per cent	1.88
Cotton	7.20	18	50 per cent	1.26
Shoes	25.50	5	20 per cent	2.55
Arctics	10.00	2	35 per cent	1.75
Gloves	.90	2	50 per cent	.16
Shoe repairs	5.25		10 per cent on materials	.25
Supplies	.81		50 per cent	.14
Caps	2.50	1	50 cents per pound+50 per cent.	.56
Hats (not straw)	1.98	1	50 cents per pound+75 per cent+25 cents each.	.90
Suits	33.50	1	50 cents per pound+50 per cent.	7.36
Extra trousers	10.50	2	do	2.59
Overcoats	20.00	1	33 cents per pound+45 per cent.	4.80
Overalls	10.00	5	37½ per cent	1.31
Blouse	2.00	1	do	.26
Work shirts	3.00	3	45 per cent	.47
Dress shirts	14.00	6	do	2.20
Union suits (winter)	4.00	2	37½ per cent	.52
B. V. D.'s (summer)	3.00	3	do	.40
Socks and stockings pairs	8.00	24	50 per cent	1.40
Shoes do	24.00	6	20 per cent	2.40
Rubbers do	2.50	2	25 per cent	.25
Rubber boots do	9.00	2	do	1.12
Gloves do	4.20	12	50 per cent	.74
Ties	1.50	4	37½ per cent	.20
Belts	1.00	1	35 per cent	.18
Shoe repairs	4.00		10 per cent on material	.20
Sewing supplies	.99		50 per cent	.17
Total	303.79			52.12

HOUSEHOLD OPERATING EXPENSES

Article	Unit of quantity	Value	Quantity	Rate of duty	Amount of duty
		Dutiable	*Dutiable*		
Soap	Bars	$5.20	52	15 per cent ad valorem	0.39
Cleaning powder	Cans	.30	3	25 per cent ad valorem	.04
Laundry starch	Boxes	.80	8	1½ cents per pound	.12
Blueing	Box	.15	1	3 cents per pound	.01
Matches	Boxes	.56	8	2¾ cents per thousand	.09
Paper	Rolls	.60	12	35 per cent ad valorem	.07
Tacks	Box	.05	1	6 cents per pound	.01
Books		16.00		15 per cent ad valorem	1.20
Records		5.00		30 per cent ad valorem	.75
Stationery, etc		12.00		40 per cent ad valorem	1.20
Toilet articles		17.00		50 per cent ad valorem	4.25
Cleaning equipment		3.20		25 per cent ad valorem	.40
Electric bulbs, etc		2.50		20 per cent ad valorem	.38
Kitchen utensils		7.50		50 per cent ad valorem	1.38
China and tableware		4.00		55 per cent ad valorem	1.10
Curtains, pillows, etc		1.60		25 per cent ad valorem	.20
Screens, shades, etc		4.00		do	.50
		80.46			12.09
		Free	*Free*		
Gasoline	Gallon	36.00	180	Free	
Coal	Bushels	30.00	300	do	
Wood	Cords	4.00	2	do	
		70.00			
Grand total		150.46			
Health, advancement, and education					
Dental work		9.00			
Oculist and glasses		17.50			
Music lessons		56.00			
Magazines		39.85			
Fraternal organizations		20.20			
Sports, etc		5.00			

Expenses—Continued

HOUSEHOLD OPERATING EXPENSES—continued

Article	Unit of quantity	Value	Quantity	Rate of duty	Amount of duty
Health, advancement, and education—Con.		*Dutiable*	*Dutiable*		
Photographs		$0.50			
Concerts, etc		12.00			
Dances, picnics, etc		10.00			
Vacation and special trips.		4.00			
Church, Sunday school, and missions.		50.00			
Red Cross		1.00			
Life insurance		66.90			
		291.95			

Summary

	Dutiable		Free value	Other value	Total	
	Value	Duty			Value	Duty
EXPENSES						
Farm expenses	$643.00	$67.75	$193.00	$598.00	$1,434.00	$67.75
Food and provisions	216.33	50.68	24.40		240.73	50.68
Clothing	303.79	52.12			303.79	52.12
Household operating	80.46	12.09	70.00		150.46	12.09
Health, advancement				291.95	291.95	
	1,243.58	182.64	287.40	889.95	2,420.93	182.64
RECEIPTS						
Farm sales	3,403.00	1,206.46			3,403.00	1,206.46
Other receipts				202.00		
	3,403.00	1,206.46		202.00	3,403.00	1,206.46

Supposing in the case of both sales and purchases the duties are fully effective, the benefit the farmer will receive from the tariff is $1,206.46, and the duties he will pay on purchases of articles, expenses of administration, food and provisions, clothing, and household expenses will amount to $182.64.

These illustrations include typical farm operations and farm purchases, but the variation between the tariff benefits the farmers receive as compared with the tariff burdens they may bear is such as to warrant the inference that the tariff as a whole operated materially to their benefit.

A CENTRAL IOWA FARM

The second illustration is that of a farm in Iowa raising a number of products. The benefit that the owner will receive from the duties is $1,679. For the articles he purchases in connection with farm expenses the duties will be $56.67. Supposing he had the same expense for food and provisions as in the preceding illustration, the duty on those would be $50.68; on clothing, $52.12; and on household operating expenses, $12.09; making a total of $171.56.

This tabulation shows the yearly experience under the pending tariff bill for a farm in central Iowa, upon the assumption that the rates are fully effective, of the amount of duty at the rates in the pending tariff bill, H. R. 2667, applied to the quantities obtained from the Department of Agriculture's studies of products produced upon the selected farm and the articles consumed upon this farm during one year.

The data for this farm were furnished by the United States Department of Agriculture and the farm was selected by the experts of the department as typical of the agriculture of the State of Iowa.

The farm consisted of 231 acres, divided as follows: Seventy-three acres in field corn, 8 acres in silage corn, 60 acres in oats, 48 acres in clover and timothy, 29 acres in pasture, 13 acres in farmstead, roads, and so forth.

Cattle and hogs were the chief source of income from livestock. The number of livestock kept were as follows: Eight horses, 2 colts, 11 cows, 37 other cattle, 14 brood sows, 70 other hogs, 90 chickens.

FARM RECEIPTS

Item	Unit of quantity	Quantity	Value	Rate of duty	Amount of duty
Farm sales:					
Corn	Bushel	2,180	$1,635	25 cents per bushel	$545.00
Oats	do	1,800	630	16 cents per bushel	288.00
Cattle (7 head)	Pound	6,676	461	3 cents per pound	200.00
Cattle (10 head)	do	7,700	625	do	231.00
Hogs (61 head)	do	16,782	1,251	2 cents per pound	336.00
Chickens	do	100	24	8 cents per pound	8.00
Cream			120	56.6 cents per gallon	41.00
Eggs	Dozen	300	60	10 cents per dozen	30.00
Total			4,806		1,679.00
Other receipts, team work.[1]			208		
Grand total			5,014		1,679.00

FARM EXPENSES

Dutiable:					
Mixed feed	Pound	600	$15	10 per cent ad valorem.	$0.75
Corn	Bushel	52	32	25 cents per bushel	13.00
Salt	Pound	700	5	11 cents per 100 pounds.	.77
Tires			35	10 per cent ad valorem.	1.75
Chickens	Pound	130	39	8 cents per pound	10.40
Horse		1	125	$30 each	30.00
Total			251		56.67
Free:					
Wagon bed			15		
Twine			34		
Paris green			2		
Gasoline and oil			111		
Total			162		
Other:					
Labor			608		
Machinery repairs			108		
Building repairs			65		
Fence repairs			50		
Silo filling			22		
Corn shelling			33		
Veterinary fees			21		
Breeding fees			46		
Threshing			91		
Telephone			17		
Farm papers			7		
Association dues			5		
Taxes			322		
Interest			400		
Total			1,795		
Grand total			2,208		56.67

Summary

Item	Dutiable		Free value	Other value	Total	
	Value	Duty			Value	Duty
Farm expenses	$251	$57	$162	$1,795	$2,208	$57
Farm receipts	4,806	1,679		208	5,014	1,679

[1] Away from farm.

THE FARMER'S DUTIABLE LIST

From studies I have had made and from other sources of information, the benefit farmers derive from the protection given their products greatly exceeds any burden to them from purchases of protected articles they buy. That is, the farmer's balance sheet will show a net profit, due to the protective tariff. It certainly did not show any favorable balance under the Underwood Act. But it should always be remembered that the tariff can not consider inefficient management in any industry.

The following table indicates the divergent attitude toward the farmer by Republican and Democratic tariff makers:

Differences in agricultural rates in certain acts

Commodity	Underwood-Simmons Act (1913)	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill (1930)
Alfalfa seed ... pound	Free	4 cents	8 cents.
Barley, unhulled ... bushel	15 cents	20 cents	20 cents.
Bacon, ham, and shoulders ... pound	Free	2 cents	3¾ cents.
Beans, dried ... do	5/12 of 1 cent	1¾ cents	3 cents.
Beef and veal ... do	Free	3 cents	6 cents.

Differences in agricultural rates in certain acts—Continued

Commodity	Underwood-Simmons Act (1913)	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill (1930)
Butter ... do	2½ cents	8 cents	14 cents.
Buckwheat ... hundredweight	Free	10 cents	25 cents.
Casein ... pound	do	2½ cents	5½ cents.
Cattle:			
Weighing less than 700 pounds	do	1½ cents	2½ cents.
Weighing 700-1,049 pounds	do	do	3 cents.
Weighing 1,050 pounds or over	do	2 cents	Do.
Cheese and substitutes	20 per cent	5 cents per pound.	7 cents per pound but not less than 35 per cent.
Corn ... bushel	Free	15 cents	25 cents.
Cream ... gallon	do	20 cents	56 9/10 cents.
Eggs:			
Fresh ... dozen	do	8 cents	10 cents
Frozen ... pound	2 cents	6 cents	11 cents.
Dried ... do	10 cents	18 cents	18 cents.
Flaxseed ... bushel	20 cents	40 cents	65 cents.
Honey	10 cents per gallon.	3 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.
Lard ... pound	Free	1 cent	3 cents.
Lard substitutes ... do	do	4 cents	5 cents.
Milk ... gallon	do	2½ cents	6½ cents.
Mutton ... pound	do	do	5 cents.
Onions ... do	⅛ of 1 cent	1 cent	2½ cents.
Oats ... bushel	6 cents	15 cents	16 cents.
Oleomargarine and butter substitutes ... pound	2½ cents	8 cents	14 cents.
Pork ... do	Free	¾ of 1 cent	2½ cents.
Potatoes ... hundredweight	do	50 cents	75 cents.
Poultry:			
Live ... pound	1 cent	3 cents	8 cents.
Dressed ... do	2 cents	6 cents	10 cents.
Red-clover seed ... do	Free	4 cents	8 cents.
Rye ... bushel	do	15 cents	15 cents.
Sheep ... per head	do	$2	$3.
Swine ... pound	do	½ of 1 cent	2 cents.
Wheat ... bushel	do	30 cents	42 cents.
Wools (pound):			
On the skin	do	30 cents (clean content).	32 cents (clean content).
In the grease or washed	do	31 cents (clean content).	34 cents (clean content).
Scoured	do	31 cents	37 cents (clean content).

Of the 38 items named above, all of which are dutiable under the previous law and under the pending act, the Underwood Act had 25 on the free list and 13 were dutiable, but at much lower rates than those provided in either the 1922 act or the 1930 bill.

The Underwood Act led to such general distress in agriculture that upon the election of a Republican administration and a Congress which assembled in 1921, an emergency act was immediately passed as a measure of urgent necessity.

THE FARMER'S FREE LIST

There is another very distinct advantage the farmer has in the long list of articles of farm utility that are not dutiable when imported. I have had carefully prepared as nearly as possible a complete list of such articles that are free in both the 1922 act and in the 1930 act, and have had added to it the articles that are dutiable under the present law but placed on the free list in the 1930 bill; also a list of articles of general consumption used on the farm and elsewhere which are free of duty in the 1922 act and the 1930 bill, and there is also shown items that are dutiable in the present law and transferred to the free list by the bill. Then the articles of general consumption used on a farm and elsewhere which are on the free list in the act of 1922 but transferred to the dutiable list in the 1930 bill.

Finally, the articles that were removed from the free list in 1922 and are made dutiable for the benefit of the farmer.

ARTICLES AND MATERIALS USED BY THE FARMER OR ENTERING INTO THE PRODUCTION OF SUCH ARTICLES AND MATERIALS FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE FARMER IN THE PRODUCTION OF CROPS, LIVESTOCK, ETC., WHICH ARE FREE BOTH UNDER THE 1922 ACT AND THE 1930 ACT

Agricultural implements: Clover-seed scarifiers, corn knives, cream separators valued at over $50 each, cultivators, drills, farm tools, forks, grape-picking knives, harrows, tooth and disk, harvesters, hay forks, headers, horse rakes, machetes, mowers, except lawn mowers, planters, plows, reapers, tar and oil spreading machines, threshing machines, tractors and parts, trowels, wagons and parts, and other agricultural implements and machinery.

Animals and poultry for breeding purposes.

Antitoxins, vaccines, serums.

Arsenic, white, and arsenious acid.

Asbestos and stucco.

Barbed wire.

Binding twine.

Calcium: Chloride, cyanamide, and nitrate (countervailing duty provision).

Coal: Anthracite, bituminous, slack; coke; briquets; and other fuel compositions principally of coal or coal dust (countervailing duty provision).

Creosote oil.

Copper sulphate, or blue vitriol.

Cyanide (fumigation).

Fertilizer materials: Guano, basic slag, manure, dried blood, bones, bone dust, bone meal, animal carbon (suitable only for fertilizer), horns and hoofs, kelp, moss, crude seaweed.

Gunpowder and other explosives (countervailing duty provision).

Hones, whetstones, scythe stones.

Jute.

Manila fiber.

Oils: Cod-liver, gasoline, kerosene, petroleum, fuel oil, and lubricating oils and greases.

Phosphates, crude.

Pitch.

Plaster rock, or gypsum, crude.

Potassium: Chloride, nitrate, sulphate; wood ashes.

Rennet.

Sand and gravel, n. s. p. f.

Seeds: Sugar-beet, cowpeas, n. s. p. f.

Sheep dip.

Sisal fiber.

Sodium nitrate, or saltpeter.

Sulphur.

Tar.

Tobacco stems.

Wood: Firewood, handle bolts, laths, pickets, poles, posts, logs, rough lumber, shingles.

Wood charcoal.

Additions to free list by 1930 act

	Rate 1922 act
Ammonium sulphate (fertilizer material)	¼ of 1 cent per pound.
Burrstones, manufactured	15 per cent ad valorem.
Calcium arsenate	25 per cent ad valorem.
Grindstones	$1.75 per ton.
Paris green and London purple	15 per cent ad valorem.
Santonin (hog medicine)	75 cents per pound.
Tankage—fish scrap and fish meal	10 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively.
Urea	35 per cent ad valorem.
Various fertilizer materials.	

ARTICLES OF GENERAL CONSUMPTION AND USE ON THE FARM AND ELSEWHERE WHICH ARE FREE OF DUTY UNDER THE 1922 ACT AND THE 1930 BILL

Bananas.

Bibles.

Borax, crude.

Bread.

Coffee.

Palm-leaf fans.

Ice.

Lumber, softwood, rough or planed on one side only (from contiguous countries).

Mineral salt (natural evaporated).

Needles (hand-sewing and darning).

Quinine sulphate.

Sago, crude, and sago flour.

Shellfish, not specially provided for.

Shingles.

Tapioca.

Tea.

Turmeric.

Additions to free list by 1930 act

	Rate 1922 act
Citrons (dried)	2 cents per pound.
Baking soda (bicarbonate of soda)	¼ of 1 cent per pound.
Plantains	35 per cent.
Spices, unground	Various rates.

ARTICLES OF GENERAL CONSUMPTION AND USE ON THE FARM AND ELSEWHERE WHICH ARE REMOVED FROM THE FREE LIST AND MADE DUTIABLE BY THE 1930 ACT

	Rate 1930 act
Boots and shoes	20 per cent.
Brick	$1.25 per thousand.
Cement	6 cents per hundredweight.
Curry powder	5 cents per pound.
Gloves made from cattle hides	25 per cent.
Harness valued at less than $70 per set, single harness valued at less than $40, saddles valued at less than $40 each, and parts	15 per cent.
Lumber	$1 per thousand board feet.
Pads for horses	15 per cent, 25 per cent.
Turpentine	5 per cent.

ARTICLES REMOVED FROM THE FREE LIST OF THE 1922 ACT AND MADE DUTIABLE FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE FARMER

	Rate 1930 act
Black-eye cowpeas	3½ cents per pound.
Chickpeas or garbanzoes	2 cents per pound.
Hides of cattle	10 per cent.
Long-staple cotton	7 cents per pound.
Oil cake and oil-cake meal (vegetable)	0.3 of 1 cent per pound.

That tariff duties do benefit farmers by increasing prices, I submit the following from the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Tariff Commission, page 183, I find this information:

Table B compares prices of No. 1 dark Northern spring wheat in Minneapolis with prices of No. 3 Northern spring wheat in Winnipeg. Prices in Minneapolis have generally been higher than prices in Winnipeg, but not by the full amount of the duty. The effect of the change in duty on prices has been modified by changes in freight rates, in conditions of storage and marketing, and in the relative quantities of the several grades imported. Furthermore, the Canadian standards for the several grades are not fixed but vary from year to year. In the fall of the year a large number of samples of the crop are obtained and analyzed, and the grades for that year are determined on the basis of the protein content of the wheat, its weight per bushel, and the percentage of foreign matter that it contains. This change in standards lessens the value of price comparisons in measuring the effects of a change in duty.

TABLE B.—*Prices of spring wheat at Minneapolis and Winnipeg, 1923–1929, per bushel*

Date	Minneapolis [1] dark northern No. 1	Winnipeg [2] northern No. 3	Amount Minneapolis price exceeds Winnipeg
1923—January	$1.28	$1.04	$0.24
April	1.33	1.16	.17
July	1.18	1.02	.16
October	1.25	.91	.34
1924—January	1.24	.89	.35
April [3]	1.26	.91	.35
July	1.47	1.27	.20
October	1.51	1.50	.01
1925—January	1.98	1.84	.14
April	1.60	1.47	.13
July	1.66	1.54	.12
October	1.58	1.20	.38
1926—January	1.78	1.46	.32
April	1.66	1.46	.20
July	1.75	1.49	.26
October	1.53	1.36	.17
1927—January	1.47	1.23	.24
April	1.41	1.33	.08
July	1.58	1.53	.05
October	1.34	1.27	.07
1928—January	1.43	1.23	.20
April	1.63	1.42	.21
July	1.47	1.20	.27
October	1.23	1.11	.12
1929—January	1.29	1.12	.17
April	1.29	1.15	.14
July	1.50		

[1] From Crops and Markets, U. S. Department of Agriculture.
[2] From Monthly Bulletin of Agricultural Statistics; Dominion Bureau of Statistics.
[3] Change in duty from 30 cents to 42 cents per bushel effective Apr. 6, 1924.

From the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Tariff Commission, page 153, I gain this information:

Medium western steer sides at New York compare with Argentine chilled sides (fore and hind quarters) in London. The Argnetine beef can be landed in New York at virtually the same cost per pound as in London. During the calendar years 1927 and 1928, the Argentine beef averaged 11.65 cents per pound for the domestic beef in London, as compared with 17.53 cents per pound for the domestic beef in New York, resulting in a market differential of 5.88 cents per pound. The following tabulation shows average annual prices for native beef steers and stockers and feeders at Chicago, chiller export steers in Buenos Aires, medium western steer beef (sides) for the years 1923 to 1928, inclusive.

Prices per 100 pounds

Year	Chicago		Buenos Aires, chilled steers	New York, medium western steer beef sides	London, Argentine chilled beef sides	Market differential between New York and London
	Native beef steers	Stockers and feeders				
1923	$9.55	$6.55	$3.60	$13.86	$9.90	$3.96
1924	9.60	6.35	4.38	13.65	10.00	3.65
1925	10.55	6.80	6.16	14.12	11.50	2.62
1926	9.70	7.40	5.16	13.71	10.60	3.11
1927	11.70	8.75	5.52	15.90	11.40	4.50
1928	14.05	11.05	6.29	19.16	11.90	7.26

The Underwood Act so impaired our industries with resultant unemployment that the purchases of farm products and farm prices declined. A considerable proportion of industries engaged in canning, preparing, or preserving farm products curtailed or discontinued their operations because of lack of markets for their outputs. Under the existing law average farm prices have increased and the purchasing power of his dollar materially advanced.

The pending bill has so increased the duties on the generality of farm products that the American farmer will have practically the American market up to our consumptive requirements.

Attempts to defeat the bill are wittingly or unwittingly attacks on the very favorable rates given agriculture. It is a basic industry. All must eat and dress and our people are accustomed to do themselves well in the matter of food and clothing. To the extent that agricultural rates are effective at any time, prices to the farmers will be increased. The investigations of the Tariff Commission indicate they are effective, varying with the market. To what extent prices will be increased to consumers will depend largely on what proportion of the increase to the farmers will be absorbed by the distributing agencies. Any increase that may occur in the cost of living will be due more to agricultural advances than to those for other schedules, since agricultural products are necessities of life and because more than 60 per cent of the general increase is due to increase in duties in such products.

The domestic market is the farmer's best market. The chief factor in that market are the wage earners in the United States, who derive their means of support from pay rolls. These wage earners, numbering over 27,000,000 with their households, comprise more than half of our people.

The wages paid to labor in the major industries alone are $11,000,000,000 annually. Employment enables them to purchase their requirements. Any depression in the activities and industries that employ them diminishes their purchasing power. The conclusion is that agriculture has a material and valuable interest in the progress and prosperity of industry which gives employment to labor.

In the remaining two or three minutes that I must take, I desire to comment further on the foreign trade.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield for just a second? Would the gentleman put in the tables later a comparison with respect to the same thing, showing the old tariffs worked out on the same basis in the case of the two farms concerning which he spoke earlier in his remarks?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will if I can find it. These figures were prepared in the Department of Agriculture, so they were prepared by experts and are not my figures.

There has been in the press a great deal of propaganda against this bill by certain large interests, stating we should reduce our duties; that this bill should fail and leave the duties as they are, with the next step a reduction in existing duties to promote our foreign trade.

No one objects to the growth of cur foreign trade. It has increased 100 per cent under the existing tariff act and will continue to grow as the country grows and prospers.

There are those Americans who have gone abroad, taking, it is said, in excess of $20,000,000,000 of capital and invested it in industries in every part of the world, who have asked us to give them preferential treatment, if not free entry, of their goods into this country, these goods manufactured abroad by foreign labor to be brought in under preferential conditions. This we refused. [Applause.] When they complain that foreign trade is not developing, these very people who have gone abroad and built industries in all parts of the world, supplying the markets abroad by these foreign manufactories, are themselves the persons who are deterring the growth of our foreign trade more than any other. If they fill the world with manufactures made by American capital abroad they themselves take away the opportunity of selling American goods in those markets.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the bill make any provision for placing a duty on Henry Ford's tractors built in Ireland?

Mr. HAWLEY. There is no change in the rate of duty. They come in free as agricultural machinery.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the gentleman will concede they are being manufactured in Ireland?

Mr. HAWLEY. Certainly.

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

Mr. HAWLEY. For a brief question; yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not true that these great manufacturing concerns that have established plants abroad have done so real-

izing that we are facing retaliatory tariff acts by other nations, and in order to control the European trade they are being compelled to go over there and establish plants in Europe and in other parts of the world because they know that such retaliation is inevitable?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will answer that question as the last part of my remarks——

Mr. BACHARACH. If the gentleman will permit, I may answer the gentleman from New York by saying that 80 per cent of the cars that Ford manufactures in Ireland are shipped into this country and shipped in duty free.

Mr. HAWLEY. For farm relief; yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How does the gentleman justify that?

Mr. HAWLEY. That is farm relief.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They are certainly not picked off of the trees. They are made by labor.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will not the industrialization of Russia within the next three and a half years, to which America is contributing the machinery, be instrumental in limiting the foreign markets of the world to our own products manufactured in America that have to compete in the limited markets of the world?

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was told the other day that there were 50,000 men walking the streets of Detroit who were formerly employed in the automobile industry by companies who have gone abroad and established factories. Is that so?

Mr. HAWLEY. I have heard it; I have not the means of verifying it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And these capitalists who have gone abroad, throwing American workmen out on the streets, are advocating the Democratic theory of a nonprotective tariff.

Mr. GARNER. This bill does not remedy that situation at all.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARE. I was interested in the statement the gentleman made about the revenue of the average farmer in the State of Ohio—what he would receive as the result of this bill, and the amount that he would have to pay. As I understood the gentleman, he would get in his farm operations approximately $1,000 a year.

Mr. HAWLEY. One thousand two hundred and six dollars if the duties were effective.

Mr. HARE. And he would pay only $182 for the things introduced into his home. Has the gentleman verified those figures?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will put them in the RECORD, and the gentleman can verify them himself.

Mr. HARE. Is the chairman willing to say that these figures are reliable and correct?

Mr. HAWLEY. I think they are; they were computations by the Department of Agriculture after intensive study.

Mr. HARE. I was only wondering if the information was reliable.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think it is.

Now, in answer to the question first asked, and in conclusion, when American capitalists go abroad and establish industries for the manufacture of goods in other countries they assume their own risk. We owe them no obligation. They are not going out with the consent or the approval of the American Congress; it is their own voluntary action. If they go abroad, as is alleged, only to prevent a reprisal by foreign tariff on American goods, and they manufacture goods abroad by cheap labor, they can not bring their goods into the United States under any preferential basis. [Applause.] If they send to this country goods made by labor, paid one-quarter or one-sixth of the wage paid American labor, they have no right to complain of conditions abroad if they are in any way adverse to them. We are not justified in taking from the American farmers and manufacturers and American labor, by unfairly reducing our duties, any part of their income to make good any losses foreign investors may incur abroad.

THE FLEXIBLE TARIFF

Economic conditions continually alter, new articles are produced, or old articles assume new forms, new price levels appear, new competitors enter the field, in this changeful world of trade and commerce, thus in any tariff structure making certain duties obsolete, others ineffective, and others too low or too high.

In order, without undue delay, to adapt the tariff to conditions as they arise, we have greatly enlarged the opportunities of the Tariff Commission for obtaining necessary information and determining differences in costs of production; we have also increased its duties and power by authorizing it to recommend what any new rate should be. At present it merely finds the facts, without recommending rates. Hereafter it will also propose definite rates for the approval or disapproval of the President.

The new provisions will facilitate investigations and materially shorten the time necessary to reach decisions.

Under the new provisions it is intended to keep the tariff up to date, obviating the necessity for frequent general revisions.

We are the Congress of the United States, responsible for the prosperity of no country but our own, responsible for the welfare of all our people rather than for that of some of the most successful, if at any time a choice must be made, and the greatest service we can render to the nations of earth is so to administer our affairs that every industry and agriculture may prosper, every wage earner have steady employment at American wages, every home maintain our excellent standards of living, for general wealth to increase, for public and private betterments to more widely spread their beneficial influences, that we may continue to present to the world the illustrious example of a self-sustaining and self-sufficient nation. That is, rather raise other nations to our levels of living than for ourselves to accept theirs. While we continue the world's greatest market, we can absorb increasing quantities of imports without disruption of our progress and send abroad enlarged quotas of our own productions.

This act was prepared in a nationally minded way. Adjustments were made where the cause was sustained by the evidence without respect to geographical location, party affiliation, or nature of enterprise. No Democratic bill ever gave the South the protection its growing needs require; this bill accords it equality of treatment.

Congress in discharging a trust so vital to the country must act nationally minded, with a readiness to discharge its obligation, irrespective of praise or blame, intent only to so provide that comfort and prosperity may permeate the land and abide with all this so great a people.

For this reason readjustments were approved where the facts and conditions warranted and disapproved where they did not. Probably no other legislation makes greater demand for discretion and judgment, for impartiality and discernment, for untiring industry and an insatiable thirst for information.

In conclusion we approach the end of a work of making a new tariff. It is my belief, after 17 months of careful study, that if this bill is enacted into law, as I am sure it will be, we will have a renewed era of prosperity such as followed the enactment of every Republican tariff bill, in which all of the people of the United States in every occupation, every industry, and every employment will share as they have always shared, which will increase our wealth, our employment, our comfort, the means of supplying our necessities, that will promote our trade abroad, and keep the name of the United States still before the world as the premier nation of solid finance, fairness, and justice to all the people, and one which for all time intends to provide for its own. [Applause.]

The following interesting summary of events in connection with this legislation was prepared by Mr. Clayton F. Moore, clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means:

HISTORY OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930

December 3, 1928: Second session of Seventieth Congress convened. Majority members of Committee on Ways and Means assembled at 2 p. m. in office of chairman to determine tariff policy in conformity to platform pledges, the Republican Party having been victorious at polls in November. The following motion was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means that the committee begin hearings on January 7, 1929, for the purpose of examining the schedules and rates of the tariff act of 1922, with a view to revising such schedules and rates as may be necessary."

December 4, 1928: Ways and Means Committee met and adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Ways and Means begin hearings on Monday, January 7, 1929, for the purpose of obtaining information necessary for the effective readjustment of the duties on imports wherever it shall be found necessary that such duties should be readjusted."

Schedule of hearings agreed upon. The chairman was authorized to obtain all available information from the Tariff Commission and various governmental sources; also to obtain authority to sit during sessions of Congress. Subcommittee composed of chairman and Mr. CRISP authorized to draft rules for procedure during hearings.

December 6, 1928: Majority members of committee met. Chairman designated subcommittees on various schedules. Tariff Commission requested to furnish Summary of Tariff Information. Public notice given

in respect of hearings, through press, by letter and telegram, and through interested organizations.

January 7 to February 27, 1929, inclusive: Hearings before Committee on Ways and Means (full membership). Witnesses heard, 1,131; testimony, 10,684 pages; index, 516 pages; total, 11,200 pages, in 18 compiled volumes: Time consumed: 43 days and 5 nights.

March 2, 1929: Majority members of committee met and agreed:

1. To hold no further public hearings.
2. Subcommittees to hold no hearings for interested parties while in actual session.
3. Examine and act upon free-list items first.
4. Proceed upon valuation basis of existing law.
5. Issue no statements except through chairman.

March 4, 1929: Members of Committee on Ways and Means, or a majority of them, who were Members elect to the Seventy-first Congress, authorized to hold hearings, sit as committee, etc., until meeting of Seventy-first Congress. (Public Law, 1034.) Herbert Hoover inaugurated President of the United States. In his inaugural address he declared:

"Action upon some of the proposals upon which the Republican Party was returned to power, particularly further agricultural relief and limited changes in the tariff, can not in justice to our farmers, our labor, and our manufacturers be postponed. I shall therefore request a special session of Congress for the consideration of these two questions."

March 9, 1929: Closing date for briefs to be printed in hearings.

March 16, 1929: Free-list subcommittee submitted its recommendations to the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

March 27, 1929: First subcommittee on rates submitted its recommendations to the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

April 15, 1929: The Seventy-first Congress met in special session at the call of the President.

April 16, 1929: President's message on farm relief and tariff delivered to Congress. This message recommended—

"An effective tariff upon agricultural products," not only to protect the farmer's domestic market but to stimulate diversity of crops and lessen his dependence upon exports, based upon differences in costs of production;

"Some limited changes" in the schedules relating to industries other than agriculture, where economic changes since 1922 "have placed certain domestic products at a disadvantage and new industries have come into being," the test of necessity for revision being "a substantial slackening of activity in an industry during the past few years, and a consequent decrease of employment due to insurmountable competition in the products of that industry" based upon the differences in cost of production;

Reorganization of Tariff Commission upon a higher salary basis;

Revision of the flexible provisions to provide a more automatic and more comprehensive formula for determining rate changes and thus assure accurate and rapid action; and

"A sounder basis for valuation" of imported articles subject to ad varolem duties.

May 7, 1929: Tariff bill introduced in House by Mr. HAWLEY (H. R. 2667).

May 9, 1929: Ways and Means Committee, by a strictly party vote, ordered bill reported. Bill reported by Mr. HAWLEY (H. Rept. No. 7). Called up in House and general debate begun.

May 10, 1929: Bill discussed at a conference of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives. Informal hearings for Members of Congress agreed upon following this conference.

May 14 to 18, inclusive, 1929: Informal hearings to all Members of Congress requesting same by the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means. Not stenographically reported. Committee sat from 10 a. m. until noon daily, from 2 to 5 p. m. May 18, and from 7.30 p. m. to 11 o'clock p. m. May 15 and 16. There were 119 appearances on 105 paragraphs and 6 administrative sections of the bill.

May 23, 1929: Majority members of committee submitted 91 rate changes to a conference of the Republican Members of the House, which were approved. Rule for expediting bill agreed upon.

May 24, 1929: Committee on Ways and Means authorized the chairman to offer, or designate a member to offer, the amendments agreed upon. Rule adopted in House.

May 28, 1929: Bill passed House with sundry amendments.

May 29, 1929: In Senate, referred to Committee on Finance.

June 7, 1929: Finance Committee gave notice to public hearings.

June 12 to July 18, 1929: Hearings held by Finance Committee and subcommittees. The full committee held hearings on valuation June 12 and 13; on free list, July 11, 12, and 13; on administrative provisions, July 15, 16, 17, and 18; on sliding scale for sugar duties, August 7. The subcommittees on the rate schedules sat between June 14 and 28, inclusive; July 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Witnesses heard, 1,004; testimony, with index, 8,618 pages, 249 pages of which were protests from foreign countries.

July 22 to August 22, 1929: Bill under consideration by the majority members of the Finance Committee.

September 4, 1929: Finance Committee ordered the bill reported with amendments. Reported, with 453 amendments, by Mr. SMOOT (S. Rept. No. 37).

September 4 to November 22, 1929: Debated from time to time in Senate.

December 2, 1929: Second session of Seventy-first Congress convened.

December 2, 1929, to March 24, 1930: Debate in Senate continued.

March 24, 1930: Bill passed Senate with 1,253 amendments.

March 25, 1930: Bill returned to House.

April 2, 1930: House adopted rule (H. Res. 197) sending bill to conference. Senate agreed to conference.

April 3 to 25, inclusive, and April 28, 1930: In conference.

April 28, 1930: Conference report submitted to House, with eight major subjects in disagreement (H. Rept. No. 1326).

April 29, 1930: Same report submitted in Senate (S. Doc. 138).

May 1, 1930: Conference report called up in House and recommendations of the conference committee agreed to. On disputed items: Senate amendment reducing from 8 to 6 cents per 100 pounds the duty on cement, agreed to. Motion to agree to Senate amendment permitting entry free of duty of cement imported by a State, city, etc., lost.

May 2, 1930: Disagreed items before House. Motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments placing a duty of 30 cents per ounce on silver, lost. Senate amendments placing logs, cedar lumber, and shingles on free list, agreed to. Motion to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment imposing a duty on certain timber and lumber, agreed to. Senate amendments reducing the House rates on sugar, agreed to.

May 3, 1930: Disagreed items before House. Motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing for export debentures, lost. Motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments to the organization of the Tariff Commission and the flexible provisions, lost.

May 5, 1930: Action on conference report by House messaged to Senate.

May 7, 1930: Senate asked for a further conference on the items in disagreement only.

May 8, 1930: House agreed to further conference.

May 9, 10, 14, and 16, 1930: Conferees met.

May 19, 1930: Senate majority conferees released from their promise to bring export debenture and flexible provisions back to Senate for separate votes before yielding to the House conferees.

May 20, 21, 22, and 24, 1930: Conferees met and agreed upon items in dispute.

May 26, 1930: Second conference report (S. Doc. 154) presented to the Senate by Senator SMOOT.

May 27, 1930: Point of order made in Senate against flexible provisions, sustained. Report returned to conference.

May 29, 1930: Conferees met and removed point of order from language agreed upon. Amended report (S. Doc. 158) presented to Senate.

June 4, 1930: Second (amended) conference report laid aside by unanimous consent in Senate, and first report brought up for consideration.

June 5, 1930: Vice President sustained points of order in respect of the agreements on watches, cheese, rayon, straying cattle, and cherries. Senate requested a further conference. House agreed to conference and appointed conferees.

June 6, 1930: Conferees met and eliminated points of order on cheese, rayon, straying cattle, and cherries. By unanimous consent, Senate agreed to return amended report (S. Doc. 158) to conferees, with understanding that both reports are to be made simultaneously, but only one vote to be taken upon the adoption of the reports.

June 9, 1930: Conferees met and eliminated points of order against watches. Reports signed. Both reports presented to Senate (S. Docs. 161 and 162).

June 13, 1930: Senate adopted conference reports. Conference reports submitted to House (H. Repts. 1892 and 1893).

June 14, 1930: House adopted rule for considering two conference reports as one report (H. Res. 253). Conference reports agreed to by House.

June 17, 1930, 12.59 p. m.: Signed by the President.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes. [Applause.] I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and print such tables as I may desire.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, carrying the highest rates ever written into an American tariff, has become a law despite the protests of virtually all farm organizations and the warnings of many large manufacturers who predict that the new rates will practically destroy foreign markets for many American products.

To my mind this tariff bill violates every precept of common sense, justice, and sound economics. Under the guise of protecting the products of agriculture, the Republican majority in both Houses has inflicted upon the country industrial rates that are indefensible; rates that can only serve to add to the burden the farmers and consumers have carried for years; rates

that will tend to reduce, and in fact eliminate, the foreign markets for many of our products, both industrial and agricultural.

In enactment of this legislation the administration leaders have indicated that they have virtually blinded themselves to the economic and industrial problems involved and the many changes that have been effected in recent years. They ignored the fact that the industries of Europe, prostrated by the World War, have again attained normal production in many lines and again are competitors for those foreign markets which for years have provided profitable outlets for the surplus production of this country.

ADHERE TO OLD PANACEAS

The administration leaders have proceeded upon the assumption that there has been no change; that the old panaceas can still be applied; that foreign consumers must come to America for their merchandise and raw materials. In my opinion, their blindness in this respect can have only one effect—reduction of our exports, which have provided employment for millions of American workers; reduction of the trade balance, which is responsible in no small degree for the great national prosperity following the World War; and place American agriculture and industries upon a basis whereby expansion and employment will be limited to the demands of the domestic markets.

This country has in recent years expended millions of dollars to develop foreign markets for the surplus production of both agriculture and industry. During the World War and the following years up to 1930, our exports increased year after year. Months before this tariff passed the Senate the world's reaction to the indefensible rates became manifest, and the first five months of 1930 showed a reduction of approximately $446,000,000 in merchandise and raw materials exported. But the Republican leaders refused to read this handwriting on the wall. They have contented themselves with denouncing those who had the courage to call attention to the economic menace contained in the rates and provisions of this bill. They have closed their eyes to the true situation, and heeding only the demands of a few but politically powerful industrial interests which demanded special favors, have blindly dragged this bill through Congress, vociferously advocating it as the panacea for all the business and economic ills of the Nation, and ignoring the protests of farmers, economists, and industrialists who have sought to prevent the enactment of such mass injustice.

BETRAYS AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS

The bill is a violation of the platform pledge of the Republican Party. It is not compatible with the demands of the President for limited revision. It is a betrayal of those agricultural interests which two years ago were inveigled into supporting the Republican Party and its candidates by promises of tariff equalization as part of the farm relief program.

The contention of the supporters of this bill that it is an agricultural measure is ridiculous. With few exceptions the increases upon agricultural products are inoperative, and practically every increase upon the products of manufactures is operative. No effort was made in the House to equalize these rates with a view of placing agriculture upon a basis of equality with industry. An honest effort was made in the Senate to accomplish this. But the House refused to accept the Senate amendments in behalf of agriculture, and turned the bill over to the tender mercies of the majority members of the conference committee, those exponents of high industrial rates who, more than any other Members of the House, are responsible for the vicious and unjust rates of this bill.

As I have stated repeatedly on the floor of this House, I believe in the principle of protection. But I believe protection should be equally distributed; that the farmers of the South and West are as much entitled to the benefits of tariff protection as the manufacturers of New England and Pennsylvania. The plea of the great mass of American people has been for equalization of tariff benefits. I contend that every section, every industry, every individual, is entitled to these benefits. But the Republican Members of this House have refused to adopt this policy. It is true they have consented to increases in many of the agricultural rates; that the tomato and truck growers, the dairy interests, and a few other agricultural producers have received the rates to which they were entitled, but in return for these concessions the majority Members have insisted upon penalizing every farmer and consumer in the United States by increasing the industrial rates.

FARMERS DENIED TARIFF EQUALITY

Every attempt to give agriculture the advantage of equal protection has been defeated. Every effort to lower industrial rates to a point of parity with agricultural rates has met the opposition of that small coterie of Republican leaders who have controlled the destinies of this bill. Those leaders raised a smoke screen under cover of which they manipulated the industrial rates to the highest point in the history of tariff making. They endeavored to camouflage this action by increasing rates on agricultural products of which a surplus is produced and upon which any tariff is inoperative. They flatly refused to accept the export debenture which would have made the tariff operative upon these surplus products of agriculture, and yet they have the audacity to refer to this bill as a measure designed for the relief of agriculture.

Defeat of the export debenture killed the last hope of over 80 per cent of American farmers to secure any substantial relief through the tariff bill, and the debenture was defeated upon the demand of the President, who called the special session for the alleged purpose of enacting tariff legislation for the relief of agriculture.

Agriculture has for years been forced to carry the burden of extortionate tariff rates. Each election the Republican spellbinders in the West and Middle West have assured the farmers that the Republican Party stood ready to come to their relief; that if the voters would forget and forgive the sins of omission and commission of which the party had been guilty, it would reform and adopt a tariff program that would place agriculture on parity with industry.

They have been long on promises and short on performance, and this tariff bill is merely a more vicious and indefensible repetition of the same old political "shell game," the same old "gold brick" that the Republican Party has been handing the farmers of the United States for the past half century.

I must confess that after reading the protestations and promises of the Kansas City platform, which Herbert Hoover and the rest of the Republican leaders acclaimed as the platform of broad policies upon which they proposed to work out equitable prosperity for agriculture as well as industry, I had some hope, especially in view of the support the Republican candidates received in many of the agricultural States, that these promises would be fulfilled to some degree at least. It is true that I had learned from years of experience the value to be placed upon such promises, but I cherished the hope that the Republican Party, with its powerful majorities in both Houses of Congress, would regard the sad plight of agriculture with at least some degree of compassion.

REPUBLICAN PARTY RESPONSIBLE FOR DEPRESSION

The Republican leaders knew that their party alone was responsible for the desperate condition into which agriculture has been plunged in recent years. They knew that their generosity in granting special tariff favors to the eastern tariff barons had created an economic condition without parallel in history; that in this country we had the anomalous spectacle of the great basic industry, agriculture, in the deepest depths of depression while the manufacturing industry was enjoying unprecedented prosperity, prosperity created by the discriminatory tariff favors conferred upon it.

When the 1928 campaign was under way it was generally admitted by the Republican leaders that the depressed condition of agriculture demanded an immediate and effective remedy. Notwithstanding the fact the Republican Party had been in complete control of all branches of Government for over eight years, during which period the agricultural depression became more pronounced each year, they virtually admitted that Republican leadership and Republican remedies had proved ineffective, but that if given another opportunity, under the leadership of Herbert Hoover they would solve the problem, place agriculture on parity with industry, and thereby create a national prosperity in which all would participate.

Weeks before the election the announcement was made by President Hoover that he proposed to call a special session of Congress for the sole purpose of solving the problems of agriculture through the medium of farm relief and tariff legislation. With this in view, the Ways and Means Committee, on January 7, 1929, opened hearings on the proposed limited revision. This was the signal for the protected industrial interests, their horde of lobbyists, and their able representatives in Congress to start their betrayal of the confidence the farmers of the West and Middle West had reposed in the campaign promises of the party.

INDUSTRIALISTS PRESENT TARIFF CLAIMS

When the hearings opened it was my opinion they would be devoted principally to a study of the tariff needs of agriculture, but I was soon disillusioned. Practically every protected industry in the United States, which for years had been exploiting the farmers and consumers, was on hand to present its plea for additional protection, and to their pleas the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee gave willing ears. The records of those hearings are available for all who wish to read. It is significant that the hearings on Schedule 7, the agricultural

schedule, comprise only 1,734 of the 10,700 pages of the printed record.

It was obvious from the outset of those hearings that it was not the intention or purpose of the Republican leaders to place agriculture upon a parity with industry. In fact, it soon was apparent that their efforts would be directed principally toward increasing the already exorbitant industrial rates that had been granted industry in the Fordney-McCumber bill. Throughout these hearings the lobbyists of the special interests swarmed the Capitol, each intent upon protecting the interests of their respective clients, and the success of their efforts was attested by the bill that finally emerged from the committee, a bill that gave to agriculture none of the promised equalization, but which did give to the special interests protection beyond their most avaricious dreams.

AN ORGY OF RATE BOOSTING

Those hearings, ostensibly for the relief of agriculture, degenerated into an orgy of rate boosting for the industrial interests. Never in the history of American tariff making had that spectacle been equaled. Industries which for years had been extorting unjust and unreasonable profits from the public sent their representatives to appear before the committee and demand higher rates, which would give them the power to further exploit the domestic consumers. They depicted their plight as pitiful; that they were being overwhelmed by the products of cheap foreign labor; that their existence depended upon additional protection.

These claims were made notwithstanding the fact the records show that many of those protected industries have "watered" their stock to many times its actual value to conceal their exorbitant profits. Apparently the vaunted prosperity of American industries was merely a myth. According to their contentions, there was hardly an industry that was not "run down at the heel," suffering from foreign competition, and could be saved only by increasing the tariff rates upon its particular product.

The Republican Members were touched to the heart by these pitiful pleas of America's "giant" industries. At times it appeared as if the Republican committee members would mingle their tears with those of the great corporations whose stocks have doubled, trebled, or quadrupled in value as a result of the special tariff favors lavished upon them by the generous and appreciative Republican leaders. All campaign pledges, all thought of relief for agriculture, if any such thought ever existed, were forgotten in the scramble to provide special interests the exorbitant rates they were demanding.

PLACE PREMIUM UPON INEFFICIENCY

The Republican members of the committee placed a premium upon industrial inefficiency. Every down-at-the-heel industrialist who appeared before them placed the blame for the condition of his particular industry upon foreign competition and inadequate tariff rates. Obsolete equipment, excessive overcapitalization, inefficiency of management, or excessive distribution costs were never considered as factors contributing to the depressed condition of any industry. The industries and the Republican members of the committee could find only one cause—foreign competition. And one remedy—higher tariff rates.

The Republican members never considered the fact that they were placing upon the American farmers and consumers the burden of virtually all inefficiency and overcapitalization in American industry. They proceeded to raise the rates, apparently upon the assumption that to the American industrialists should be granted the privilege of placing upon the public the burden of all mismanagement and industrial inefficiency.

In this connection, it is rather significant that the most efficient of the American industries—the automotive industry—was one of the few appearing before the committee in opposition to higher tariff rates. The automobile manufacturers took the broad view that the American public should not be penalized because of inefficiency in industry or the frenzied financial transactions of many of these corporations which are among the chief beneficiaries of this tariff bill. They urged that a policy be adopted that would tend toward development of foreign markets for the surplus production of America's farms and industries, a policy that met only the derisive scorn of Republican leaders who were determined to secure for their special interests the highest rates that could be written into the bill.

HAD NO INTENTION OF FULFILLING PLEDGES

I contend that from the very inception of this tariff bill the Republican leaders had no intention of giving agriculture a "square deal"; that they had no intention of fulfilling the pledges of their party platform, so far as those planks relating to the relief of agriculture were concerned. Apparently, they deemed it both expedient and necessary to give first heed to the demands of those to whom the party was under obligation for financial support during the campaign, as was attested by JOE GRUNDY'S testimony before the Senate lobby investigation committee. GRUNDY clearly expressed the Republican point of view when he indicated that the industrial interests of his State and other States in the North and East felt that they had paid for additional tariff favors when they contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars, extorted from the public, to the Republican "war chest" to elect Herbert Hoover. The farmers of the United States, who for years have been subjected to the extortions of the tariff barons, were not such liberal contributors to the Republican campaign fund, and, according to the Grundy line of reasoning, were therefore of secondary importance in the consideration of tariff rates.

The reports of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate prove conclusively how thoroughly the Republican leadership is imbued with the political theory of Grundyism—that to those who contribute should go the profits of political success. The tariff rates reported by those committees, the majority of which were incorporated into the bill signed by President Hoover on June 16, are designed to reimburse manyfold the generous contributions of the manufacturing interests to the Republican campaign fund.

According to this theory, so frankly portrayed by Mr. GRUNDY, the extent to which promises of the Republican Party to provide relief for the farmers will be carried out depends upon the amount of protection they are willing to purchase through campaign contributions. In other words, the Republican Party under the present leadership apparently adheres to the Grundy policy of extending the benefits of protection to those who will pay for it by providing the funds necessary to perpetuate the party in power.

This policy may have an appeal to the manufacturing interests with millions of profits upon which to draw; but it has no appeal to the American farmer who has been subjected to the toll exacted by the tariff-protected interests while he is compelled to take the prices fixed by the world markets for his products.

ENTIRE COUNTRY VOICES PROTEST

On May 7, 1929, the Ways and Means Committee reported the tariff bill in the House, and the American public was apprised of the class of tariff legislation that could be expected under the leadership of the Republican Party. The disillusionment of the farmers of the country, who had been inveigled by the promises of Republican leaders into retaining that party in power, was immediate and complete. Farm leaders who were under the impression that agriculture would receive a fair hearing and fair rates, denounced the bill as a complete betrayal of the agricultural interests. Members of Congress were deluged with protests from every section of the country. But the Republican machine, in complete control of the House, disregarded all protests, applied the "gag rule" to prevent consideration of the measure on the floor of the House, and passed the bill which contained 434 pages, 183 sections, and 727 paragraphs, without giving any Member, other than the 15 Republican Members of the Ways and Means Committee who framed the bill, an opportunity to offer an amendment.

Many of the Republican Members from agricultural States, who in the campaign had been most vociferous in pledging the Republican Party to tariff equality for agriculture, meekly followed the dictates of their party leaders and voted to apply the gag rule which placed the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee in complete control of the situation and prevented offering of amendments for relief of the farmers. The Republican leaders applied the party whip and those alleged representatives of the farmers, whose promises were largely responsible for Republican success in the 1928 election, aided and abetted the party leaders in accomplishing their purpose of granting to industry tariff rates discriminatory against agriculture, violating the pledge of the Republican Party and perpetuating the conditions against which the farmers of the country were in almost open revolt prior to the Republican National Convention at Kansas City.

SENATE COALITION DISSECTS RATES

The history of the tariff bill in the Senate was decidedly different. The Democratic-progressive coalition dissected the rates and exposed to the public the hypocrisy of the Republican contention that the bill was framed for the purpose of equalizing tariff benefits. The coalition proceeded to rewrite several of the schedules, reducing many of the industrial rates to a point of parity. Defeat of the coalition, due to logrolling tactics during the last weeks the bill was under consideration, resulted in undoing much of the good work of the coalition. But the bill as it was finally returned from the Senate was far

superior to the House bill, many of the schedules representing an honest effort to place agriculture upon parity with industry.

The Republican leaders of the House, incensed by the action of the Senate, again applied the party whip and the House refused to accept the Senate amendments, the majority of the so-called progressives obeying the dictates of the party machine and voting to send the bill to conference.

RATES INCREASED IN CONFERENCE

In conference, the camouflage of the Republican leaders was dropped completely. They showed conclusively that they were primarily interested in the highest rates they could obtain for industry. On practically every item upon which there was a difference between the House and Senate rates, the conference accepted the highest rate. As a result, the average of rates in four of the schedules are now higher than in either the House or Senate bills.

The House, obeying the distates of the Republican Party leaders, struck the export debenture from the bill, increased the rates on cement and sugar, and finally passed the bill, with only a mere handful of the Republican Representatives from agricultural States having the courage to oppose the demands of the party leaders. In the Senate the votes of Senators REED and GRUNDY of Pennsylvania saved the measure from defeat, practically every Senator from an agricultural State voting against it.

The bill was signed by President Hoover with apologies to the American public, and the assertion that he hoped to remedy the glaring defects of the measure by exercising the powers given the President in the flexible provision. However, the President's failure to come to the relief of agriculture when it became evident that the leaders of his party had no intention of carrying out the pledges of the Kansas City platform, his opposition to the export debenture, which offered for over 80 per cent of the farmers the means of securing tariff protection, and his virtual acquiescence in the program put over by his party leaders in behalf of the tariff barons, indicates that the relief agriculture will receive through Mr. Hoover's application of the flexible provision will be a minus quantity.

BILL WRITTEN BY LOBBYISTS

The Hawley-Smoot tariff is not the result of the application of economic facts derived from research and investigation. It is not the result of the application of scientific deduction or findings. It is the result of political subserviency to a small but powerful group, financially able to maintain in Washington a large and efficient corps of lobbyists and to control to a great extent the financial affairs as well as the policies of the Republican Party.

It is generally conceded that the lobbyists wrote and put over the Hawley-Smoot bill. Certainly there was no public demand for the indefensible rates contained in this measure. On the other hand, there was a widespread and vigorous demand that the rates either be reduced to place agriculture upon parity with industry or the bill defeated.

A poll of newspaper editors while Senate debate on the bill was in progress revealed that a total of 75 per cent, of whom 45 per cent were editors of Republican papers, opposed the bill. But the demands of the public were disregarded. The Republican leaders gave heed only to the demands of the lobbyists representing special interests, and practically every schedule of the tariff bill indicates how effective was the work of those lobbyists and the influence they wield over legislation of this character under a Republican administration.

Even President Hoover, titular head of the Republican Party, frankly admitted the power of the lobby which was formed in Washington to put over the rates of the Hawley-Smoot tariff. In announcing that he would approve the bill one of the reasons he advanced was that it would relieve the country for many years from further tariff revisions, which are not only disturbing to business but, with all their collateral surroundings in lobbies, logrolling, and the activities of group interests, are disturbing to public confidence.

POWER OF THE LOBBYISTS

Discussing the power of the lobbyists and their connection with this bill, Gustavus Myers, in a recent article in the New York World, stated:

The enactment of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill has presented a singular and mystifying aspect. Here is a measure which has been widely denounced in America and has caused intense perturbation in other countries. American bankers, economists, industrialists, and merchants have declared that the results will be evil.

The bill, they variously point out, will greatly increase the cost of living at home, will not benefit domestic business except in isolated instances, will cripple America's foreign trade, and forfeit the good will of other nations. From Europe have come vehement protests and threats of reprisals and a tariff war.

Congress spent nearly 15 months in debate on the bill. David S. Muzzy, professor of history at Columbia University, has estimated the cost of this protracted debate at no less than $2,000,000. Yet all of the politicians involved have been and are seeking to evade responsibility for the bill.

There has been a general effort on the part of spokesmen of the dominant Republican Party, as well as representatives of the Democratic Party, to disown the bill. Senator FESS, one of the most hidebound of Republican regulars, has sought to cast blame for many of the high duties upon the Democrats. The veteran tariff lobbyist Senator GRUNDY, and also Senator REED, both stanch protectionists from the highly industrialized State of Pennsylvania, assailed the bill and announced their reluctance in supporting it.

And the matter will remain a mystery so long as we continue in the regulation groove of thinking that Congress is composed of two Houses. But there is another house which Senator CARAWAY has succinctly termed "the third house." Unrecognized by any provision of law, it is, nevertheless, a fixed institution and has supplied ample proof of its deft underhand capacity in both proposing and shaping legislation. This third house is the lobby, the operations of which supply the answer to the riddle.

The composition of the third house is unusual and invites exceptional attention. A political government is installed in Washington; at least the administrative and other branches are supposed to embody definite political principles. The third house is in nowise actuated by principles, political or other. It represents specified interests, generally of a financial and industrial character.

There are hundreds of organizations centered in Washington. Many of these are representative of movements, not of interests. They watch legislation but do not undertake to interfere; their functions are those of observation.

It is the organizations which are financed by particular interests for the purpose of molding legislation that compose the real lobby, or the third house. They use politics and manipulate politicians with the sole aim of producing financial benefits for their industrialist backers, who are corporations or combinations of corporations. Hence the third house is in reality a representation of industries executing its influence and will within a politically organized government.

Disclosures before the Senate lobby investigating committee gave only inklings of the ramifications and subtle arts of the third house. Those disclosures afforded no enlightenment at all on the vast difference between modern lobbying methods and those of former times. Just as industry itself has evolved from the crude to the superfine organization, so has lobbying developed into a masterly science. The old-time individual lobbyist who depended upon personal geniality, free mixing, treating to drinks, and casual appeals or outright bribery is obsolete.

The members of the third house of present days are of a different order. Cloaking themselves under the impressive name of some organization, they maintain elaborate offices, have busy staffs of press agents, secretaries, corps of stenographers, and retinues of lawyers.

Included in their highly efficient service is an intelligence department which gives almost instant notification whenever there is introduced a bill which in anyway affects the interests they represent. They minutely scrutinize every item of proposed legislation, and if it is considered dangerous, formulate immediate plans to suppress or counteract it.

To cope with such a situation the third-house lobbyist must be a diplomat and something more in resourcefulness. He is skilled in specious arguments, studies the character of those with whom he deals, knows how to appeal to the political home interests of politicians, and understands how to induce swapping of votes. This last named was one of the most effective in promoting the passage of the tariff bill, as testimony before the Senate lobby investigating committee clearly indicated.

"The rate structure, in the main," said Senator LA FOLLETTE of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, "is the product of a combination of lobbyists who pooled their interests to secure the rewriting of this piece of legislation during the final weeks of its consideration. For the first time in the history of the Senate avowed lobbyists testified under oath regarding the deals by which they proposed to secure the duties they wanted. Votes were changed overnight, not by arguments nor by new evidence. Industrial lobbyists have secured new and higher tariff rates for the benefit of the special interests they represent."

But before demonstrating its ability to carry out its designs, the third house had to have precise information as to congressional plans. An illustration of the lengths to which the third house could and did go was proved in the case of Senator BINGHAM, of Connecticut.

C. L. Eyanson, a representative at a salary of $10,000 a year of the Manufacturers' Association of Connecticut, was placed by Senator BINGHAM on the Government pay roll as clerk of the Senate Finance Committee. In that capacity Eyanson had full entrée to the committee's secret sessions at which tariff rates were framed.

He did his work so effectively that the result was the granting of increased rates amounting to $76,000,000 annually. Disclosure of the facts brought severe censure upon BINGHAM in the Senate.

Never in the history of legislation has Washington seen so numerous, so well organized, and so adroit an assemblage of lobbyists as were in evidence during the progress of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. According to Senator MCKELLAR, the present tactics of lobbyists are more those of indirection in operating through influential friends than attempts at direct approach. But proved facts hardly bear out that assertion.

The American Tariff League was in militant evidence. According to the testimony of its secretary, it has an annual budget of about $100,000 and 600 contributing members, among whom are the General Electric Co., the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., the Cheney Silk Co., the American Cyanamid Co., the Eastman Kodak Co., and other corporations.

When the Senate lobby investigating committee sought to prove that the American Tariff League was in reality working for higher tariff rates, W. Warren Barbour, its president at the time, benignly and blandly insisted that its purpose was "only to educate people." Pressing that "educational" idea a little further, Senator WALSH asked whether the "education" was not designed to impress Congress to act favorably upon the league's proposals. Mr. Barbour replied affirmatively.

The activities of William Burgess, of Pennsylvania, a conspicuous member of the third house, were described in detail in a report by Senator CARAWAY. For many years Burgess had been employed as a representative at Washington by the United States Potters' Association, of which he has been vice president. Burgess has also been employed by wool and other associations.

In this case, too, Senator MCKELLAR'S asseveration is not borne out. Here we see again an economic representative of a special industry giving his undivided attention to promoting its financial interests and doing it in person. Senator CARAWAY'S report did not describe Burgess's methods, but it did point out:

"During the entire time he has been in Washington, almost, if not continuously, since the first of the current year, his principal, if not his only business, has been in looking after pending tariff legislation, and particularly after Schedule 2, the earths, earthenware, and glassware schedule. He has been in frequent consultation with Members of the Senate on tariff matters, as well as with others at the Capitol, exhibiting deep concern in the passage of the tariff bill as it came from the House, or in securing higher duties on manufactured products."

Before his appointment to the Senate, JOSEPH R. GRUNDY, head of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, was quite outspoken. He frankly declared that only by alert watchfulness on the part of those concerned could "protected interests get the kind of legislation they need at the hands of Congress." Which led to Senator CARAWAY'S significant comment: "You are in the third house and you write the rates, do you not?"

As practical organizations the special industries maintain their third house on an adequate if not a lavish scale. What the total expenditure is no one can accurately say.

Here were two associations alone—the Southern Tariff Association and the American Taxpayers' League—which gathered more than $1,000,000 in funds during the past four years. Senator CARAWAY'S report depreciated them as shadowy lobby organizations and expressed amazement at the gullibility of business contributors—an opinion which, in turn, may well arouse reciprocal amazement. But granting that they have been phantom organizations this urgent question arises: What, then, have been the cumulative revenues of actual influential organizations?

Some light upon funds spent is given by this Senate committee report upon the fight over the sugar schedule:

"Both sides of the controversy are represented—the one organization or group of organizations struggling for an increase in the duty prescribed by existing law, the other to secure a reduction or at least maintain the rate at the present level. Roughly estimated, the cost to the contending forces of the fight they have waged over the tariff bill now before the Senate has been over $400,000, the cost to those urging the raise being between $175,000 and $200,000, and the cost to those against the raise being between $200,000 and $225,000. Some of the organizations constituting units in the lobby maintain permanent establishments in Washington."

The third house is the one factor that has not disowned the new tariff law. This, the evidence shows, is the culmination of its systematic campaign to use the Government's taxing power for groups of private beneficiaries who do not openly hail the acts of their agents.

TARIFF HITS FARMERS' FOREIGN MARKETS

The Hawley-Smoot tariff bill not only discriminates against the farmers in the exorbitant and indefensible rates granted numerous industries, thereby assuring increases in the prices of practically all commodities the farmer is compelled to buy, but it goes further and threatens to destroy the foreign markets for the surplus production of American farms.

The fact has repeatedly been pointed out in both the House and the Senate that agriculture would be the first to feel the effect of any retaliatory tariff policies that may be adopted by foreign countries. The manufacturers, well organized to control production and limit it to domestic demand, are in position to secure maximum benefits from the tariff. But the farmer, unorganized, is forced to sustain the losses inflicted by the retaliatory policies of those foreign countries that heretofore have been the chief consumers of the surplus crops.

It is rather significant that cotton constituted nearly 25 per cent of the $63,000,000 decline in merchandise exports during the month of May, and it is also significant that the price of the staple went to a new low level for recent years when the tariff bill was signed. Wheat is in practically the same position as cotton. Without an export debenture, faced with the growing resentment of those foreign countries which heretofore have provided markets for the surplus production, and with the domestic markets reduced by widespread unemployment and the consequent curtailment of the purchasing power of the American workmen, the farmer is placed in anything but an enviable position.

I contend that the discriminatory tariff policy of the Republican leaders is directly responsible for the serious plight of American farmers. Since the enactment of the Fordney-McCumber tariff in 1922 the agricultural depression has each year become more pronounced and more acute. The Republican leaders recognized the fact that the tariff was at least partially responsible for this condition and admitted it in the Kansas City platform and their campaign pledges. They led the farmers to believe that if the Republican Party was retained in power agriculture would receive the tariff relief demanded; that the discriminatory rates would be adjusted and agriculture placed on parity with industry. But again they betrayed the interests of agriculture, enacted the Hawley-Smoot bill with its higher industrial rates, and any hope that American farmers may have entertained for relief under a Republican administration has been dissipated.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I realize fully the futility of making any address on this bill. I have discussed it at length twice, pointing out its iniquities and going into detail as to its vicious features from my viewpoint. Therefore I shall not attempt to make any real discussion as to the demerits of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, if any legislative body in the history of the world was ever controlled by leaders drunk with power it is this body. I appeal from "Philip drunk to Philip sober." In future, let us consider important legislation under the general rules of the House in an orderly and parliamentary way, which will result in better-considered and better legislation. [Applause.] I have the highest respect for the leaders individually. They are my personal friends and they are men of the highest character, but in the consideration of this tariff bill from the very day the Ways and Means Committee finished its hearings they have been ruthless. They seem to think that they must act as guardians, if not wet nurses, for some of the brethren of the majority, and the purpose of this rule adopted to-day for the consideration of this bill was for that purpose and for no other, to prevent them from having to vote directly on the second conference report placing a duty on lumber and cement. There was no need for this rule. This conference report was privileged and could have been called up without any rule, but if called up under the general rules of the House there are two separate and distinct substantive conference reports, and the House would have had an opportunity to vote on each of them. My colleagues, even if one bill is before you and it contains two substantive propositions, the rules of the House provide that it can be divided and you can vote on each of the propositions, for you might be for one and against the other; but, to contravene that, this rule is brought in, and for no other purpose. They knew if separate votes could be had, the conference report with the duty on lumber, the duty on cement, which alone would justify the defeat of this bill, would embarrass many of the Republicans, and the leaders knew that many of them would not vote for the second conference report. Therefore they hit upon this scheme which contravenes the rules of the House, to force you to vote on both of them at one time. My colleagues, you can not deceive your constituents by this subterfuge. If you vote for the conference report, you are voting a duty on lumber, shoes, cement, and every other item in the bill, and there is no escape from it. Do not deceive yourselves nor attempt to deceive your constituents with alibis.

Now, in the whole consideration of this bill the rules of this House have been brushed aside, gag applied, rules brought in to meet the political exigencies of the case. I know the bill is

going to pass, and, like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I can not get up any steam in discussing it. I shall content myself with making just a few calm, dispassionate observations regarding it, and I have reduced what I am going to say to writing, and I am going to do what I very seldom do—read those observations.

Within a few minutes the final legislative formality of passing the Smoot-Hawley tariff monstrosity will be consummated and the bill will go to the President for his approval. Instead of being a limited revision to equalize agricultural tariff benefits with industrial ones, the bill widens and enlarges the disparity and greatly penalizes agriculture for the benefit of industry, and is general in scope. It specifically raises duties on over a thousand articles and raises duties on thousands of others not specifically named in the bill by increasing the rate provided in the basket clause of some of the schedules, which affects thousands of useful articles. I am convinced beyond reasonable doubt that the bill is the worst and most inequitable tariff bill ever enacted by Congress, and that its enactment into law is fraught with grave consequences to our economic welfare; that it will greatly reduce our foreign commerce, both exports and imports; that it will injuriously affect our factories, causing them to run on part time, thus throwing many workmen out of employment or greatly reducing their weekly pay; that agriculture, instead of being benefited, will be seriously injured, and for each dollar of benefit agriculture may receive it will be penalized at least $10 on account of the higher prices the farmers will have to pay for their essentials of life.

The bill violates the promises of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in the last campaign to remove the disparity in tariff benefit as between agriculture and industry, and the consuming public will be unjustly burdened with additional taxes for the benefit of the special interests. Under the pseudo claim of aiding agriculture, this bill is forced through Congress by lobbyists and the tariff millionaires, large contributors to the Republican campaign fund. They know the farmers are given mere paper tariff duties, for the most part inoperative and futile, while industry is given, in many instances, embargo duties and other rates 100 per cent effective, which give American manufacturers a monopoly of our home market, thus permitting them to levy an unfair tribute upon the American consuming public. Let me illustrate the solicitude this so-called farmers' bill shows for the farmer: His rakes, forks, harness, and hoes are taken off the free list and a high tariff duty levied upon them, thus increasing their cost to him. He is to pay a tax on the brick, cement, and lumber used on his farm, while the great power trusts, railroads, and telephone companies can import free of duty their posts.

When this bill becomes a law, in my judgment, it will be an unfortunate event for our beloved country, but a good thing politically for the Democratic Party, for I am persuaded that the American electorate will rebel against its injustice and drive from power the Republican Party responsible for its passage. Loving country more than party, I had hoped the calamity might be averted, and I have fought its passage at every stage and will, of course, vote against it. The bill will probably reach the President next Monday, and many columns have been written in the newspapers as to what the President will do with it. It has been most amusing—oh, what delicious humor! You recall the old story of the justice of the peace who advised a lawyer pleading a case before him that he might speak as long as he desired, but when he concluded he would find the judgment of the court already written out, signed, and recorded on a certain page of the document. Mr. Ford and other efficient business men, many of the leading newspapers of the Nation, the agricultural interests, and 1,080 economists of the Nation have with wonderful unanimity urged the President to veto the bill. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the story of the justice of the peace correctly reflects the attitude of the President relative to this bill. I am neither a seer nor a prophet, nor am I authorized to speak for the President, but I hazard a prediction as to what he will do. He will issue a statement severely criticizing the bill, saying he does not approve it in its entirety, that it has many bad features; but that, as it will aid agriculture—which, in my judgment, without the debenture, which he opposed, it will not do—taken as a whole, the good outweighs the bad, and that, as he has power under the flexible clause to rewrite the bill and correct its errors, he approves it. My colleagues, see if I am not a correct prophet. Under the flexible clause, upon the recommendation of the Tariff Commission to be appointed by the President, whose term of office under a decision of the United States Supreme Court is subject to the will of the President, he can raise or lower by 50 per cent any tariff duty. May I make this practical suggestion to an already over-tax-burdened people? Bring pressure at once to bear on the President to exercise this great power, delegated to him at his insistent demand, to correct immediately some of the most outrageous wrongs of the bill. The duties on sugar, shoes, lumber, cement, clothes, household and kitchen furniture and utensils, and steel products can be reduced 50 per cent. The President has the power to reduce them. Will he exercise it? Time alone will tell. For the welfare of the Nation, I hope he will. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the policies of a government or nation may change with social and economic conditions, but the fundamentals upon which a government is founded can not change without affecting the future or final destiny of such government. The high protective tariff policy is not one of the fundamentals upon which our Government is based. It is true the policy of protection, to a greater or less extent, has existed for more than a century, still this does not make it a basic principle of government. History reveals the fact that the existence of slavery was a well-recognized policy in our country for two centuries or more, but the policy of physical slavery no longer prevails, although it was constitutionally recognized by our present form of government for three-quarters of a century.

That is, a hundred years ago certain men, women, and children were not free. They were held in physical bondage under a well-recognized policy of government. Their masters dominated and had complete control. The products of their labors were turned over to their masters. The policy was ordered to be changed nearly 70 years ago, but in reality, gentlemen, it was only shifted, for we still have men, women, and children, reckoned by the millions, who are in economic slavery and bondage because of the established high protective tariff policy of our Government. The policy in both instances existed and was maintained primarily for the benefit of the few. One of the stock arguments in favor of the original policy was that the slave was better fed, better clothed, better housed, and better cared for generally than if he had been permitted to shift for himself. The same argument is heard to-day in support of the high protective tariff policy, supported and maintained by the same Government. The advocates of such a policy, the economic masters of the situation, and the tariff barons are all saying in justification of the policy that the men and women, often referred to as economic serfs, are better fed, better clothed, better housed, and better cared for generally than they would be without this guardian care, saying, "The higher the tariff the greater the prosperity." The high protectionists have labored long and loud proclaiming how the protective tariff policy insures better wages and more regular employment for labor, and they have not failed to proclaim with high-sounding phrases and convincing logic how it furnishes a market to the farmer; how it increases the prices of his products and swells his income beyond his most sanguine expectations, but all these arguments fail and are but "sounding brass" to the man who is hungry for the lack of work or the farmer whose home has been sold because his income has been less than his outgo.

You may argue and you may philosophize as much as you please but they all fail when you face conditions like those we have had to confront for the past 12 months. For more than a year now Congress has had under consideration a tariff bill carrying the highest duties of any bill within the history of our Government and almost from the beginning the condition of the farmer and industrial worker has grown worse as the days have passed by until to-day we have millions of laborers walking the streets of our industrial centers looking for work and begging for bread.

The argument made by high protectionists that a high tariff is largely for the benefit of labor is a rather plausible one but does not always prove to be true, for very often the laborer receives but little or none of the advantage arising from such a tariff. On the other hand, a high tariff invariably stimulates production and when the production of an article increases to such an extent that it exceeds the demand and there is a surplus the manufacturer, almost without exception, reduces production by curtailing operations which means that the employee is thrown out of employment to a greater or less extent and any apparent increase in wages per day is offset by a reduction in the number of days of employment. To illustrate, suppose an employee under normal conditions is entitled to receive a wage of $3.25 per day for 300 days annually and then by reason of a high protective tariff on the article he is helping to make his wage is increased to $3.50, but by reason of this increase in the tariff and resulting increase in profits to the manufacturer there is increased production by the introduction of additional machinery or an increase in working hours by night shifts and such production increases beyond demands and the plant closes for 30 or 60 days during the year, or closes on an average of one day in the week for a year, it is easy to see that the employee has been the sufferer.

For example, under normal conditions the employee in the first instance who works for 300 days at $3.25 per day will receive $975 annually; but suppose, as we suggest, that his wage is increased to $3.50 per day, but he then loses 30 days in order to reduce production to meet demand, he would work only 270 days, which would mean an annual income of only $945, or an actual loss of $30 per year. At the same time he has been compelled to pay an increase in price of the commodities he has had to buy, and to that extent his annual income has been further decreased. But suppose, instead of a loss of 30 days, there should be a suspension of 60 days during the year in order to harmonize production with demand—and many plants have been closed this year for more than 60 days—this same employee would receive only $840 per year, or an actual loss of $135 per annum; and this, coupled with the higher cost of living, which follows a high tariff, his net income is absolutely wiped out, and he finds himself at the end of the year in a much worse condition under the increased tariff than under the normal conditions referred to. To my mind, this serves to illustrate exactly what we are facing to-day. Following the high protective tariff provided for in the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922, there was increased production in industry. It could not continue indefinitely. The saturation period was reached a year ago or more when the supply of manufactured goods, according to statements made by the manufacturer, exceeded demand. Curtailment of production followed, resulting in unemployment and distressing conditions among those employed in the various industrial enterprises.

Of course, the laboring man should be paid in proportion to his contribution toward the value of an article, for he is legally entitled to it; but he is entitled to a further consideration, for when he elects to follow a particular line of work and endeavors to increase his efficiency he has a right to expect regular employment. The manufacturer can close his plant for 30 or 60 days with but little or no material loss, but when the laboring man is thrown out of employment for 30 or 60 days he suffers and in many cases suffers to hurt.

Gentlemen, I am making this observation not for the purpose of misleading or prejudicing the mind of anyone, but I am submitting it to the reason and intelligence of what has often been referred to here as "Mr. Average Man." If I am wrong in the facts submitted or in the conclusions drawn, my mind is open to conviction and I am prepared to correct either, but if I am right I feel that those who listen or those who read will sooner or later register their approval or indorsement in a way that all will be able to understand or interpret their wishes in the matter, and that this long-standing, high, and increasing protective-tariff policy will be changed or modified in such a way that all classes may be benefited alike, if there be any benefit, and the old policy of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" will again become the dominant and leading policy of our Government.

The high protectionists proclaim from the housetop that this policy is necessary in order to maintain domestic or home markets for producers. That may work well for the manufacturer, but the cotton producer wants also a world market for his crop.

If you force the cotton grower to confine himself to the home market and exclude his crop from the markets of the world you will drive him completely out of business, because under existing conditions he must sell more than one-half of his crop abroad, and if you erect high-tariff walls around this country and thereby force foreign governments to erect similar walls and exclude our raw products you not only injure the cotton farmer, but you absolutely destroy him. It is impossible and unthinkable to contend that the cotton produced in this country should be left to the domestic markets and then expect the producers thereof to even eke out a living at the prices that will follow.

Now, we would like to look at the question just a little further from the standpoint of the farmer. While the pending bill was being considered in the House about a year ago I undertook to show from its various provisions how, in my judgment, it would operate if enacted into law against those engaged in the agricultural industry. I did not speak in generalities, but pointed out specifically the amount of tariff or duty that would have to be paid by a farmer upon the purchase of various articles needed in the operation of his farm and in connection with his home or family budget. From the table or figures submitted at that time it was estimated that a farmer of moderate circumstances with a family of five or more persons would pay on an average of $150 to $1,000 per year in the way of tariff duties on those articles necessary for his home and farm. Up to this time the estimate has not been denied nor has any effort been made to refute it. I refer to this because there has been and there is still a serious and unsolved farm problem in this country, and farmers in some sections have at times been led to believe that the high protective tariff policy means greater prosperity for agriculture as well as industry. But in view of the high rates found in the last tariff act passed in 1922 and in view of the undisputed and lamentable fact that agriculture has gone from bad to worse every year from its passage to the present time I am unable to see where any intelligent farmer can longer be deceived by this argument.

However, the proponents of the bill are saying now that the passage of the bill will mean higher prices for farm crops. If there is any change at all, they will have to be higher because it is almost impossible for them to go lower, for the price of wheat, cotton, corn, and some of the other crops is lower to-day—June 14—than on any corresponding date since the passage of the high tariff act of 1922.

I am not certain that there is going to be an increase in the price of farm crops after the passage of this bill, but if there should be a small increase, or a substantial increase for that matter, it does not follow that there will be a greater net income or increased prosperity to the farmer. He might sell his products for a higher price and still he may be the loser because of the greater increase in the price of those things he has to purchase to carry on his farming operations or for those things he may need in his home. I will attempt to illustrate the point I am endeavoring to make by the use of some figures recently obtained from the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture.

The table below will show the average annual production of five major farm crops, to wit, cotton, corn, wheat, oats, and tame hay for the 5-year period from 1912 to 1916, and the period from 1925 to 1929, together with the per cent of increased production during the latter 5-year period over the former five years.

Crop	Average annual production, 5 years, 1912–1916	Average annual production, 5 years, 1925–1929	Average annual per cent of increase in production
Cotton ..... bales	13,327,000	15,287,000	14
Corn ..... bushels	2,761,252,000	2,762,364,000	.04
Wheat ..... do	809,357,000	821,581,000	1.50
Oats ..... do	1,296,406,000	1,319,011,000	2
Hay, tame ..... tons	76,978,000	94,528,000	23

The following table will show the average annual price of the various crops named for the two 5-year periods, 1912 to 1916 and 1925 to 1929, together with the per cent of increase in price during the latter period over the former:

Crop	Average annual price, 5 years, 1912–1916	Average annual price, 5 years, 1925–1929	Average annual per cent of increase in price
Cotton	12.4 cents per pound	16.6 cents per pound	33
Corn	65.7 cents per bushel	71.4 cents per bushel	8
Wheat	101.3 cents per bushel	114.8 cents per bushel	13
Oats	40.7 cents per bushel	41.4 cents per bushel	2
Hay, tame	$11.44 per ton	$12.78 per ton	11

It will be observed from these tables that there was not only an increase in the average annual production of each of the five major crops in the last 5-year period over that of the former, but there was also an increase in the price. It would appear, therefore, that when there is an increase in production, as well as an increase in price, there should be increased prosperity in agriculture. Let me make the illustration a little more specific. Suppose the average annual production of each grower of cotton increased 14 per cent during the 5-year period from 1925 to 1929 over the 5-year period from 1912 to 1916 and each should receive an increase of 33 per cent in price, as shown from the above tables, it would seem that the economic condition of the cotton growers during the latter 5-year period would be much better than during the former 5-year period. Yet I doubt very much whether you would be able to find a man in the Cotton Belt who would admit that to be true, because they would all say that economic conditions among cotton growers was much worse from 1925 to 1929 than from 1912 to 1916, and I think you would find the same thing to be true as to the farmer in the Wheat Belt or in the Corn Belt. Then, gentlemen, I ask, in all seriousness, why is this true? The tables show that there was both an increase in production in each of the crops named during the latter 5-year period, as well as an increase in price. Then why should not the farmers growing these particular crops be in better financial condition at the end of 1929 than at the end of 1916? The only reasonable answer I have been

able to obtain is that the farmer had to pay a greater increase in the price for the things he had to buy than he received by way of increase in price for the things he had to sell. And this seems to be verified by the table below, which shows the average wholesale factory price of the various articles named for the 5-year period 1912 to 1916 and the 5-year period 1925 to 1929, together with the per cent of increase in price prevailing during the latter period as compared with the former, the figures being furnished me by the Department of Commerce.

Article	Average wholesale factory price, 1912-1916	Average wholesale factory price, 1925-1929	Per cent of increase in price
Wagon, 2-horse	$61.40	$101.80	65
Harness, set	35.42	47.38	33
Plow, 1-horse	4.32	7.21	67
Harrow, peg-tooth	8.77	16.13	86
Mower	34.70	69.14	70
Binder, grain	96.57	156.75	62
Binder, twine, bale	4.30	6.10	41
Shoes, men's work	1.21	1.80	55
Sewing machine	29.05	49.45	60

It will be noted that the increase in the price of the above-named articles increased from 33 to 86 per cent in the 5-year period from 1925 to 1929 over the 5-year period from 1912 to 1916, whereas the price of the crops the farmer had to sell increased from 2 to 33 per cent. In other words, the maximum increase in the price of the farm crops, to wit, 33 per cent corresponds exactly with the minimum increase in the price of the commodities he had to buy. That is, if the articles sold were equally weighted as to quantity or value and the articles purchased were also correspondingly weighted, we would see that while the price of the crops the farmer had to sell increased approximately 14 per cent the price of the things he had to buy increased 60 per cent over the same period of years, and it should be observed that the period showing the difference in the increase of prices was after the passage of the last tariff act in 1922 which was said to be for the special benefit of agriculture. These figures well illustrate how it is possible for a farmer or any one else, to be deceived or misled by apparent increase in prices for crops he has to sell, for increased production and increase in prices does not necessarily mean increased prosperity, because there may be a greater increase in the cost of production than the increase in price of the commodity sold and instead of there being a profit there will be an actual loss in the operation. To my mind, this is exactly what has happened to agriculture within the last 10 years, and if we are to go through the same experience following the passage of this bill I shudder for the future of agriculture and the destiny of this Nation.

Now, gentlemen, before closing my remarks I want to call to the attention of the House and the country the statement just made by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. HAWLEY] with reference to the benefits that are going to accrue to agriculture from the operation of this bill.

When I first became a Member of this House the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] impressed me as a man who was absolutely honest and fair, and I do not mean to question his integrity at this time, or to say that I have in any way been relieved of my first impression as to his absolute fairness, but I want to emphasize the fact that he goes upon record and proclaims to the country that, under the operation of this bill, according to figures submitted to him by the Department of Agriculture, an instrumentality of this Government, the general farmer in the State of Iowa will receive as a benefit accruing from the bill, approximately $1,600 a year, whereas he will have an expenditure of only about $182 a year in the way of a tariff on the things he purchases to go into his home and in the conduct of his farming operations. If that statement is absolutely true, I look to see the State of Iowa within the next two years to bloom and blossom as the rose. I would like to see the farmers of Iowa take notice of this statement, and I will be interested to know whether or not, in actual results, this is going to be the result of the operations of this bill when enacted into law. If so, I will change my mind with reference to the tariff and modify my statements with reference to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] referred to a specific farmer and not to the average farmer.

Mr. HARE. I understood him to say it would be a representative farmer or a general farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I think not.

Mr. HARE. That was the impression I received. But I am glad the gentleman asked me this question, because it gives me an opportunity to call further attention to this feature of the bill, especially since so much has been said with reference to agriculture.

In 1922, when you passed the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act, a great deal was said then about agriculture. Let us see what the author of the bill had to say about it. Mr. Fordney, speaking on the bill, said:

> My friends, as far as rates are concerned this is purely an agricultural bill.

That statement was made when explaining the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922, and it is such an important statement I want to repeat it.

> So far as rates are concerned this is purely an agricultural bill.

Every farmer in this country knows now whether or not that statement was true.

Then I was interested a few days ago when I read that wonderful speech made by my good friend from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] when, referring to the benefits that would accrue to agriculture from the operation of this bill, he said——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HARE. He said:

> I have made a very careful analysis of the bill with reference to that particular matter, and I am thoroughly convinced that from the standpoint of agriculture the bill is one of the best that has ever been before the House, and certainly is much better than the act of 1922.

The act of 1922, according to the author, Mr. Fordney, "was purely an agricultural bill." Now we have the information that this is more than purely an agricultural bill, because, according to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON], it "is much better than the act of 1922."

It reminds me of the old darkey who was a star witness in court. After he had told his story the lawyer said to him, "Uncle Isaac, are you sure you have told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing else but the truth?" "Yas, sir," he replied. "I shore have told the truth, the whole truth, and, if anything, a 'leetle' to the rise of the truth."

I think if we had a purely agricultural bill in 1922, according to the statement of my good friend from South Dakota, this will be just a "little to the rise" of a "purely agricultural bill." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, the Hawley-Smoot bill is reaching the end of its long trail. Great credit is due the learned, able, conscientious, and loyal chairman, Hon. WILLIAM C. HAWLEY, for his masterly conduct of the bill in the House and in conference. [Applause.]

The meed of praise should not be withheld from his supporters on the committee, who did excellent service in making this bill the legislative masterpiece of the Seventy-first Congress. [Applause.] Nor should be forgotten the minority members, who, not agreeing in ultimate results or in voting for the bill, have in individual cases given considerable aid and interposed little obstruction to the progress of the bill.

So that the undue delay in its passage, causing loss of at least $75,000,000 revenue to the Treasury and the incalculable loss to agriculture, labor, and industry by their paralysis in the long period of delay, must be placed elsewhere than in the south wing of this Capitol. [Applause.]

The district I represent is an area of the best part of the American Corn Belt, which is the best part of the world. We have sent no outcry as from a sinking craft. We have only demanded as long oars as the experienced boatmen have, and we will do the rest.

This bill gives us that. We will pull through. We are willing that a little life-saving shall be done for others. Yes; we are willing to help.

Nebraska is the most exclusive agricultural State in the Union. If this bill favors agriculture, it will favor Nebraska. With its passage practically every product of the Corn Belt will be protected. As two-thirds of the articles we buy are on the free list, and we sell more protected articles than we buy protected and free combined, we have had an advantage in that respect for years. Our sole handicap has been our farm tariff rates being lower than those of industry. That disparity has been removed by the Hawley-Smoot bill. The solemn pledge made by the Kansas City convention and restated by President

Hoover is being grandly redeemed in yesterday's and to-day's votes and the anticipated presidential approval next week. [Applause.]

There are critics and antagonists of this bill who have been critics and antagonists of the 1922 act.

This will leave them as professed friends of the farmer, with the 1913 act as the only ghastly evidence of their farm affections. [Applause.]

Excluding sugar, tobacco, and wool, the 1913 agricultural rates averaged 6.79 per cent.

The 1922 rate, 17.09 per cent.

The 1930 rates, 33.35 per cent, applied to 1928 imports throughout this speech.

All industrials, 1913, estimated, 27 per cent. This was measured by its actual operation.

1922 rates, 29.42 per cent.

1930 rates, 32.76 per cent.

It will be noted that there was a disparity of 20 per cent between agriculture and industry in the Underwood law, 1913 act; 12.33 per cent in the 1922 act; while in the 1930 act there is a complete reversal, the agricultural rates exceeding all industrials by 0.59 per cent. [Applause.]

The increases I show are arithmetical—the base being 100 per cent—with additions to or subtractions therefrom. Were we to use the geometrical form—that is, percentage of increase with Fordney-McCumber rates as a basis—it would show on agricultural products an increase of nearly 100 per cent.

In 1922 all raw agriculture is 38.10 per cent; 1930, 48.92 per cent, an increase of 10.82 per cent.

All industrial in 1922 was 29.42 per cent; 1930, 32.76 per cent, or an increase of only 3.34 per cent, which is a little less than one-third of all agricultural increase. [Applause.]

All dutiable items in 1913, 27 per cent; 1922, 32.31 per cent; and 1930, 38.14 per cent.

It will be noted that the 1922 act increased all dutiable articles 4.31 per cent, and the 1930 act increased them 5.38 per cent.

It will be readily seen the large influence in this latter increase was made through the higher agricultural rates.

If we select 20 of the leading agricultural products of the Northwest, namely, barley, beef, butter, cattle, corn, eggs, fruit, hay, horses and mules, milk, mutton, oats, pork, potatoes, poultry, rye, seeds, sugar, wheat, and wool, the percentage of duty under the Underwood tariff would be approximately 6 per cent and under the 1922 act 26 per cent and the 1930 act 38 per cent.

This last statement should be understood that each one of the items is given equal rank, and the value of the figures would be merely presenting another angle.

The increase of the 20 articles treated as units is 11.59 per cent over the 1922 act, which is nearly four times as great as the increase of all industrials.

The increased revenue on a 1928 basis for all imports would be $106,426,269. Of this, raw agriculture representing one-third of the imports would bring in a revenue increase of more than one-half the total increase, to wit, $55,448,390.

All agriculture, with less than one-half the imports, would produce 68 per cent of the increase. That is more than two-thirds. So we have the situation of raw agriculture producing more than one-half the increase of revenue, while it is only one-third of the imports.

Approximately 40,000,000 of our people are farmers so classified. They being one-third of the population are given two-thirds of the benefits under this bill which would be as a matter of distribution in the ratio units of 4 in favor of the farmer to 1 of all others. Then, under the theory that protection will contribute to the wealth of those favored, two-thirds of the benefit would go to swell about one-sixth of the Nation's income, the farmer's income being $12,000,000,000; total income for the United States being from seventy to eighty billions.

It is gratifying to know that labor and agriculture are united in the support of this excellent measure. This matter settled, we look with confidence for reduction of unemployment. [Applause.]

A strong opposition is being fostered through the metropolitan press with the purpose reasonably well understood. It was the same purpose manifested in 1911 and 1913 which in behalf of the consumers of the great cities attempted to reduce the cost of living at the expense of the farmer, and it was done. Now with a prospect of the agricultural congressional districts being reduced from 20 to 25, and a corresponding increase in the great centers it behooves the producers of the United States to support this measure and occupy a coign of vantage now which we will not have again in 100 years.

They are not courageous Americans who either listen to or join in the foreign clamor against this measure. We will take care of our own affairs; and the coming campaign will sift out those who stand up for American industries and farms, and reveal to the public those who always take the foreign interests because they like the foreign flavors. The American market is the largest economic factor in the world. It is eighteen times as great as our foreign market. Every other nation by direct attack, subterfuge, and threat is endeavoring to gain access thereto.

The deplorable fact is that legal residents of this country are taking their cue against America and for the foreign interests against their own people. We read in papers this bill denounced as "infamous." Others declare it an "outrage," probably without ever reading it or knowing its contents. It is a fact that the loudest denunciations are by those least informed.

The criticisms of this tariff bill actually made on the floor of the House are the mildest made against any tariff bill in the last 50 years. And the better informed its opponents are, the milder are their criticisms. The American market belongs to the American people, and the State of New York and New England are of more importance as a market for the Corn Belt than is all the outside world. The Pacific coast means more to us than all the Orient, while Ohio and Pennsylvania are better than all Europe. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America have been promised more and given less by the present national administration than by any other administration within the past 100 years.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] a few moments ago referred to the promises of the Republican Party at the Kansas City convention. In answer I will say to the gentleman, who poses as a friend of the farmer but who is to-day voting with and for the special interests, that American farmers have not forgotten those innumerable preelection promises during the last campaign. [Applause.] They have not so soon forgotten the Republican platform pledge that agriculture was to be placed on equality with industry. Equality for agriculture was not only solemnly promised by the party platform and candidate, if elected, but that promise was made so persistently from every stump that the farmers of the country evidently felt they had a right to expect that solemn promise to be kept by the party now in power.

FARMERS PROMISED "LIMITED" REVISION

For the purpose of carrying out the oft-repeated pledge of placing the farmer on parity with the manufacturer, the farmers were further promised a "limited" revision of the tariff. But permit me to remind Members of this House that no general revision of the tariff was promised or suggested during the last campaign. No one, except possibly the gigantic corporations and special interests ever dreamed of a general revision or the unreasonably high tariff bill that we are now asked to support.

Even when this tariff tinkering began many months ago the President in his message to Congress urged only a limited revision. He did not urge a general tariff revision or an embargo on foreign products. Many of the inequalities of agriculture with industry had been pointed out, and at last the farmers thought they were coming into their very own. But, Mr. Speaker, it now is almost impossible to believe that the special session of Congress, called by the President for the alleged purpose of keeping campaign promises, was actually referred to as the "farm-relief session," for it was there that this high tariff bill had its inception. Your "stepchild," this Hawley-Smoot-Grundy tariff bill, has now been born, and our leading economists assert the measure will "relieve" the American farmers to the tune of a billion dollars every year. [Applause.]

HISTORY OF BILL EXPLAINS "WHAT MAKES THE HIGH TARIFF HIGH"

Before the final vote is taken, the final curtain falls on this measure, it might be interesting to Members of this House and the country should I first give a brief history of how this infamous measure was conceived and written and jammed through Congress against the wishes of a majority of Members on both sides of this aisle. Such a résumé of the history of this legislation might also answer the oft-repeated question of "What makes the high tariff high?"

While the farmers were congratulating themselves on the thought that soon a tariff bill would be revised in order to give the farmer the same degree of protection the industries have long enjoyed, the gigantic industries who were already showing enormous profits were actually writing a monstrosity of a bill proposing to heap additional burdens on the backs of the American farmers.

It is well known that this tariff measure was first prepared by a handful of Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Not over 15 Members of this House had a chance to know what kind of a bill was being handed us.

Of those 15, exactly 11, as I recall, reside east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio Rivers. Practically all of them represent industrial districts in Congress. It is also true that Democratic members of the committee were ignored and not permitted to have a hand in the writing of the bill.

Subcommittees were first appointed from the Ways and Means Committee of the whole, and if you will take the time to look up the districts of each subcommittee chairman it will not be difficult to understand why the special interests of the industrial East, rather than the farmers or the friends of agriculture, wrote this tariff legislation.

WHO WROTE SUGAR SCHEDULE?

As a glaring example, the duty or tariff on sugar under the old Fordney-McCumber Act was $1.76 per 100 pounds. The President's Tariff Commission of experts declared that to be excessive, and I think the country generally will agree that sugar is now, and has for many years, been entirely too high for the consumer.

Of course, the sugar interests, being dissatisfied with a legitimate and reasonable profit, wanted to get its dastardly hand into this tariff-tinkering in order to rob the millions of citizens of this country. What happened? The farmers and public generally got the first but by no means last shock when the one Member of Congress, who in my judgment should of right been embarrassed to even vote on the sugar schedule, was appointed as chairman of the subcommittee to write the tariff on sugar. I refer to the able gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE], who has in his congressional district no less than 13 of the largest sugar mills of the entire country. Now, it so happens that our people in Oklahoma, whom I am endeavoring to represent in part in Congress, are consumers rather than makers of sugar, and feel that the high cost of living, including sugar, is already outrageous without being forced to pay an additional tariff on this necessity in every home. But the point I desire to stress is that it is little wonder that the consuming public got bunkoed in the writing of the sugar schedule. Is it difficult to understand what makes high sugar higher? Instead of reducing the tariff on sugar in keeping with the recommendation of the experts on the Tariff Commission, the duty was, of course, raised to heights undreamed of.

In fact, the sugar interests overdid the thing. Had the sugar barons been satisfied with gouging the public for only a few millions possibly no serious protest would have been raised. While the great sugar corporations were writing this particular schedule they, no doubt, decided to eliminate all competition. They just could not be bothered by the consuming public. So the Sugar Trust hiked the duty in the House bill from $1.76 to $2.40 per 100 pounds, and to my amazement I saw them line up honest men who, no doubt, really wanted to represent their constitutents, to vote for such an unreasonably high sugar tariff. Under the lash of administration leaders I saw Republican Members, representing agricultural districts from our great Southwest, vote for the bill with many such unconscionable items as the sugar schedule. And that is not all, I saw some of them vote for a rule to shut off debate on that bill. It was "gag rule" in the extreme. But I want to be fair, and desire to say I was glad to see a number of Progressive Republican Members join in the fight of the Democrats in this House to force the sugar schedule down from $2.40 to $2 per 100 pounds. I wish it had been possible to have placed the tariff on sugar at a lower rate.

HOW LUMBER LOBBY "LOGROLLED"

Without going into further details let me say the lumber interests wrote the lumber and shingle schedules in a similar fashion. The increased duty on lumber and shingles will cost the American people, according to the experts, no less than $50,000,000. The lumber interests have not only written thousands of letters urging an increased tariff on lumber, but all of us know they have had their high-powered lobbyists here in Washington for months lobbying and logrolling for a lumber tariff. And still some one asks, "What makes the high tariff high?" [Applause.]

What I have said about sugar and lumber applies to many other tariff schedules. Especially is this true of the brick and cement schedules. Hereafter, when the farmer buys lumber, brick, cement, and other building materials, he will find he has been "relieved" of his cash, if perchance he should have any, by being forced to pay decidedly increased prices. And some of you still have the temerity to try to make the farmer believe this tariff tinkering by and for the special interests has been done to place agriculture on equality with industry!

For every dollar Congress has given the farmer in this tariff bill it has robbed him of $10 in increased prices on those things he must eat and wear.

INDUSTRIES NOT POVERTY STRICKEN

The greedy industries had no moral right to come here and jam this bill through Congress as has been done, especially in the face of the fact that industries in general have enjoyed tremendous profits under the old Fordney-McCumber law.

The National City Bank is my authority for the statement that 375 manufacturing corporations during three months of 1929 made an average of 37 per cent on their investment. The same report shows that many of these made more the first six months of 1929 than was made the entire year of 1928.

When this tariff tinkering began, more than a year ago, the production of iron ore was higher than ever in the history of this country. Yet, in the face of this and the fact that its profits were enormous, the iron-ore interests had the gall to come here asking for another substantial increase in the tariff on iron, and got it.

IS 182 PER CENT "REASONABLE"?

When one of the ablest Republican Members of this Congress, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] was endeavoring to defend this iniquitous tariff bill on the floor of the House recently and was pleading for "reasonable profits" for his industries, I ventured to point out to him that one of the great steel companies made as high as 182 per cent earnings last year on its investment and asked if he considered that reasonable. His reply indicated that he thought 182 per cent not only reasonable but entirely legitimate. Well, the farmers of Oklahoma have not made 182 per cent on their investment. Many of them have not made 2 per cent, yet the steel companies are getting additional "protection" under this Grundy bill at the expense of downtrodden and depressed agriculture. [Applause.]

Let me say investigation discloses that not only did one steel corporation make 182 per cent on its investment, but in addition I find at least one steel company, the Republic Iron & Steel Co., showed an increase in earnings last year of 208 per cent. The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.'s increase in 1929 was 145 per cent over the year of 1928. The Bethlehem Steel Co. showed an increase of 160 per cent. The Otis Steel Co. only showed an increase in 1929, over 1928, of 78 per cent! Yet, they come to Congress, these poor "poverty-stricken" steel companies, pleading for more so-called "protection."

LIBERAL DONATORS GET "LIBERAL PROTECTION"

Is there any wonder that our citizens all over the country are up in arms against this bill? The people know that the big steel trusts were here to get "in" on this so-called "farm relief" program. This, in face of the fact that the United States Steel Corporation was recently given a refund in taxes of the sum of $33,000,000 by the Government. Not $3,300 nor $33,000. Secretary Mellon decided the steel trusts were paying too much taxes and refunded $33,000,000 to one steel corporation.

One outstanding and notorious lobbyist freely admitted, when questioned by a Senate committee, that inasmuch as the special interests had donated heavily to the Republican campaign they were entitled to ask for additional "protection." Judging from the manner in which the special interests have been cared for in this tariff bill, and I refer especially to the steel trusts, one is made to ask just how liberally they donated to the Republican campaign committee.

FARMER'S LAST VESTIGE OF HOPE GONE WITH DEBENTURE DEFEAT

The farmer might have withheld his condemnation of this tariff written by and for the industrial East had the farmer been given the export debenture. But with that out of the bill the farmers lost their last vestige of hope as far as this tariff legislation is concerned.

Administration leaders among the high protectionists, especially from the industrial East, have had much to say about having voted for higher farm tariffs in the pending bill. But may I suggest they well knew that very few of these tariffs could possibly become effective without the debenture, and, of course, they were assured that the debenture drawback provision would not be finally left in the tariff bill. Although it is true that on a few farm products the tariff will be partially effective in securing high prices, these will only be on specialty crops like oranges, lemons, citrus, and other fruits, all of which will add to the high cost of living. Thus the farmers of Oklahoma and 45 other States will pay tribute by way of increased prices to a few farmers in the States of California and Florida.

This tariff bill is not calculated to assist the cotton farmers, but will add to their many additional burdens. The farmer must pay more for his cotton hoe next year and considerably more for his next cultivator. He must pay increased prices for every thread of clothing he buys for the family. No fair-minded person pretends to say this tariff is going to help farmers who produce other staple crops like wheat, corn, oats, hay, and similar farm commodities.

BORAH CONDEMNS GRUNDY BILL

Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH, recognized not only as one of the most eloquent statesmen in America but also as a profound thinker and consistent friend of the farmer, recently said:

So long as we have the protective system without the debenture the American farmer must inevitably sell, to a very marked extent, in an open market, and buy in a highly protected market. If we take the debenture out of this bill and leave the farmer without the protection which that would give him, what will we have done for agriculture at this session of Congress? We will go away from here without any substantial, permanent benefit to the cause for which we were called here.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho further said, in his characteristic way:

The people who live in agricultural States will not continue to pay high prices for what they buy and be refused protection for that which they have to sell. If there is anyone so shortsighted as to suppose that the vast territory west of the Mississippi River will surrender at the mere dictation of a conference committee, he is very much mistaken about the attitude of mind of those people.

DEMANDS OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS IGNORED

It is a significant fact that every farm organization in America is now opposed to your tariff bill since you have eliminated the debenture, the one and only amendment the farmers were really fighting for in this measure. Here is what Fred Brenckman, legislative representative of the National Grange organization, has to say about the Hawley-Smoot-Grundy tariff bill:

Until recent weeks we had hoped that the tariff bill might be revised in the Senate in such manner as to meet the needs of agriculture. But, in all frankness, it is necessary to say that the rates of the bill which has been passed by the Senate and sent to conference fall far short of placing agriculture on a basis of equality with industry, as was promised in the last presidential campaign.

Speaking further, this legislative representative of one of the largest farm organizations in the world recently added:

The debenture amendment contains the only proposal pending before Congress which is intended to accomplish this. In recent months the price of wheat, cotton, dairy, and poultry products, and other farm commodities has been lower than at any time since the World War. At the same time farm costs have been maintained at high levels, principally by existing tariff rates on industrial commodities.

Mr. Brenckman speaks not only the sentiment of every farm organization in America, but also practically every farm leader in the entire United States.

WHEAT TARIFF A "GOLD BRICK"

A few politicians in their efforts to fool the farmers are saying they voted for tariff on wheat of 42 cents per 100 pounds, but they forget to add that they have left the wheat grower to compete with Argentine and Russia in the Liverpool market. With wheat prices at such low levels it will be difficult for the politicians to make the Oklahoma wheat grower believe that the wheat tariff is any aid to the American farmer.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will my colleague permit me to interject a statement right here that we import and pay duty on one two-hundredths of 1 per cent of the wheat we produce in the United States, or 37,321 bushels. About one-sixtieth of 1 per cent of corn. The cotton imported is negligible.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is very true, and I thank my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma for his valuable contribution.

The able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who has been representing his district in Congress with distinction for many years, another progressive Republican, has had the courage to speak his convictions on this tariff legislation. Concerning the much-talked-of 42-cent wheat tariff, Congressman FREAR recently said:

Raising the wheat tariff rate to 42 cents per 100 pounds and then leaving the American wheat grower to compete with Russia and Argentina in the Liverpool market is a boasted feature of the pending bill that ostensibly promises protection to the farm. As passed by the House, the tariff increase is a gold brick that would convict any stock gambler of fraud if left to the average jury. Yet we do just that when, in 1929, we produced around 900,000,000 bushels of wheat and imported only about 37,000 bushels that possibly could be subjected to a 42-cent-per-hundred duty.

WHY SPECIAL INTERESTS "SCRAPPED" DEBENTURE

It is significant that practically all the Senators and a majority of the Representatives in Congress from the great wheat belts of the Northwest and Middle West favored the export debenture for the reason that it would insure, if enacted, to the wheat growers 21 cents per bushel, or 50 per cent of the duty of 42 cents per bushel on wheat. The debenture amendment, in my judgment, was "scrapped" by the special interests that conceived and wrote the tariff bill for that reason. They knew full well it would actually become effective on wheat and other farm products; that is why the debenture was discarded and the farmers who had been promised so much have been given so little.

WORSE THAN PAYNE-ALDRICH BILL THAT WRECKED REPUBLICAN PARTY

The brilliant young BOB LA FOLLETTE, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, has referred to the Grundy measure as the hijacker's tariff and that—

Its impositions far exceed those of the Payne-Aldrich bill that wrecked the Republican Party in 1909.

The eloquent young Senator, another progressive Republican, has condemned this tariff bill in more bitter terms than has any Democrat in either House of Congress. He boldly charges that the bill is—

The product of a series of deals conceived in secret and executed with a brazen effrontry that is without parallel in the annals of the Senate. Its most iniquitous features are the product of a combination of lobbyists, who have pooled their interests to achieve their ends.

FARMERS "FLIMFLAMMED," SAYS NORRIS

Senator NORRIS, the able and venerable statesman from Nebraska, who is known for his independence of thought and action and absolute loyalty to the common people, has condemned the Grundy measure in his fearless and courageous manner, so characteristic of the distinguished Nebraskan. He has not hesitated to say that the farmers have been "flimflammed" by this latest tariff tinkering. He, too, has charged that the Grundy bill was lobbied through the Senate by the trusts and special interests by using the old game of logrolling and trading lumber for sugar and sugar for lumber, and so forth.

OPPOSITION NOT PARTISAN POLITICS

Several months ago, after the Grundy tariff bill had been rushed through the House without giving the Members a chance to debate its features, I made a speech on the floor of the House at the first opportunity, at which time I pointed out some of the inequalities and abuses proposed in the pending bill. At that time administration leaders raised the cry of "politics" and charged me and other Democrats with opposing their bill for partisan reasons. But now that many of the outstanding and leading progressive Republicans of the great agricultural West, like the Senators and Members of the House I have just mentioned, have joined the Democrats in condemning the tariff bill, it is obvious that the opposition is not altogether partisan by any means. I do not propose to cast a partisan vote on the tariff or any other legislative question. I am endeavoring to represent all the people, regardless of politics, whom I have the honor to represent in Congress. I am convinced that an overwhelming majority of the citizens of the sixth congressional district of Oklahoma, irrespective of politics, are absolutely and unequivocally opposed to the Grundy bill.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, there are two outstanding ways by which Congress might possibly aid the farmers by legislative enactment. First, all agree that the Congress would materially aid the farmer if it could and would assist him to secure better prices for his farm products; and, second, by revising the tariff downward on actual necessities, and thus decreasing the high cost of living. I would gladly support a tariff bill that would do so. I would go further than that; I would freely support a measure that would do either. If I thought the pending tariff bill would insure better prices for stable crops like cotton, corn, wheat, oats, or hay, or, if I felt that it would decrease the high cost of living, I would support the measure and urge its enactment. But I know it will do neither. I know it is going to add thousands of additional burdens upon the citizens of Oklahoma for the necessities of every household, without giving them any possible benefits.

INCREASED COST IS ASTOUNDING

Is it any wonder that practically every independent newspaper in America has condemned the Grundy bill as a fraud and a farce? Is it at all surprising that more than a thousand of America's leading economists have declared the measure grossly unfair to the consuming public and have estimated that it will cost a billion dollars in increased prices? Following are a few items the tariff makers "found" needed additional "protection." The increase in cost of each schedule is enormous. It is astounding!

Increase in cost of leather, boots, and shoes, $250,000,000.
Cement, $60,000,000.
Lumber, $50,000,000.
Brick, $15,000,000.
Tiling, $25,000,000.

Sugar, $32,000,000 in addition to the $216,000,000 now paid by the consumer.

Pig iron, on which the duty was reduced to 75 cents a ton by the Senate, has been put back to $1.12½ a ton, as fixed by the President under the flexible provision.

The Senate reduced the high rates on aluminum and aluminum household utensils to the low rates of the 1913 Democratic tariff, but the conferees put them back practically to the rates of the Fordney bill. The sole beneficiary is the Aluminum Co. of America, controlled by the Mellon interests.

Textiles have been granted the highest rates ever known. Woolen wear has increased from 56.4 per cent to 89.54 per cent. The woolen schedule alone is expected to cost $300,000,000 on clothing and wearing apparel.

When this fact was pointed out to one high protectionist during the course of his remarks on the floor of the House recently—I refer to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER]—his only answer in defense of the woolen schedule was, "Well, who wants to wear a woolen shirt, anyway?" That is about as logical an argument as has been offered this afternoon for this bill. [Applause.]

ADMINISTRATION MUST ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY

But why speak longer? Why give further statistics? The die has been cast. Noses have been counted. The big stick has been swung over the heads of Members of Congress. Many are giving the Grundy bill their half-hearted support against their best judgment. But the word has gone out that the bill must be passed, and we all know that will be done. Let the responsibility rest where it belongs. Let the administration and administration leaders who have been boasting of their "great victory" in jamming this infamous, unconscionable, and unprecedented high tariff bill through the Congress of the United States accept the consequences. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the passage of this bill, and my reasons are too many to discuss in the time that is possible for me to take under the hurry for a vote, but I can not allow a bill such as this to become law without entering an earnest and solemn protest and giving a few of the many reasons why I do not think it should pass and some of the outrages that will be committed under its administration.

Before turning to this bill it should serve a good purpose to briefly review the tariff history of the United States, at least in part. It should be remembered that when our Government was formed the United States were rural. Alexander Hamilton, the patron saint of the present Republican Party, in his famous Report on Manufactures advocated a protective tariff.

As the years passed all parties more or less favored protection at some time or another with the view of developing a self-sufficient and economically independent country. The spirit of nationalism at best was relatively weak, and party leaders vied with one another from time to time in strengthening the forces making for a united country. By the time of the administration of John Quincy Adams the tariff had been increased to where the masses of the people were in a most rebellious spirit against what they termed a tariff of abominations. For a time at least it seemed that the Union itself would not be preserved, so strong was the discontent with the tariff imposed by Congress under the leadership of those who were the forebears of the present Republican Party. When we read the schedules that excited such animosity a hundred years ago we are startled by how low they were compared with those imposed in our day and generation. In order to quiet the country, the compromise of 1833 was effected. This compromise gave a reduction of 20 per cent and directed that the reduction was to be made gradually over a period of 10 years, giving time for industries to readjust themselves without losses. In 1842, after the fall of the Jackson-Van Buren régime, many of the high duties were restored. The country resented this effort to fasten upon it a permanent policy of high tariffs. When Congress convened in December, 1845, the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert J. Walker, submitted what I think to be one of the very ablest reports ever submitted to any Congress, in which he recommended very high rates on all luxuries, including wines and liquors; an average duty of 25 per cent was to be laid on the great bulk of imports which would compete with American wool and iron manufactures; and a long list of articles of everyday consumption was submitted on which no duties would be imposed. The recommendations were enacted into law in July, 1846, and proved to be most successful. The tariff of 1846 remained the corner stone of the Democratic structure until 1861. Did this reasonable tariff policy interfere with the prosperity of the country? Not at all. The decade from 1850 to 1860 was exceedingly prosperous.

This tariff stimulated trade to an unprecedented degree. The merchant marine of the United States expanded to an unprecedented degree and gave promise of mastery of international commerce. It was an era of great growth, expansion, and prosperity throughout the whole land. Compare it for a moment with the time in which we live—bankruptcy and stagnation on every hand.

Since 1861 the Republican Party has largely had its own way with reference to the tariff. As soon as it came into control it scrapped the policy which was established in 1833 and reaffirmed in 1846, which policy meant moderation and fairness to the whole people in tariff making. Every time the Republican Party has revised the tariff it has raised existing rates without regard to how it would affect the country, except the selfish interests desiring to operate behind a prohibitive Chinese wall. The methods of writing tariff laws by Republicans has, since the first, been characterized by log-rolling, trading and trafficking, and throwing to the winds every consideration of justice and fair-dealing to sections of the country and groups of citizens.

When the Democrats came into power in 1913, under the leadership of President Wilson, a Democratic Congress created a Tariff Commission with power to investigate all tariff schedules and recommend rates in accordance with fairness and justice to all concerned, as had characterized the Democratic Party from its beginning to that date. President Wilson recommended, and a Democratic Senate confirmed, such distinguished and learned ecnomists as Frank W. Toussig, of Harvard, and Page of the University of Virginia, and others of similar standing, ability, and unimpeachable character. Men who were not afraid to seek and find the truth.

Their recommendations to Congress were not clouded by bias or partisanship or by the hue and cry of local and purely selfish interests. It was known that they would make careful study and report of competition in this country and abroad and submit to Congress data upon which sensible changes could be made. That Tariff Commission had standing in the country. Their recommendations were respected everywhere as the result of arrival at honest conclusion made not in a partisan spirit nor fear of loss of job if they did not find what the selfish interests wanted them to find. I assert that no Tariff Commission since the Republicans came to power in 1921 has had the faith and confidence of the country. The Republican Party has not dared repeal the law creating a Tariff Commission, because the country too well understood and indorsed the work it had done, but a Republican President did drive from the commission the scientists and experts and appointed men who, without independent judgment, were willing to take orders and do the bidding of the appointive power and the special interests who battered at the doors of the commission and the White House. Who are the members of the present Tariff Commission? Nobody knows. The average Member of Congress could not name them, nor would he take seriously any character of recommendation made by them. The commission as reconstructed since 1921 has been prostituted to do the bidding of selfish interests seeking favors through Federal legislation. With this pliant commission, the President can get any recommendation he wants. On its face it may look like the independent action of the commission, while in fact the President has only approved what he has already asked this order-taking body to find. Under the provisions of this bill the power, so called, of the Tariff Commission is not curtailed but extended.

The wrong of the thing lies in the irresponsible exercise by the Executive of a legislative function. The defenders of this provision claim that by this bill a nonpartisan commission will be appointed and that the ills of the present law of which we complain will be cured. But will it be a nonpartisan, independent commission? If the present President does what his predecessor did, he will appoint no man to the commission whose actions he does not know in advance.

With a pliant Tariff Commission and the flexible provision in the law, whereby the President on and after advice from the Tariff Commission is empowered to raise or lower any existing tariff rate 50 per cent, we can and will see the tremendous and dangerous power that you lodge in the hands of the Executive, it matters not who he temporarily may be.

In 1922, when the Congress enacted the so-called flexible provision, I then denounced it as the most cowardly abdication of congressional authority and duty of which the Congress had ever been guilty in its whole history. That I repeat to-day.

Under the Constitution the taxing power is vested in Congress, and all legislation for the levy of taxes must originate in the House of Representatives, and for a good reason, as the Representative is elected each two years, and comes fresh from the people, supposed to be carrying the latest expression of their

will on public matters. Yet the Congress, which itself should cling to this function, privilege, and duty, has and is by its own act surrendering to the Executive the power to write the tariff laws of the country, and thereby acknowledging its incapacity to do the work that the fathers gave to it as a solemn duty.

It would be no more violative of the intent and spirit of the Constitution for Congress to assume the duties and prerogatives of the Executive than it is for the Congress to abdicate this greatest of all its functions to the Executive—that is, the power, the right, and the duty to select the objects of taxation and fix the rates thereon. No President will ever ask Congress to assume any duty imposed on him by the Constitution. The reverse is true, as practically every Executive is grasping for more power and never giving up any. The trend is to glorify the Executive, and Congress is adding to this ever-growing power by supinely and cowardly passing laws at every session of Congress giving away its duties, powers, and functions to the Executive.

In this bill you place a tariff of 2 cents per pound on sugar. This will cost the consumers of America $200,000,000 annually. The President, under this bill, can raise this rate to 3 cents per pound and by one stroke of the pen put an additional $100,000,000 on the consumers of sugar, a necessity of life used in every home.

Let us see some of the other things this bill does. Shoes are taken from the free list and a 20 per cent duty is substituted. This will undoubtedly raise the price of every pair of shoes. More than that, every piece of leather will be taxed. Every time the farmer buys a horse collar, a plow line, or a piece of leather for any purpose he will pay a higher price.

Lumber, heretofore on the free list, will carry a tax under this bill. Every time a home, a barn, a chicken house, is built or repaired, the man who buys the lumber will pay an additional tax added to what he already pays in extortionate prices to the lumber trust.

The rate on steel and iron is raised in this bill. Farm implements are already so high that the farmer can not buy what he actually needs to carry on his farming operations. Not satisfied with that condition you put an additional burden on him by the passage of this bill. Think of it, every time the farmer buys a hoe, a rake, a plow point, a turning plow, sulky, mower, or a threshing machine, he will pay more than the high prices that he nows pays, which will make it impossible for him to own what he should have to carry on his business as a farmer. The price of one farm wagon is more than all the profit from a whole crop.

Cement is taken from the free list and put on the taxed list. This will add many thousands of dollars to the building of roads and everything into which cement goes. If a farmer wants to put concrete in his dairy barn or his hog pen he will, by the passage of this bill, pay more for it. If the housewife desires a few yards of linoleum to cover a floor of the home, she will find the price higher on account of a 20 per cent tax levied by this bill. Even the little mirror carries an increased tax of 20 per cent. The hair brush and the shaving brush will carry an increased tax of 20 per cent. The small alarm clock on the mantelpiece carries an increased tax of 50 per cent.

We could carry this list of outrages on indefinitely, but I have called attention to only a few of the provisions of this bill that the Republicans call a farmer's tariff and a part of their program of farm relief. It will relieve the farmer of what money he can get hold of, and to think, under the provisions of flexibility in this bill, the President has the power to raise these extortionate rates 50 per cent higher than they are in the proposed bill. Some say the President will not raise these rates. We must judge the future by the past. A Republican President raised the steel and iron tariff from 75 per cent to 112½ per cent. He has made many other raises, and few reductions.

Practically everything of common use in the home and on the farm carries an additional tax under the provisions of this bill.

It is true that there are some products of the farm and ranch that a reasonable tariff would help. Take, for instance, citrus fruits of all kinds, many vegetables, dairy products, poultry products, onions, potatoes, wool, meats, and a few others. These carry a tariff in this bill and would benefit the producer if the bill did not by other provisions raise the price of everything the producer has to buy in much higher degree than you benefit the producer by the tariff that you give him. It does the producer no good when, by this law, you put a dollar in his pocket with one hand and with the other hand take $10 out of his other pocket.

The farmer has been told for a generation by the Republican Party that a protective tariff was beneficial to him, and many of the farmers throughout the West and Middle West have believed this and have consistently voted the Republican ticket. Some years ago a tariff of more than 40 cents a bushel was placed on wheat. Wheat to-day is selling at the lowest price it has in many years. A tariff of 15 cents a bushel was placed on corn, and yet every farmer in the corn-producing section will tell you that he has sold his corn below the cost of production. A protective tariff can not help agriculture as a whole it matters not how high a rate is put on agricultural products, for the reason that 75 or 80 per cent of the land planted to crops in the United States raise crops that a tariff can not reach. No crop of which there is an exportable surplus can be helped by a tariff. We export from 55 to 60 per cent of the cotton that is raised in the United States. No cotton that comes in competition with the ordinary American cotton is shipped into this country. Therefore, no tariff, it matters not how high, would help cotton, and yet there is an effort from some sources to create the impression among cotton farmers that a protective tariff would be a good thing for them.

We have been for 60 of the last 70 years under a protective tariff that is supposed, according to the argument of its defenders, to make the country prosperous; but after all of these years of protective tariff the American farmers and small business men find themselves upon the brink of bankruptcy. Practically everything that he buys has been made higher by the tariff and practically everything that he sells is below the cost of production. A protective tariff has resulted in making a small part of the country rich and a large part poor. No one wants to take from him who has and give to him who has not, but we do assert that it should not be taken away from him who has little and given to him who already has much. We find under such laws as this proposal that 1 per cent of the people own 59 per cent of our national wealth. Thirteen per cent of the people own 90 per cent of our national wealth. Should this obtain? Does it show a healthy condition or does it bode well for the future welfare of our country? Conservatively estimated we find at this time 4,000,000 men out of employment. Just the other day the president of the American Federation of Labor told members of the House Judiciary Committee that millions of families in the country could not buy the bare necessities of life. Is this Republican prosperity? Presidential proclamations that business depression is over and that good times are returning have not made it so nor has it made jobs for the jobless nor put food in the mouths of the hungry.

It is predicted from some high sources that this bill will decrease our export trade by causing people in other countries to buy as little from us as possible in retaliation for our putting up this tariff wall against their products. If our foreign markets are destroyed or impaired, it can have the effect only of reducing the price of the surplus crops and the surplus products that we export by narrowing the market into which they are to go.

The Republican Party has been in undisputed control of the Government for the past nine years. Their campaign promises of relief to legitimate business and to agriculture have not been kept. Allow me to repeat that after these years we find legitimate business depressed as never before and agriculture in all its branches on the verge of ruin. How long the American electorate will continue to vote the Republican ticket and have their hopes shattered by the breaking of campaign pledges I do not know.

The leader of the Republican Party in the Senate predicts that if this bill is passed the tariff will not be revised again within the next 12 years. This means, of course, if the Republican Party remains in power. Therefore, the only way that the American people can hope for relief from this burdensome tariff is to put out of power the party that sponsors it and that has so often broken its pledges to them and put into power the party of Jackson, Cleveland, and Wilson.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH].

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] referred a few moments ago to the lumber item, and I rise especially to express myself frankly upon that proposition.

Before doing that, I desire to make a few general observations upon the bill as a whole. No tariff bill has ever been entirely satisfactory to anybody or to any section of the country, and, of course, there is no section of the country where this bill in some particular is not being criticized. For instance, there are a great many who think it does too much for industry. On the other hand, there are many industrial sections of the country, where men are out of employment as a result of the importation

of foreign goods, made by cheap labor, where it is thought it does not give adequate protection to industry, and it is condemned because of its high agricultural rates.

I think the farm rates in this bill are by all odds the best that were ever enacted in this country. [Applause.] We might frankly admit, of course, that upon great export crops, like wheat, the tariff can not be of very great benefit except under certain conditions and upon some grades of wheat, but, certainly, upon such farm products as meat and live cattle and poultry and eggs and butter and cream and cheese, where there have been large and increasing importations, the bill ought to be of substantial benefit to the farm country.

Of course, there are many items in the bill which I do not like at all. I think the bill, on the whole, is better than when it passed the House. I think, for instance, that it improved the bill to put on the free list logs and shingles, cedar lumber, and to keep sugar and cement at the lowest figures between the rates of the House and the Senate.

Then we have been able to secure an improved flexible provision, which I believe the President will forcefully administer with the aid of a reorganized Tariff Commission. I think this should mark a distinct step forward in securing more scientific tariff adjustments.

On the whole, to sum up, I think it is much better to pass the bill than to continue the tariff agitation with its depressing effect on business everywhere.

Having said this, I want to state frankly, with reference to the tariff upon soft lumber, that I do not absolve from criticism the conferees in failing to bring that item back to the House for further consideration. I did not like it at all at the time, and said so very emphatically and say so again to-day.

What was the situation? Neither the House nor the Senate committee had recommended a tariff upon soft lumber. In the other body it was first defeated and then was carried by a majority of one vote. The Senate rate was $1.50 per thousand.

If I may say so, I had something to do with the gentleman's agreement under which the House had an opportunity to vote upon a number of highly controversial items of general interest to the people of the country and those separate votes materially improved the bill. The conferees, upon the lumber item, put on in the Senate by a majority of one, came to the House and recommended a compromise of 75 cents. The House defeated this motion by a vote of 250 to 144, or a majority of 106. An emphatic majority in favor of free lumber.

I admit that the conferees, technically, were within their rights under the rules of the House. Nevertheless, as I view it, they should, in good conscience, with all this background upon the lumber item, have come back to the House and permitted the House to determine whether under the circumstances that then existed in the conference, we should agree to the lumber item.

I am not saying this simply for the purpose of indulging in criticism, but having had something to do with the agreement for these separate votes, and having expressed myself elsewhere, I felt it only fair to those who were associated in that movement to state frankly here in the RECORD our emphatic disapproval of the action of the conferees in this particular.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am thinking today of the several millions of our citizens unemployed and of the great majority of our people who are striving to provide a proper living for their families despite the increase in cost with no corresponding increase in wages. I do not think of my political welfare nor of the platforms of political parties. The welfare of our people means more to me than political success for the individual or the party. I propose to vote against this bill, because after careful study I am convinced that the benefits that will accrue to the farmer will be far offset by the advance in rates that will increase the profits of industry and cause the cost of living to mount, thus putting an additional burden estimated by many well informed on the tariff question as $1,000,000,000 annually.

My constituents, practically all of whom are employees, who are faced with depriving themselves of many necessities of life at the present time, not speaking of luxuries, are in no position to shoulder this additional burden.

When outstanding business men predict further unemployment in the event of the passage of the bill it is folly to pass it, but I realize that the special interests are in the saddle to-day and the bill will be sent to the President.

President Hoover will have an opportunity to prove the oft-repeated declaration relative to his remarkable foresight and ability to demonstrate now whether he is a politician willing to extend special privileges to a special class or whether he stands for fair play for the American people.

While not of my political affiliation and knowing that if he vetoes the bill he will place himself in a position where he will be looked upon as being bigger than his party, I hope he will look at this question as I do when the bill is before him, think of the welfare of all the people and not a select few, and veto the bill. It is unnecessary at this time to analyze the bill. Every newspaper in the country has told the people what it contains; how every article they wear, the food they eat, and the material that goes in the construction of their homes will all increase in price, thus enlarging the profits of industry. Where do we find one industry, one business establishment of any kind who has notified their employees their salaries will receive a corresponding boost. On the contrary, officials of large corporations have announced that men will be laid off if the bill becomes a law.

When the verdict of Congress is announced to-night there will be gloom in the home of every citizen who understands the situation, but I say there is still hope and that hope rests with the President. He can, in my opinion, prevent further suffering among the unemployed and add to his prestige by returning the bill to Congress without his approval.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is the last time the tariff bill will be considered in the House, and I am glad once again to register my protest against it. I shall vote against the conference report as I did against the bill on its passage. To me it is indefensible, in that it will impose a burden upon the American people which they can ill afford to bear.

It is rightly called the billion dollar tariff bill, for it will increase the cost of living of the American people in excess of that amount, and its exactions will fall heaviest upon the poor.

I can not follow the logic of those who hail it as a panacea for our economic ills. To feed the hungry, raise the cost of food; to clothe the naked, increase the cost of shoes and wearing apparel; to house the homeless, raise the cost of lumber, cement, brick, and building materials; and to put money into the pockets of the poor, make them pay more for the necessities that they buy. That is the logic of those who defend it.

Surely, the masses of the American people will not profit by it. The chief beneficiaries under its terms will be the industrial capitalists. It was for their benefit it was designed; it was their lobbyists who dictated its terms; and they alone will reap its rewards. To the masses it will be a curse rather than a blessing. In scriptural phraseology its practical effect will be that—

> Whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away, even that he hath.

With a Republican majority of 100 in the House and 16 in the Senate, the adoption of this conference report is assured, which means that this iniquitous bill will become a law unless President Hoover should veto it. This he will not do, for the interests which procured his nomination and expended vast sums of money in securing his election demand that it become a law, and their behest he will obey.

When consideration of this bill was first begun about 16 months ago the President and Republican leaders in Congress declared that the changes to be made in this bill from the existing tariff law would be exceedingly limited and confined to agricultural products and a very few others. What is the result? The bill is gigantic in size, and instead of a limited revision, it is broad and comprehensive in its scope and covers nearly every item that the American people have to buy, from a spool of thread to the building material of which our homes are constructed.

The tariff rates on 1,122 different items are changed. On 887 items there is an increase and on 235 items there is a decrease in rates. Of the items involved in agriculture the tariff on 194 items is increased and on 34 is decreased, making the net number of items of agriculture increased 160, while in industries other than agriculture 693 items are increased and 201 are decreased, making the net gain in items affected in other industries than agriculture 492.

I shall not attempt to enumerate all of the items upon which the tariff is increased, but among the 887 articles in common use upon which there is an increased tariff, and which the American people will have to buy almost daily, I mention the following:

THINGS TO EAT

Sugar, beef, mutton, lard, Irish potatoes, rice, oatmeal, vinegar, lemons, olives, almonds, molasses, maple sugar, maple sirup, celery, lettuce, pineapples, grapefruit, and chocolate.

THINGS TO WEAR

Men's, women's, and children's shoes, woolen clothing, mohair clothing, cotton clothing, felt hats, wool hats, straw hats, hosiery, handkerchiefs, silk clothing, rayon wearing apparel, thread (both cotton and silk), needles, gloves, embroidery, and so forth.

HOUSEHOLD ARTICLES

Furniture, chairs, blankets, quilts, carpets, rugs, tablecloths, earthenware, chinaware, clocks, organs, electric generators, shades, screens, linoleum, brooms, hairbrushes, matches, matting, and so forth.

BUILDING MATERIAL

Lumber, shingles, cement, paint, brick, asbestos, sand, lime, plate glass, steel, slate, blinds, paint brushes.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Leather harness, purses, pipes, pencils, pens, violins, fishing rods, leather traveling bags, dolls, hemp twine and cord, garden and flower seed, pistols, shotguns (except muzzle loaders), anvils, umbrellas, clothespins, starch, toothbrushes, Christmas-tree ornaments, baskets, oilcloth, bells, surgical instruments, and so forth.

The American people will be required to pay an increased price for all of the articles above enumerated as result of the increased tariff rates thereon, and the present high cost of living in the United States will go still farther skyward. Millions of our citizens are now struggling to secure the necessities of life—they are asking for bread and you give them a stone.

Shoes are now on the free list, but this bill imposes a 20 per cent tariff on them, and it is estimated that as a result our men, women, and children will pay annually $250,000,000 more for their shoes than they have heretofore. The prices of shoes already seem unreasonably high.

As an excuse for imposing the 20 per cent tariff on shoes and to make it appear that the cattle raisers are to be benefited thereby a tariff of 10 per cent on hides is imposed. This will likely increase the cost of hides about 75 cents each. A hide will make about five pairs of shoes. The small increase the cattle raisers will receive in the price of their hides will be more than offset by the increased price which they will have to pay for shoes which they buy.

The cattlemen have not been deceived by this gold brick that is offered them of trading a 10 per cent tariff on hides whereby they will pay 20 per cent tariff on shoes. The American National Livestock Association, representing thousands of livestock raisers throughout the United States, especially in the Western States, on April 15, 1930, wired Hon. JOHN GARNER, Representative from Texas and Democratic leader in the House, that the members of their organization preferred that hides remain upon the free list rather than to give to the leather and shoe interests this large increase, the closing sentence in the communication to Mr. GARNER being:

> We wish to go on record as being irrevocably against the acceptance of such a make-believe tariff on hides as an excuse to grant substantial protection to the leather and shoe industries.

To the same effect was a telegram of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, which organization, in a telegram to Congressman GARNER on April 17, 1930, used this language:

> It is felt generally that the 10 per cent ad valorem in the House bill on hides is no tariff at all. It is generally felt that we would be more favorable to free hides, free leather, and free shoes, for the schedules which are carried in the House bill which provide protective duties for leather and shoes are simply a gesture of protection on hides.

The woolen schedule alone is expected to increase $300,000,000 annually the cost of clothes and wearing apparel. The sheep raisers will get a very small portion of this, the lion's share going to the woolen manufacturers. The tariff on sheep is raised from two to three dollars a head. The number of sheep in the United States in 1928 was 44,554,000, and an increase of a dollar a head on these would give the sheep raisers $44,554,000, while the woolen manufacturers would receive over $255,000,000 of the increase, or a ratio of nearly 6 to 1 in favor of the manufacturers.

The annual increased price the American people will have to pay upon lumber is estimated to be $50,000,000; on brick, $15,000,000; tiling, $25,000,000; sugar, $32,000,000, the increase on sugar being in addition to the $216,000,000 tariff now paid annually under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law.

Lumber, brick, and tiling are now on the free list and the tariff imposed upon these items under the bill will discourage the building of homes and necessary improvements thereon, and instead of helping the retail lumber and brick industry will have a tendency to retard it. A glaring example of discrimination is found in the tariff on lumber, wherein there is specially exempted from this schedule crossties, telegraph and telephone poles, these being placed on the free list. The railroads, telegraph, and telephone companies are exempt from paying a tariff on these items, while the farmers and the people generally are required to pay a tariff on all lumber which they buy. This is another evidence of Republican favoritism.

Cement is now on the free list, and under this bill a tariff of 6 cents per hundred pounds is imposed, which will mean an increased cost annually of $60,000,000 on this item alone.

An amendment passed in the Senate exempting from the tariff cement used in the construction of public roads, but the Republican leaders forced the House membership to have this item stricken out, and the cost of concrete highways will therefore be materially increased. On a road 20 feet wide and 7 inches thick the extra cost per mile under a 6-cent tariff on cement will be $769.95. In 1928 it is estimated that Texas built 431 miles of roads, and with a 6-cent duty on cement this would mean that the people of Texas would have to pay $331,484.45 increase in price. Texas is in its infancy in road building, and the number of miles constructed is growing each year, and it is safe to estimate that the first year this tariff law is in effect it will cost the people of Texas at least $500,000 increase in the price of road construction alone.

AGRICULTURE NOT BENEFITED

The claim that this bill will bring relief to the farmers of America is a delusion and a snare. Let no one delude himself in the belief that the great masses of our farm population will profit by this bill. Its phraseology and many of its rates may be alluring to agriculturists, but when the entire bill is analyzed and the duties on agricultural products are considered in the light of experience of the total ineffectiveness of existing tariff rates to secure to producers increased prices on farm products, the farmers of America will find that in so far as they are concerned the bill is a mere mirage in the desert of hard times. It glitters with promises, but most of its agricultural tariff rates are like the leaves upon the barren fig tree—they look enticing, but will bear no fruit.

Eighty-five per cent of agricultural products of the United States will receive not one cent of benefit. Farmers who raise cotton (except long-staple), corn, wheat, hay, oats, sweetpotatoes, peaches, watermelons, cantaloupes, oranges, grapes, apples, tobacco (except wrapper and filler), horses and mules, hogs, poultry, and so forth, will profit nothing by it.

The aggregate value of all agricultural and livestock commodities produced in the United States for the year 1928 amounts to the sum of $14,038,189,000. I have prepared three tables in which I have enumerated these various commodities, giving the value of each crop produced in the United States. Tables 1 and 2 contain those that will not be benefited by this bill and Table 3 those that may receive some benefit therefrom.

TABLE 1.—*Farm products upon which there is no tariff, or no increase in rates, and will therefore receive no benefit under this bill*

	Total value 1928 crop
Cotton (except long-staple cotton which is deducted)	$1,229,796,000
Cottonseed	231,660,000
Wheat (other than high-protein)	666,554,000
Sweetpotatoes	72,680,000
Barley	197,459,000
Rye	37,290,000
Tobacco (other than wrapper and filler, which is deducted)	238,550,000
Apples	200,582,000
Peaches	63,649,000
Pears	24,167,000
Oranges	142,285,000
Watermelons	14,549,000
Cantaloupes	20,040,000
Grapes	49,601,000
Horses and mules	52,204,000
Total value of items in Table 1	3,241,066,000

TABLE 2.—*Farm products upon which tariff rates are increased, but will not be effective, and producers will receive no benefit*

	Total value 1928 crop
Corn	$2,119,046,000
Oats	589,048,000
Hay	1,182,960,000
Hogs and pork products	1,387,192,000
Poultry	444,208,000
Eggs	746,285,000
Grapefruit	18,901,000
Sheep, lambs and mutton	197,406,000
Buckwheat	11,794,000
Wheat, high protein	234,200,000
Farm gardens	306,000,000
Truck crops, summer	275,000,000
Milk and cream	1,032,639,000
Butter	228,139,000
Total value of items in Table 2	8,772,818,000

That the increased tariff on above products in Table 2 will result in no benefit to the producers is supported by the findings

of a group of economists at the University of Wisconsin, headed by Prof. John R. Commons, as reported to the Rawleigh Tariff Bureau in recent study of agricultural tariffs.

As to milk and cream, these economists find that the increased duty will affect prices only in New York and in New England, but it was impossible to estimate definitely the amount of increased benefit to farmers in that section. They found definitely that the present tariff on butter is only partially effective, that its benefits are decreasing, and that a higher tariff will not help farmers anywhere in the United States.

The findings of this group of economists are fully corroborated by available statistics, showing the ineffectiveness of existing tariffs on commodities listed in Table 2.

Since 1922 there has been a tariff of 15 cents a bushel on corn and oats, and during these eight years farmers have not received one cent of benefit in increased price. Increasing this tariff to 25 cents a bushel on corn and 16 cents a bushel on oats, as this bill does, is a meaningless gesture, designed to fool the farmers who raise corn and oats.

The corn crop produced in the United States for the year 1928 was 2,818,901,000 bushels, of which there were exported to other countries 41,629,000 bushels, and our imports of corn for that year amounted to only 349,000 bushels. The quantity of production was therefore eight thousand times greater than our imports, and our exports one hundred and nineteen times greater than our imports.

The oat crop produced in the United States for the year 1928 was 1,439,407,000 bushels, of which we exported to other countries 16,497,000 bushels, and we imported during that year only 117,000 bushels. The quantity of production was therefore thirteen hundred times greater than our imports, and our exports were one hundred and forty-one times greater than the quantity imported.

So long as our quantity production of corn is nine thousand times greater than our imports, and our exports of corn are over a hundred times greater than the amount imported, and our production of oats is over thirteen hundred times greater than the amount imported, and our exports of oats one hundred and forty-one times greater than our imports, we know, without the testimony of economic experts, that a tariff on corn and oats imported into this country will be of no value to the corn and oat farmers of the United States.

TABLE 3.—*Farm products upon which tariff rates are increased and may be effective, and if so producers will receive some benefit*

	Total value 1928 crop
Flax seed	37,316,000
Sugar beets	50,960,000
Sugarcane	24,669,000
Lemons	22,720,000
Wool	109,209,000
Tobacco wrappers	9,262,000
Tobacco fillers and binders	27,137,000
Olive oil	250,000
Soybean oil	840,000
Winter vegetables (estimated)	25,000,000
Cherries	2,500,000
Dates	63,000
Figs	418,000
Pineapples	15,000
Mushrooms	15,000,000
Almonds	4,760,000
Walnuts	11,160,000
Peanuts	39,213,000
Irish potatoes	293,679,000
Beans, dry	73,815,000
Cattle and beef products	1,137,176,000
Cheese, Swiss	7,250,000
Onions	22,574,000
Rice	37,319,000
Cotton, long staple	72,000,000
Total value of items in Table 3	2,024,305,000

In Table 3 I have listed all commodities where economic experts agree that a benefit to producers may result, thereby giving the bill the benefit of the doubt. In many instances I fear the producers will receive no benefit. One thing is certain—the increased price upon products in Table 3 will not all go to the farmers and stock raisers who produce them, but much of the enhanced price will be realized by the subsequent handlers and processors of these commodities.

Then again, in many instances the increase in price will be small. For instance, on Irish potatoes and onions economic experts estimate that if the increased tariff on these excludes all imports the increased price on potatoes would be only 2 cents a bushel, and on onions 30 cents a bushel.

In Table 3 I have listed peanuts as a product upon which the increased tariff may be effective. However, Congressman CRISP, of Georgia, who comes from a State where peanuts are produced in such quantities that it is sometimes known as the "Goober State," stated on the floor of the House that there had been a tariff on peanuts for a number of years and that this tariff was further increased by presidential order, and that prior to such increase the growers of peanuts were realizing $90 a ton, and since the increased tariff they are selling for from $50 to $60 a ton.

Assuming, however, that the increased tariff on all products listed in Table 3 will be fully effective, and that the producers of same will receive some benefit, which I much question, yet the fact remains that these products constitute only 15 per cent of the total farm and livestock products of the United States.

The products listed in Tables 1 and 2, upon which the producers are to receive no benefit, aggregate in value $10,797,123,000, or 85 per cent of the total value of all farm and livestock products in the United States, while the aggregate of items in Table 3 comprise only about 15 per cent of such products.

Offset against the probable benefit to 15 per cent of our farmers is the added cost that 100 per cent of the farmers will have to pay upon the necessities of life. It has been truly said that for every dime of benefit any farmer may receive under this bill he will be compelled to pay $1 in return for increased prices upon industrial products.

One of the strong indictments against the inadequacy of this bill to give relief to agriculture is the fact that when it passed the Senate on March 24 five Republican Senators from agricultural States of the West, although committed to the doctrine of protection, realizing the futility of the bill to do justice to agriculture, voted against it. These were Senators NORRIS, of Nebraska; BLAINE and LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin; MCMASTER and NORBECK, of South Dakota.

Again, when the final conference report on the bill was considered in the Senate yesterday—the export debenture provision having been stricken from the bill—additional Republican Senators from Western States also voted against it, among these being Senators BORAH, of Idaho; HOWELL, of Nebraska; SHIPSTEAD and SCHALL, of Minnesota; and BROOKHART, of Iowa.

TARIFF ON LONG-STAPLE COTTON

The bill imposes a tariff duty of 7 cents a pound upon all cotton imported into the United States which has a staple of 1⅛ inches or more in length; cotton having a staple of this length being commonly known as long-staple cotton.

The cotton farmers generally will not be benefited, since long-staple cotton produced in the United States amounts to only about 4 per cent of the total cotton produced in the United States. In Texas less than 1 per cent of the cotton produced in that State each year is of the long-staple variety.

From the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture I have obtained the following statistics:

Long-staple cotton produced in the United States and in Texas. (Tariff imposed)

CROP OF 1928–29

Length of staple	United States	Texas
Upland cotton:	*Bales*	*Bales*
1⅛ and 1 1/32	446,000	29,109
1 3/16 and 1 7/32	158,000	5,961
1¼ and over	28,000	502
American-Egyptian cotton	28,000	
Total	660,000	35,572

Short-staple cotton produced in the United States and in Texas. (No tariff)

CROP OF 1928–29

Staple less than 1⅛ in length:	Bales
United States	13,818,000
Texas	5,070,428

The entire cotton crop of the United States for the season 1928–29 was 14,478,000 bales, of which 5,106,000 bales were produced in Texas.

From the above figures, therefore, it is apparent that long-staple cotton, upon which a tariff is imposed, is only 4 per cent of the entire crop of the United States and only 1 per cent of the Texas cotton crop.

Whether the growers of long-staple cotton will receive a benefit or not is speculative, this being the first time a tariff on long-staple cotton has been imposed since the Civil War, and its effect is largely experimental.

The Government is unable to furnish statistics as to the exports of long-staple cotton from the United States. The chief imports of this cotton are from Egypt, and for the year ending July 31, 1928, amounted to 202,000 bales.

While the producers of long-staple cotton should receive a much higher price than they do for short staple, experience has been during the last few years that manufacturers have been buying the long-staple cotton for substantially the same price that they pay for the short staple.

It is to be hoped that the farmers who raise the long-staple cotton may receive some benefit from this tariff, but if any such benefits are received they will be limited to that particular kind of cotton. Therefore 96 per cent of the cotton farmers of the South and 99 per cent of the cotton farmers of Texas can not possibly receive any benefit.

EXPORT DEBENTURE REJECTED

The only way by which agricultural products of which we have a large exportable surplus, like wheat, cotton, and corn, are to receive any benefit from a tariff bill would be the adoption of what is known as the export-debenture plan.

Since some of our constituents are unfamiliar with this plan, I would make its meaning clear.

Of course, every one knows that by the word "export" is meant the act of shipping a commodity from one country into another. "Debenture" means an instrument in the nature of a bond, or a more simple definition would be "a Government pay order."

Abstractly, then, the words "export debenture" mean the giving by the Government of a bonus in the nature of a bond to those who ship products out of this country.

This tariff bill imposes a duty on all goods imported into this country, but makes no provision for those exported. I have already pointed out the small importation from other countries of corn and wheat, and that of these commodities we raise much more than we consume, and therefore export large quantities to other countries. The same is true in a still larger sense of cotton. About the only cotton imported is about 200,000 bales of the long-staple variety, while we export or ship to other countries about 62 per cent of all the cotton grown in the United States, our cotton exported some years being as much as 9,000,000 bales.

The Senate on October 19 last adopted what is known as the Norris amendment to this bill, by which the export-debenture plan would be effective when the Federal Farm Board determined that the price of any agricultural commodity was so low as to require this method to increase the price. Under this amendment the Farm Board, when they determined that such plan was necessary, would certify such finding to the Secretary of the Treasury. Thereafter it would be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury "to issue export debentures to any farm cooperative association, stabilization corporation, or other person" shipping such agricultural product abroad, the amount of the export debenture being dependent upon the tariff rate.

Where a tariff was imposed the debenture would be one-half of such tariff rate, and as to cotton, since there is no tariff imposed, the amendment expressly provided there should be a debenture rate of 2 cents a pound, or $10 a bale, on all cotton exported.

These export debenture certificates would be redeemable "from any money in the United States Treasury derived from the payment of duties collectible against articles imported into the United States, at a rate of not less than 98 per cent of the face value of such export debentures."

Expert economists tell us that this would result in raising the price of all farm products upon which the debenture is issued practically in the amount of the debenture, which would mean that the price of cotton in the United States would be increased 2 cents a pound, or $10 a bale.

The four main reasons which I have heard urged against the export debenture plan are these:

First. That it is a bounty. This is true, but a tariff duty upon goods imported is likewise a bounty. If the manufacturers of articles are to be given a bounty upon goods imported, why would it not be fair to give to the farmers a bounty upon such agricultural products as are exported. A special reason exists why farmers should have such a bounty, in that they are required to pay tariff upon all that they buy, and this plan would in some measure compensate them by giving them a bounty upon that which they sell.

Second. It has been claimed that this plan would stimulate an increase in the production of agricultural commodities upon which the debenture was imposed, but this can likewise be said against any plan that increases the price of a product. However, the Norris amendment sought to prevent overproduction by providing that where the "agricultural commodity during any crop year has exceeded the average annual production of such debenturable agricultural commodity for the preceding five years" that during the next year the export debenture rates for such commodity should be reduced in the following proportions: If the increase in production of a crop was less than 20 per cent of the average for the preceding five years, there would be no reduction in the debenture rate; if the increase in production exceeded 20 per cent, but less than 40 per cent, there would be a reduction of 20 per cent of the debenture rate; an increase in the production of 40 per cent, but less than 60 per cent, there would be a reduction of 50 per cent of the debenture rate, and so forth.

Third. When the export debenture system was attempted to be made a part of the farm relief bill last year some opposed it on the ground that the debenture certificates would fall into the hands of the speculators, who would unduly depress the price of these certificates. The Norris amendment met this objection by providing that the debenture certificates would be redeemable by the United States Treasury at a rate of not less than 98 cents on the dollar.

Fourth. Some claim that the plan would not work because the certificates would be received by the exporters and not by the producers of the commodity. Offset against this contention is the conclusion arrived at by practically all political economists, that if the debenture plan is put into operation the inevitable result will be that the price of the whole product, not merely the export portion of it, will react to the level of the world price, plus the debenture, which, under the Norris amendment, would mean that the farmers who produced the agricultural commodities upon which the debenture was imposed would receive an increased price in accordance with the debenture rate, which would mean, as to cotton, an increase in price of 2 cents per pound, or $10 a bale, amounting to over $50,000,000 to the farmers of Texas alone in a single year, and over $150,000,000 to the cotton farmers of the Nation.

When the farm relief bill passed at the last session of Congress, many of us sought to have an export debenture amendment adopted, but we were defeated by the Republican leaders in the Senate and House, and the same leaders have defeated the Norris amendment, it having been eliminated in conference and is not now a part of the bill.

Thus far the farm relief act has been ineffective, and it is to be regretted that the export debenture amendment was not made a part of that measure, so that we would have had at least a trial of it. This method is not new and untried. While we have not had it in the United States, it has been successfully used in other countries.

In England, as long as agricultural products were exported, the farmers were given the benefit of such a law. Germany, Sweden, and Czechoslovakia have in operation similar plans now, as applied to the export of grain.

If such a law worked successfully in England for a hundred years, why not give it a trial in the United States? The National Grange, one of the oldest and largest farm organizations in the United States, has indorsed this plan and has worked earnestly to secure its adoption for four years.

Manufacturers who export manufactured products to other countries receive governmental favoritism in the nature of reduced freight rates. For instance, the freight rate of steel shipped from Chicago to San Francisco for export to other countries is 40 cents per hundred pounds, while on steel shipped between the same points which is not to be exported the rate is $1 to $1.25 per hundred pounds. The freight rate on farming implements shipped from Chicago to San Francisco, where they are to be exported, is $1 per hundred pounds, but where they are to be used in this country the freight rate between the same points is $1.93 per hundred pounds. The freight rate on automobiles shipped from Chicago to San Francisco, when they are to be exported, is $2.10 per hundred pounds, while on autos shipped between the same points, not to be exported, the rate is $4.65 per hundred pounds.

There is no reduction in freight rates, however, on farm products that are shipped for export, this favoritism applying only to manufactured products.

If the Government, in order to encourage manufacturers to export their products to other countries gives these large concessions in freight rates, why should not the same Government give a similar encouragement to farmers who ship their products to other lands?

I have voted in favor of the export-debenture plan every time the matter has been before the House, and shall not be satisfied until the American farmer has at least had a chance to try out this method of farm relief, since it seems that all other methods proposed and tried have thus far been ineffective.

FLEXIBLE PROVISION OBJECTIONABLE

Another objectionable feature of the bill is what is known as the flexible provision, which confers upon the President, upon recommendation of the Tariff Commission, the power, by proclamation, to raise or lower tariff rates as much as 50 per cent.

Delegation by Congress of the power to increase or lower tariff duties was first contained in the tariff act of 1922, but this bill enlarges still further that power. Section 336 of the bill deals with this question. It provides that the Tariff Commission may, upon its own volition, or upon request from the President, either House of Congress, or upon application "of any

interested party," investigate the differences in the costs of production of any domestic article and of any like or similar foreign article. The Tariff Commission, upon concluding its investigation, makes a report to the President, recommending an increase or decrease in rates of duty, and, based on this, the President, if in his judgment the rates should be changed, makes a proclamation fixing the rates in accordance therewith.

The act confers upon the commission authority to adopt such procedure, rules, and regulations as it deems necessary, and likewise confers upon the President the authority to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out his functions, and confers similar authority upon the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to his functions in the matter.

The tariff is a tax, and the exclusive power to impose and regulate all taxes should be exercised by Congress and not by the President or any bureau.

This is in keeping with our system of government, and any departure therefrom violates the spirit of our Democratic form of government. Even in a monarchy like England, Parliament would not dare delegate to the King the power to tax. The English people have not forgotten that one of the sacred rights they obtained under the Magna Charta was that no taxes should be imposed "save by the common council of the realm."

The history of the centuries vindicates the wisdom of adhering to this policy of the legislative and not the executive branch of the Government regulating and imposing taxes, and any departure from our traditional moorings in this regard is fraught with danger.

The growth and exaltation of the power of the President during the past decade is one of the menacing signs that threatens our Republican form of government. I placed in the RECORD a few months ago an address which I delivered upon the subject of "Presidential power," before the annual banquet of the Baltimore County Bar Association, of Baltimore, Md., which deals with this question, and I shall not, therefore, speak further upon the subject at this time.

There are other reasons why I object to this bill, but deem it unnecessary to enumerate them here.

I know the bill is going to pass and become a law, but I want to register my protest and set forth some of the reasons which actuate me in voting against it.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have always been opposed to a tariff which leaves out of consideration the interests of the vast majority of our people. I refer particularly to those citizens who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. It is, indeed, distressing to think that within the hour, when the roll is called, the Members of this House will have to indicate their position for or against this measure. It is distressing, if we are to believe the predictions of the gentlemen in control of this House, that this bill will be passed.

The Members of the House are familiar with the fact that the bill under consideration, known as the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, began to take form on January 7, 1929, when the House Ways and Means Committee opened hearings which lasted until February 27. On April 15, the Congress convened in a special session called by President Hoover for farm relief and "limited revisions" of the tariff. Almost a month later, on May 7, the bill was reported to the House by the Ways and Means Committee, and on May 25 was passed by the House and messaged to the Senate the following day and immediately referred to the Finance Committee.

From that time on, until to-day, the bill has been under attack by the leading economists of the country, the majority of the newspapers, and a vast army of the country's leading business men. In substance, they have criticized this bill as a bill without a conscience. By that, they mean that the provisions of the bill were prepared and framed so as to meet the approval of the reactionary group in this country now in control of the Republican Party. It is interesting to observe that, regardless of this intelligent and determined opposition by the leading progressive and public-spirited citizens, the Republican majority, with their good old reliable steam-roller tactics, are about to jam down the throats of the American people this Hawley-Smoot bill, which I am convinced is detrimental to the best interests of our country.

It is a sad commentary upon the legislative branch of our Government to have the elected Representatives in the Senate and in the House of Representatives indicate that they propose, for the sake of their party regularity—that is, the Republican Party—to vote for this bill, even though they do not believe it is the best tariff bill that could or should be passed at this session. We can not be unmindful of the terrible unemployment situation existing throughout the United States and, if the Republican Party now in control of Congress does not propose to remedy that unemployment situation by constructive legislation they certainly should not add to the frightful unemployment conditions by enacting into law this tariff bill which is so fundamentally wrong and which will only aid a small selfish minority.

May I suggest, ladies and gentlemen of the House, before you cast your vote on this very important tariff bill, that you keep in mind the fact that this bill, if enacted into law, will be the law of this country for many years to come? If you will keep this in mind from now until the time you cast your vote, I am sure you will agree that it is indeed a serious matter. If you vote in favor of this bill with all of its unfair provisions, you will inflict upon the people irreparable wrong and the people you represent will rise up in political rebellion They will be so disturbed that their resentment will be expressed effectively on next election day and I hazard the prediction that few, if any, of those Members voting for the passage of this tariff bill, will be returned by their constituents.

I propose to vote against this bill because I have not heard one intelligent explanation as to the reason or necessity of this outrageous tariff bill and I honestly believe it will saddle a financial burden upon the American workingman, which, like the proverbial straw upon the camel's back, will be unbearable. I urge you, ladies and gentlemen of this House; yes, I beg you to join with me in working and voting to bring about the defeat of this proposed Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. If it is not defeated, it will place upon the American people a tax which they will have to pay every day in the year, not a tax to aid the Government, but a tax to enrich favored and powerful individuals now basking in the sunshine of the present Republican administration.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, the President called Congress in special session April 15, 1929, for the purpose of enacting legislation for the relief of agriculture and the readjustment of tariff schedules in the interest of agriculture and limited changes in industrial rates where industry was in distress. He made it clear in his call and in his message to the Congress that he desired a limited revision of the tariff and not a general revision.

Speaker LONGWORTH, in his speech of acceptance upon his election as Speaker, emphasized the necessity for farm relief and a modification of tariff rates, "as few in number as possible," which were not in line with changed conditions since they were imposed six years ago. A farm bill was passed, but it was a marketing bill only. It was not the kind of bill the Middle West farmers and farm organizations wanted. It does not have the effect of giving staple agricultural products an American price above the world price level.

There was no demand from the country for a general tariff revision, such as we have in this bill. Under the flexible provisions of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922, the President is empowered and authorized to raise or lower existing rates 50 per cent on recommendations of the Tariff Commission. This is a commission created by Congress, whose members are appointed by the President, to study the tariff problem from an economic standpoint. If rates needed raising or lowering, the President had full power and authority to adjust them within that range. Why has he not acted if necessity therefor exists? That he has not acted seems proof that no economic necessity exists for raising rates. Any revision through that source would be an economic revision, with rates based on the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. Tariff beneficiaries are not content with that. Special favors could not be handed out to them in sufficient quantities to satisfy their selfish appetites, hence they resort to other means to accomplish their purpose.

Anticipating a special session, the Ways and Means Committee of the House convened at the Capitol on the 7th day of January, 1929. During 50 days, over 1,100 witnesses were heard, and briefs and arguments were submitted by many more, all of whom were clamoring for and demanding increased tariff rates on the commodities produced by them. When tariff making is in progress it is haymaking time for special privilege, and their representatives and lobbyists infest the Nation's Capital.

The Ways and Means Committee is composed of 15 Republicans and 10 Democrats. As soon as the hearings were concluded, the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee were excluded from further consideration of the tariff bill and the Republican members proceeded to draft the bill. The Republican members spent 2 months and 10 days in secret conferences in the preparation of the bill after the hearings were concluded. Who participated in those conferences they alone know.

It was then necessary to have a rule under which the bill should be considered on the floor of the House. The Rules Committee, having jurisdiction of rules of procedure in the House, consists of 12 members, 8 Republicans and 4 Democrats. The Democratic members of the Rules Committee were excluded and a rule formulated by the majority of the Republican members, wherein and whereby no amendments except those agreed upon by a majority of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee could be offered or considered by the membership of the House.

By this rule, eight Members, being a majority of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee who drafted the bill, were invested with sole authority to offer amendments on the floor of the House, thereby denying to all other Members this privilege. By this rule 8 Members were given arbitrary power over the 435 Members of the House and made absolute dictators in this tariff revision in what has been said to be "the greatest deliberative legislative body in the world."

I voted against this rule. I was sent here by the people of my district to represent their interests in this legislative body, and I do not consider that I, or any other Member, have the right to delegate that authority and foreclose ourselves of the obligation imposed upon us by our constituents when they elected us to this body.

I speak of this legislative procedure to direct your attention to that fact that it was necessary to lasso, bind, and securely tie the membership of the House, if what has been said to be the most iniquitous tariff bill ever considered by an American Congress, was to be put through. It was well known that if amendments could have been offered by Members and considered on the floor of the House without the necessity for an O. K. by those who drafted the bill, the scheme of the favored few would be thwarted—the playhouse of special privilege torn down, their plunder bund exposed to public view. It was well known the pitiless light of publicity would be the death knell of their cherished designs. The Republican leadership of the House conceived the rule and, through their influence, caused its adoption by almost a strict party vote.

They well knew the special favors carried in this bill would not be countenanced by the membership of the House if given an opportunity to offer amendments and consider rates on an economic basis. They well knew that an entirely different bill would be the result of the deliberations here if schedules were considered separately. They considered that the end justified the means. Such means are the lobbyist's paradise. It opens wide the gate to special privilege.

All the opponents of the bill could do was to make speeches on and vote against the bill as a whole, nothing more. Those who voted for it had to take it with its manifold iniquities for the little good it contained. Note how the bill was considered on the House floor. But 82 lines of the 10,681 lines were read, 6 only of the 727 paragraphs were read, and 4 pages only of the 434 pages in the bill were given consideration. Then the vote.

The bill was sent to the Senate May 2, 1929. On the Senate floor something like 1,200 amendments were adopted. In that body, where more liberal consideration was permitted, in practically every instance amendments relating to the industrial rates resulted in lower rates in the interest of the consuming public and some agricultural rates were increased.

The bill then went to a conference committee composed of the ranking members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate to work out the differences between the two Houses. The Republican members of this conference committee, after much delay and opportunities for logrolling, agreed upon a conference report. Who were they? Generally considered to be reactionaries and standpatters of the most pronounced type. It is interesting to note that in this conference report, in practically every instance, the highest rate adopted by either House was the rate agreed upon. Beneficial amendments adopted by the Senate were bartered away or surrendered by its conferees.

I had hoped, in view of the President's announced intention, when he called the Congress in special session in April last year to consider farm relief and a limited revision of the tariff, and the declared position of the Speaker of the House in accepting the Speakership, a bill would be submitted to the membership of the House for which I could vote. I wanted to go along, if the tariff was to be revised, and by my vote and what little influence I may have in the House, contribute to a tariff bill that would be in the interest of the people generally. A bill that would do justice to the farmers, the laborers, the manufacturers, the consumers of the country, and likewise have due regard for our trade relations with other countries, upon which the welfare of the American people so largely depends.

I believe in a protective-tariff policy in so far as it gives protection to capital, labor, and the farmers of this country alike, one that does not unduly tax the consumers, who compose the great mass of our body politic. It has always been my theory that rates in tariff fixing should be based upon the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, and that this difference should be determined through study by an impartial, nonpartisan, fact-finding tariff commission. If we use that principle as the yardstick, capital and labor will both fare well, and the rights of the consuming public will be protected against undue exploitation by way of increased living costs.

A tariff is an indirect tax. It but adds to the cost of the commodity upon which it is levied. It is effective in raising prices, unless an uncontrolled surplus of the commodity is produced in this country for which we must look to foreign markets for an outlet. In such case, the world price level controls the domestic price and sky-high tariffs will not be effective in raising prices. That is the farmer's trouble so far as his staple crops are concerned.

In the consideration of tariff bills we should have free, open, frank discussions of the schedules involved, with an opportunity to the Members of the House to offer amendments and have them considered by the representatives of the people here assembled. Certainly the 435 Members of this House could be trusted in framing tariff schedules to consider rates on economic grounds, and it is not wise or expedient to delegate to 8 Members out of the 435 the sole authority to write the bill and dictate what amendments should be offered and considered.

We, as individual Members, are sent here by our people to look after not only the interest of the people of our districts but the general welfare of the American people. Under our system of representative government, each Member here is charged with responsibility as the agent of the people who sent him here. The people should not be denied the right of having their interests protected and promoted on the floor of the House through their duly chosen Representatives.

Of course those specially favored by high tariff rates know that if the people's representatives here had free right of action and could register their views by their votes on the schedules separately and on their real merit, they could not plunder the consumers of the country as they do, because rates would be fixed more nearly in line with economic necessity. They move in a devious way by imposing legislative restrictions on the membership, whereby the Members are shorn of their legislative birthright of free and independent action, and sole power and absolute authority is vested in the select few. By this legislative subterfuge they gain special favoritism in tariff rates, and not otherwise. Through the influence of the majority leadership special privilege was enthroned and dictated the terms of the bill.

If the added cost by reason of the tariff were charged separately when an article is purchased, the consumers would revolt at the injustice heaped upon them by unjustifiable high tariffs. As it is, the tax is wrapped up in the price the consumer pays, and he is kept in ignorance of the tribute he pays to the tariff beneficiary. The cost of living in this country is already too high, and we should not heap burdens upon the consuming public by increasing that cost through unwarranted tariff rates.

High tariff barriers constitute a wall of protection to the manufacturing interests of this country, within the shadow of which they may form their pools and combinations to raise prices for the exploitation of the American consumer. They are not satisfied with a tariff that marks the difference in the cost of production in this country and abroad. They could have gotten that through the flexible provisions of the present tariff law by presidential proclamation. They want the wall built so high that, through their trade combinations, they can fix the prices to suit their greed and wax rich by raising the price of their commodities which the consuming public must pay. They are not content to keep their hands in their own pockets. They insist on reaching down in the other fellow's pocket and extracting tribute every time a purchase is made.

The policy of logrolling, with a view of getting exorbitant tariff rates, was never demonstrated more forcibly in all the years of our Nation's existence than in the practices indulged in by the tariff beneficiaries in the consideration of this bill. This bill has been named, "The Grundy Billion Dollar Tariff Bill," as it is estimated it will cost the consumers that much annually by way of increased prices. JOE GRUNDY, of Pennsylvania, who has been a reputed tariff lobbyist around the Capitol for 20 years, was given a seat in the Senate, where the special interests represented by him could have the feast of privilege prepared for them by more direct contact with the lawmaking body. The stigma of the name "lobbyist" as applied

to GRUNDY was transferred to the more euphonious name of "Senator GRUNDY." The Senate's investigating committee of lobbying made revelations which astounded the Nation, yet they plied their trade and accomplished their purpose through specially set up legislative machinery.

Our tariff wall has already been built so high that the nations of the world, with whom we have been dealing, are establishing trade relations with other countries. We are driving trade away from us.

We produce and manufacture products for sale. If not an exchange of commodities, then cash is required for settlement. Nations can not afford to pay all cash; for by so doing they deplete their gold reserves, and a depleted gold reserve means financial collapse. Hence, when we raise the barrier so high that their goods can not be exchanged for ours, without their having to pay so much "to boot" on account of our high tariffs, they seek trade relations with other nations where such barriers do not exist. They retaliate by raising barriers against our products coming into their country. They say if we bar their products, they will bar ours. Results: Our foreign trade crippled, our agricultural products piling up in granary and warehouse, depressed farm prices. Our manufactured products accumulating on shelf and in warehouse, factories shutting down—labor on part time only, and often long periods of unemployment. Families must be fed and clothed. No work, no pay—no pay, want and deprivation, disappointment, discouragement, unrest, misery—a cultivated soil for bolshevism, communism, and sovietism.

There is a limit beyond which we can not go in tariff making, if we have regard to the safety of the Republic and the peace, happiness, and welfare of the masses of the American people. Our chief concern should be with the rank and file rather than with the captains of industry. Big business should be treated fairly. Capital is necessary, but should not be clothed in a garb of protection that will give it an undue advantage. It should not be given a cloak of special privilege under which trusts, monopolies, and combinations are formed for the exploitation of the masses.

Already 36 nations have protested the exorbitant tariffs provided in this bill. Movements are in operation, supported by full-page newspaper advertisements, in many countries which have heretofore been the chief buyers of our agricultural and industrial products, having as their slogan, "Buy no American grown or made products." This policy of excessive tariffs is breeding ill will. It causes resentment. It endangers world peace.

How far this will go no one can tell, but it is alarming and may be disastrous. We can not afford to pursue a policy that will add to our overproduction in products from farm, factory, or mine. Factories and mines can close down to control their overproduction, but when they do laborers, most of all, suffer, are thrown out of employment and on the streets, prices are depressed, and in the wake will come discontent, want, suffering, and distress. Prosperity must neither be spotted nor sectional. It should be general. We must keep our productive agencies active; we must keep labor employed on full time at good wages. Without markets for our products—and we have reached the stage of production in this country that we must have foreign markets for our great mass production—general stagnation will reign, with all its attendant evils.

The disturbance of our trade relations with other countries through retaliatory measures and boycott of American products by foreign countries on account of our excessive tariffs against them have been scented by some of our captains of industry who have been enjoying a lucrative trade abroad, and to guard against such reprisals they are building and equipping factories abroad from which to supply foreign trade. American investments in foreign countries have been growing by leaps and bounds in recent years. This militates decidedly against American labor. Every foreign laborer employed in their production program abroad means less demand for American labor here.

Instead of supplying their foreign trade by products made in America, where American workers are employed, they are supplying it by products made abroad where foreign labor is employed. Thus foreign labor supplants American labor. American labor ought to get the benefits of this trade. We should not drive our foreign trade away, as we are by exorbitant tariffs. American workers need the work. The country can not stand too much unemployment, and this policy adds to our unemployment problem.

There are some rates in the list of agricultural commodities that will benefit farmers in some sections of the country, such as small fruit and vegetable farmers, but they are negligible as compared with industrial rates. Tariffs on corn, wheat, oats, beef, pork, our so-called staple farm products, while increased to some extent, are ineffective, as we produce a surplus of these commodities and must depend on foreign markets for our outlet. Other countries, with which we deal, do not have the money to buy our farm products. They depend upon exchanging their products for ours, and our tariff wall acts as a barrier to that trade.

As a result, our outlet being choked, our corn, wheat, oats, beef, pork, and other staple products pile up in this country and depress our local markets, thereby driving prices for such commodities down. But, they say, they have given agricultural products the highest tariff rates in this bill ever enacted. What of it? They are not effective. It is sop thrown out to the farmers of the country in an attempt to pacify them and keep them in line politically. You may follow in the daily press price quotations of these products in this country and in the markets abroad, and you will find that with all the tariff rates on such commodities the price in this country is no greater than the price in foreign markets, often less, thereby proving conclusively that a tariff alone is of no benefit to the producer of such commodities.

The only way to make the tariff benefit the producers of such commodities is through the operation of the export-debenture plan. That plan, coupled with the agricultural rates carried in the bill, would make the rates on agricultural products effective. Unfortunately, the export-debenture plan put on in the Senate was eliminated in the conference, and when it was eliminated the virtue of the bill, so far as agriculture is concerned, ceased. That action crucified the bill's virtue to agriculture. It enthroned its vices on a commanding pedestal.

Now, the tribute it levies on the farmers of the country by way of indirect tax through increased prices of practically everything he has to buy, without giving him corresponding benefits, leaves the farmer in a much worse condition than under the present tariff law, and it is pretty hard to conceive a more deplorable condition than that existing to-day in agricultural sections.

The present administration in power has not only failed to restore agriculture to a parity with industry but under this bill it has imposed additional burdens on agriculture. Thus the breach is widened. Look to census reports and see the steady drift of our people to the industrial centers. Notice the exodus from the farm to the city, not farmers who go to the city to retire and live on their income but farmers and sons and daughters of farmers unable to make a respectable living on the farm. During the past 10 years the migration from farm to city is alarming. Unequal laws are largely responsible. We should not add to this unfortunate situation by the enactment of tariffs further penalizing agriculture.

What is the opinion of the press of the country as to this Hawley-Smoot tariff bill? May 9 last telegrams were sent by the New York Telegram, a great daily in New York City, to the leading newspapers of the country having daily circulation of 50,000 or more asking their stand on the bill. Of the 93 replies received up to May 14, 74 were opposed to it, 16 favored it, and 3 noncommittal. Of the papers replying, 64 are listed as independent, 10 independent Republican, 8 independent Democratic, 7 Republican, 3 Democratic, and 1 Socialist.

The Globe-Democrat, St. Louis (independent), May 17, editorially said:

> It will be an ignominious failure. There was no demand for such legislation and no need for it. It has aroused fears and animosities all over the world, creating demands for reprisals that in some important countries have already resulted in retaliatory legislation inimical to our interests. It has cost us enormously in world trade. It would work harm rather than good to the farmers, in whose name is was obviously undertaken, and it would lay upon American consumers a tremendous burden of increased costs. It is a calamitous measure without an atom of good in it.

The Detroit News (independent) says:

> Few can benefit, farmers least of all, for farmers must lose in two ways—by paying more for manufactured goods and losing foreign markets for our products.

The Louisville Courier-Journal (independent):

> Tariff legislation to relieve farmers will relieve them by lightening their pockets.

The St. Louis Star (independent):

> The Star regards the Hawley-Smoot tariff as harmful to international relations, a blow to export trade, a burden to the entire population, and a gold brick for the farmers.

Wallace's Farmer, Des Moines, Iowa:

> If the Hawley-Smoot bill goes through as it now stands the farmers of the United States, instead of gaining by tariff revision, will be robbed of many additional millions.

The Prairie Farmer says:

While this bill was originally designed as a farm-relief measure in accordance with the promises of President Hoover and the Republican Party, it turned out to be anything else but that. It offers little actual help to the farmers, but will be very effective in transferring money from the farmer's pocket to that of the favored manufacturers. It does just that to the tune of $186,000,000 a year, according to the Rawleigh Tariff Bureau. That is, this new bill will add that much to the farmer's costs over the amount now taken from him by the present tariff law. That amounts to $30 on every farm in the United States.

Even these figures are not large enough. They cover only nine of the most important products used by farmers on which additional protection is given by the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. The present law taxes farmers $214,656,963 for the benefit of the manufacturers of these nine commodities. Under the new law this tribute will be increased to $400,636,006, if the duties are fully effective. No wonder these manufacturers can afford to be liberal when the hat is passed for campaign contributions.

Scores more to similar effect. Why quote more?

One thousand and twenty-eight of the leading economists of the country recently set forth their opinion of this bill. They declare, among other things, that it will increase the general cost of living, that it will inflate profits of the few at the expense of the many; that it will rob the farmers it is supposed to enrich; that it will cripple manufacturers through raw-material rates; that it will lower the buying power of our foreign customers; that it will provoke foreign retaliations against our exports; that it will jeopardize payments from our foreign investments and debts; that it will increase unemployment and poison world peace.

These men have made a careful study and analysis of this bill. They are competent to deal with economic questions. Their training has been along that line. They are competent to judge. They are experts. They come from 179 of our leading colleges and universities of the country. Farm organizations and business organizations have protested in vain. In the face of all this, special privilege rides roughshod over the rights and interests of the rank and file and dictates and puts through a bill of its own choosing.

It will increase the cost of practically all necessities of life, adding materially to the cost of living. Increased prices on sugar, clothing, furniture, household necessities, boots and shoes, harness, cement, brick, lumber, iron and steel products, paints, and thousands of other articles of daily necessity. It is estimated it will cost the people of Illinois alone $43,440,000 over and above what the tariff bill of 1922 costs them.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on the two conference reports as one, which is the last act so far as Congress is concerned, the final step that sends the bill to the President. For 17 months it has been before Congress. It violates the pledge of the Republican platform in the last national campaign, as well as the Democratic platform. We should make good our promises to the people. They trusted us. We should not fail them now. My vote will be cast against the conference report. [Applause.]

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, it was only a few days ago that I learned the definition of that expression we hear so frequently used—"special interests."

In his speeech in the Senate on this conference report the distinguished Senator from Mississippi paid me the compliment of saying that in the conference I watched the correspondence with my constituents and that they were my "special interests."

Now, I am very glad indeed to plead guilty to such an indictment as that. If that is the proper definition of "special interests," we are here for that purpose, to do the best we can for our constituents and at the same time for the country as a whole.

So I think the Senator from Mississippi both complimented me and himself, because he was the cause of there being put in the bill a duty on long-staple cotton. He was looking out for the special interests of Mississippi.

Now, as usual I greatly enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER]. Always he is an interesting speaker. We like to hear him on the floor, and as usual I was diametrically opposed to practically every statement he made. [Laughter.]

Why, it seemed a far cry for him to say that by the change of two or three schedules we would set up a country here where there were no imports and no exports. That is practically what the gentleman from Texas just told the House of Representatives. There can not be, to my mind, any stranger construction made of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill than that made by the gentleman from Texas this afternoon. In my judgment, that is exactly what the bill will not do. It is drawn for the distinct purpose of protecting our manufactures and at the same time dealing fairly by the products of other countries.

He said another thing to which I wish to take exception, and that was that the honorable chairman of the committee, Mr. HAWLEY, was double-crossed or he double-crossed somebody. The gentleman from Texas must have some information of the conference report and the meeting of the conferees that I did not have, if there was anything of that kind took place in any period of the conference. I believe I attended every session.

Neither did Mr. HAWLEY double-cross anybody or did anybody double-cross him. I think that should be said in full justice to the chairman of the committee, because if there has ever been a trying situation put on any man in the last 18 months it has been on the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY]. He has been under a heavy strain in handling and being responsible for getting out this bill and bringing it to this body for final passage here. [Applause.]

I want particularly to tell this House that in all my associations during life—and I do not class myself any longer as a young man—I never have seen a more patient, diligent, nor painstaking man to deal with under any circumstances than our honored chairman. [Applause.]

He deserves every bit of credit that is to come to the Republican Party as the leader in the passage of the so-called Hawley-Smoot bill. He struck the nail on the head in his remarks a few moments ago when he said that as a result of this bill we will see in the near future a very active movement and stimulation along the lines of industry throughout the country. The uncertainty that has been forced on the country, largely through the tactics of the Democratic Party in the Senate and their associates, is the cause of the present uncertainty in the business world.

We are told that this is, and that it is not, an agricultural bill. That question has been answered by the recent primary in the State of Iowa, where our distinguished colleague, Mr. DICKINSON, won out by such a very handsome majority, for which we congratulate him to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] Agriculture spoke in the State of Iowa in the nomination of Mr. DICKINSON, because he made this bill his one plea before the voters of Iowa, and I say to my Republican colleagues that when we go out in the near future and appear before our constituents the example set by Mr. DICKINSON is the one that we ought to follow. Praise this bill, and we will get votes.

Who are the critics of the bill? The chief critic of recent days has been a distinguished manufacturer of automobiles, who makes them now in foreign countries and brings them in here under a lower rate of duty in order to get advantage of the markets here, though manufacturing them with industry employed abroad. Let us face this situation as it is. The rates on automobiles have been reduced from 25 per cent to 10 per cent in this bill, and it seems to me a far call for any manufacturer of automobiles, having set up his enterprises abroad, to come in now and criticize the bill when we are endeavoring to assist industry in this country. The prosperity of this country has brought prosperity to the automobile industry, and particularly to the men who are now criticizing the tariff bill because it is beneficial to other industries than their own and because in writing the bill we have given the interests of this country first consideration rather than those individuals who have financial investments abroad. Stand up and be counted. This country is going to benefit in the near future and for years to come by the passage of this Hawley-Smoot bill.

There is one other statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] I desire to refer to. It had to do with propaganda by the Tariff Commission. I do not know to what he referred. I have had dealings with the Tariff Commission over some period of years, and, so far as I know, I never have had an opinion presented which showed the slightest political tinge. That commission has been a fact-finding body, one which ought not to be criticized, either as a commission or as individuals, as was done a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Texas. I think he referred to Mr. Brossard, who has always been ready to furnish information, not propaganda.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Briefly.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Referring to Mr. Ford, in April, 1928, Henry Ford used these words:

Free trade leads the country to high wages and prosperity. I don't believe in anything else but free trade all around.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have no doubt that that was his opinion then and evidently is now. Therefore, naturally, he will criticize a bill that is for the benefit of American industry. I agree fully with the gentleman from Ohio and his statement. Let me

add this also, that that statement and others similar to it are backed not by what are called special interests, but by big interests. Evidently there is a group of people in the country to-day who are more interested in their investments abroad than they are in the welfare of the American workmen in this country. [Applause.] My first interest is with the workingman. I want to see all men and women employed in our mills and our factories throughout the country in producing American goods for American consumption, and then let these foreign bankers look after their own interests after we protect American industry here at home. I have no patience with this type of criticism of this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five or six minutes to myself. I was very much interested when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] raised himself up to his 5 feet 11 inches and stated he was proud to represent the special interests of the country, and when he followed that statement with another that his sole interest is to see that the workingmen of this country get higher wages, I could not help but think that the tender solicitude of the gentleman from Massachusetts for the working people of the country is the most touching and pathetic incident that has happened in the 11 months of this debate. [Applause and laughter.] With all deference to my friend from Massachusetts, for whom, personally, I have a high regard, is there a man or a woman in this House who believes that he cares one rap or one penny whether the workingmen get a higher or lower rate of wage if it prevented the manufacturer in his district from getting a high rate of protection? He talks about some one accusing the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] of double-crossing some one. I do not know about that, but my knowledge of Mr. HAWLEY is such that I do not believe that in private, public, or political life he would double-cross anyone. [Applause.] I am not accusing the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] of double-crossing. I would not use so harsh a term. I prefer to use the word "flimflam." [Laughter.] I remember the situation here not long ago, after 8 or 10 hours of debate, when we voted on all of those 1,200 amendments. After the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HADLEY] had stood here like soldiers in the trenches, voting for item after item for the gentleman from Massachusetts, I saw the gentleman from Massachusetts, just after he had received a high rate on this cheap imitation paper roofing that is made in his State, shove Mr. HADLEY aside when he wanted only a measly 25 per cent on shingle roofing made in his State. And after this old Roman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] had stood by him all day long voting for a high rate for every industry in Massachusetts, I saw him shove the gentleman from Colorado to one side, after he saw that he was 60 votes ahead on the first roll call, as he said, "I am going to dinner; sugar is going to be free."

But I say to you, sir, that it is almost impossible to get any satisfaction from criticizing him, because he is like the man who went to a newspaper fellow and said, "Say something about me that is good, if you can; but if you can not say something good, then say something bad; say something!" Anything concerning the gentleman from Massachusetts is a boost. [Laughter.]

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has commended to you the Iowa position. I also commend it to you. The Iowa Members are my personal friends, and I have watched them for the last nine years, ever since the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill was enacted. I find that they have a system that can not be beaten. It works every time. It is to get on the stump and everywhere fight and talk against the tariff bill, and then vote for it on the floor. [Laughter.] In that way they catch votes going and coming. They do that all the time. [Laughter.]

I have not time to go into the iniquities of this tariff bill. I had hoped that when the Tariff Commission made a recommendation that a rate be lowered or raised 50 per cent, within 60 days that question would be settled within that time. But now applications may be pending indefinitely. I am not charging that the present President of the United States or any President of the United States would ever hold up these accumulated applications until just a few days or a few weeks before or after an election, but I do not want by my vote to place any such temptation before a President as that. That to my mind is one of the most indefensible features of the flexible plan. This is the highest tariff bill in the history of the country and by a mere stroke of the pen, if the President desires—and I do not charge nor believe he is going to do it—yet by a stroke of his pen he can make it twice as high as it now is if he wants to.

My good friend from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] and my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH] have been charging me as being a dire prophet of ruin and disaster. They say I made this prophecy in a speech I delivered some nine years ago on the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, and they love to hold me up as a false prophet. My friends, I dare you to tell me that I am a false prophet now. Since the 1st of January of this year our balance of trade has fallen off over $500,000,000. After 10 years of the highest tariff in the history of the Republic we find so many unemployed that your officials are afraid to give out the number because it is much more than you expect.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COLLIER. I can not help yielding to my good fisherman friend. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOOD. Do you see the forecasts that were made concerning the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, to the effect that it would absolutely destroy our export?

Mr. COLLIER. Well, after nearly 10 years of operation under that bill they still say it.

Mr. WOOD. And you say that during the existence of the Fordney-McCumber tariff it has destroyed our exports?

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman knows that during the campaign two years ago, when they were talking about the almost unequaled and unheard-of prosperity we had in this country the gentleman knows that was nothing but newspaper talk, and we never had it. The only time when the foreign trade of America was the greatest in our previous history was in the last four years of a Democratic administration. There have been four decades in the history of this Republic in 140 years when the wealth of our country in a decade increased over 100 per cent, and each and every one of those decades was a decade in which there was a Democratic administration. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the revenue from imports into this country more than doubled under the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, and that the exports from this country were nearly doubled?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes; there were times when the exports were so. Those were times by reason of the war when Europe was prevented from making things there. But as soon as the war was over and when conditions got normal, although I do not claim to be a prophet, it turned out just as I expected. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in opposition to some of the editorials and cartoons in the Hearst newspapers, I wish to call attention to an editorial from a paper in Nebraska. The McCook Republican, edited at McCook, Nebr., by Mr. Barnes, who has lived in that section of the State for 25 or more years, publishes the following editorial under date of June 6, 1930:

We are told by metropolitan newspapers now making a drive on the protective tariff system that this country is now suffering from overproduction, and that our only chance to dispose of our surplus production is to seek markets abroad, and in order to gain markets abroad we must admit the further invasion of our markets by the cheap-labor products of foreign lands.

Many will wonder how it can be said that we are suffering from overproduction. It is a fact that hundreds of thousands of wage earners have been thrown out of work in the United States through their inability to compete with foreign cheap labor, whose output crowds the shelves of stores in the United States. Is there not a more immediate and profitable prospect of consumption by these unemployed men were they back at work than among the peasants, coolies, and peons of foreign lands who are now doing the work of supplying American necessities?

Abroad we must meet on their own ground the makers of the very cheap-labor products we are now buying in such quantity instead of absorbing the output of our own industries. If we can not undersell them at home, how can we do it abroad?

Our only hope of gaining markets abroad is in supplying them with products which we can make cheaper or better only because our large-scale market here permits the economies of mass production.

The operations of the present tariff law which it was predicted would destroy our foreign trade, proves to the contrary. When we keep our own industries going we are enabled to buy abroad articles of luxury and of necessity we do not produce here in greater and greater quantity. We are enabled to spend more in foreign travel. Our prosperity does not destroy that of foreign lands; it promotes the general prosperity of the world.

The truth is that the outcry arising in this country against a tariff measuring the difference in labor costs at home and abroad on all competitive commodities is chiefly inspired by international financiers who want to collect the vast amounts they have loaned abroad at the sacrifice of American production, and the international industrialists who

wish to manufacture in foreign cheap-labor markets and sell with as little interference as possible in our markets. That these financiers and industrialists are killing the goose that laid their golden eggs does not affect their short-sighted attitude, or that of merchandisers who want the opportunity to buy cheap foreign goods regardless of the fact that they thus destroy the purchasing power of their customers in the United States.

We seem to be up against the problem of whether our tariffs shall be adjusted to suit home needs or foreign demands. Foreign nations with sky-high tariffs and 47 varieties of interfering with our exports to these countries are inspiring an outcry to the effect that if we look out for ourselves they will cut our throat. They are now, and always have been, doing a pretty good job of looking out for themselves, and presumably they will continue to do this whatever our tariff rates. The first job of our Government is to look out for our own people, and sometimes that job seems to be somewhat neglected.

Presumably the fact that Henry Ford has removed his tractor production to Ireland, where he is paying half the Detroit wage scale, and that the General Motors has made a tie-up with the German motor industry, where wages are less than 40 per cent those paid in the United States, may account for the enthusiasm of the officials of these two companies for low tariff or no tariff on the ground that protection creates unemployment.

I also call attention to a headline in the Hastings Daily Tribune, a paper of wide circulation published at Hastings, Nebr., which refers to the recent primary election in Iowa. It reads:

Iowa vote for DICKINSON approves tariff.

The editors in Nebraska, strictly an agricultural district, are possessed of as much common sense and intelligence as the editors of any other newspapers. They were in close touch with the condition of agriculture.

I represent a district that is absolutely and strictly agricultural, and I hear few complaints, but many commendations, from the farmers in that section of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG].

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if those of us who believe in a tariff for the protection of American agriculture, American labor, and American industry, and will so vote to-day, in accordance with the pledge of our party platform, are entirely satisfied with the bill, because each group of us representing different industries would like to have high rates for ourselves; but I do believe this is the best tariff bill this country has ever had, and especially it is best for agriculture. [Applause.] The rates for agriculture in this bill are the highest rates we have ever had in the history of the Nation, and I will be very proud to have an opportunity to vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I can not agree with my friend from Kansas [Mr. STRONG], who said he thought this was a good bill for agriculture. In my judgment it is against the interest of agriculture; it is against the interest of labor, and will be detrimental to a large percentage of the business men of this country and I can not support it. [Applause.]

After almost a year and a half of hearings and debates the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill is brought on the floor of the House for final passage.

What a different law it will be from what the people of the country had a right to expect after listening to the promises made by the Republican candidate for President and other Republican speakers during the last campaign, or even after the President sent his message to Congress on April 16, 1929.

In his message to Congress he said he was in favor of an effective tariff on agricultural products that would compensate the farmers' higher standards of living, and that he was in favor of some limited changes in other tariff schedules where economic changes have taken place and where new industries have come into being since the last tariff law was enacted. With these promises made and accepted in good faith by the American people they had a right to expect that they would be fulfilled, but by the passage of this bill, the way it has been written, about everything else has been done except to carry out this pledge.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is no wonder that the farm organizations of the country have protested against the passage of this bill; that the economists are alarmed at the economic effect it will have on the country; and that some of our leading business men have vigorously protested against its passage.

The leading economists of the country—1,028 of them in number, coming as they do from 179 of the leading colleges of the country; also from some of our largest banks and most important industries—set out 12 points as to why the so-called "Grundy billion-dollar monstrosity tariff law" should never be passed by this Congress.

They are as follows:

First. It will increase the general cost of living.

Second. It will subsidize industrial waste and inefficiency.

Third. It will inflate profits of the few at the expense of the many.

Fourth. It will hit city workers hardest.

Fifth. It will rob the farmers it is supposed to enrich.

Sixth. It will cripple manufacturers through raw material rates.

Seventh. It will lower the buying power of our foreign customers.

Eighth. It will provoke foreign retaliation against our exports.

Ninth. It will violate the resolution of the world economic conference.

Tenth. It will jeopardize payments from our foreign investments and debts.

Eleventh. It will increase unemployment.

Twelfth. It will poison world peace.

The economists have been heard from. They realize in advance what the passage of this bill will mean to the American people. The people themselves will be heard from later on, and in my opinion, when they realize what has been done to them by the passage of this bill the protest of the economists will fade into insignificance when we hear the protests made by the people themselves at the polls next November.

The farm organizations have protested against the passage of this bill because it does not carry out the pledge that was made to them in the last campaign. They were promised that agriculture would be placed on a basis of equality with industry, but the rates in this bill fall far short of placing agriculture on a basis of equality with industry. They state that the President advocated only a limited revision of the industrial schedule and that it is astonishing to them that industry that is already highly protected should demand and be granted still higher rates in connection with a revision of the tariff, undertaken primarily to give agriculture parity with the other groups composing our industrial system.

Our farmers now realize that they have been at a disadvantage, as compared with industry under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law, and, those that have studied this bill, find that four times as many increases in rates will be granted to industry as to agriculture, and, that the disparity will be greater under this law than it was under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law.

Our farmers are beginning to realize that while industrial tariffs are usually 100 per cent effective and operates to raise the farmers' costs, farm products are not advanced in accordance with the tariff placed on them, as we export our surplus crops, and until the tariff is made effective on our surplus crops the farmers will receive very little benefit from the tariff. For this reason a number of our leading farmers and farm organizations demanded that the debenture amendment placed on the tariff bill in the Senate be left in the bill, for in reality it is only through a plan of this kind that the farmers can expect to make tariff effective on their surplus crop.

The President has had very little to say about the tariff bill, but when it came to placing something that would really help the farmers of the country in the tariff bill, or, in other words, when the debenture amendment was placed on it in the Senate, a protest from the President was received at once, and the farmers were told that the so-called "placing agriculture on a basis of equality with industry" was not to be granted under this tariff bill, and, in my opinion, will never be granted under this administration.

When I hear our Republican friends talking about passing a tariff law that will be helpful to our farmers I am reminded of the story told about the old bullfrog hunter who made a living catching bullfrogs. The story goes that one evening he told his friends that he had that day caught the biggest bullfrog in the world. He said it weighed by actual weight 102 pounds. Some of his friends insisted on weighing the frog. They discovered when they weighed it that it actually weighed 2 pounds and that the rest was bull; and, my friends, in my opinion, that is about what this tariff bill or any other tariff bill passed under a Republican administration will mean to our farmers. Men selected to take care of the big interests of this country can not at the same time help pass legislation that will be helpful to our farmers. This was to be a tariff bill that would put agriculture on a basis of equality with industry; instead of doing what it was supposed to do, agriculture will fare worse than it did under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law. You can not serve God and mammon at the same time. It can not be done.

A large number of our leading business men are against this tariff bill because it will advance their raw material rates, lower the buying power of their foreign customers, and cause foreign countries to retaliate against importing American-made goods.

Some of our leading business men have made strong protest against this tariff bill because they realize it is not in the interest of a number of our large employers of labor and that it is bound to increase unemployment.

At the present time there are 36 nations of the world protesting against this tariff bill, and they are threatening to put into effect reprisal tariffs, which they have a perfect right to do. The following are the names of some of the nations that have officially protested to our State Department:

Austria; Belgium; Czechoslovakia Republic; Denmark; Dominican Republic; France; Great Britain; Australia; Bahamas, Bermuda, India, Scotland, West Indian Colonies; Greece; Guatemala; Honduras; Irish Free State; Italy; Japan; Mexico; the Netherlands; Norway; Paraguay; Persia; Rumania; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; Turkey; Uruguay; Union of South Africa; Germany; Canada; Egypt; Finland; and Hungary.

Australia has already ordered that the importation of certain commodities be prohibited altogether, and that the tariff rate on certain other commodities be increased 50 per cent.

The following list of commodities will be prohibited in Australia:

Acetic acid.
Adhesives, prepared.
Aluminum ware, other than spoons and forks.
Batteries, including dry cells and accumulators.
Beams, iron and steel.
Blankets and blanketing, except printers' rugs.
Blue, laundry.
Biscuits.
Bolts, rivets and nuts.
Butter, peanut.
Candles.
Cements, Portland cement.
Channels.
Cheese.
Clay.
Columns.
Confectionery.
Cultivator, except hand-worked cultivators.
Custard powders.
Cutters, chaff.
Drills (fertilizer, seed, and grain).
Eggs in shell or otherwise.
Electric appliances, cooking and heating.
Flour, corn.
Fruits, dried, excepting dates and figs.
Fruits, preserved in liquid.
Furs and other skins, partly or wholly made into apparel or other articles.
Gas appliances, cooking and heating.
Gears, horse.
Gelatine, all kinds.
Girders.
Glucose.
Glass, opal sheet.
Glue.
Harrows.
Harvesters, including stripper harvesters.
Irons, electric smoothing.
Iron and steel, trough and bridge.
Jams and jellies.
Jelly crystals and powders.
Joists.
Kerosene, appliances, cooking and heating.
Lard and edible fats.
Lemons.
Meats preserved in tins and other air-tight containers.
Milk in dried or powdered form.
Milk, malted, prepared in coconuts.
Nuts, bolts, and rivets.
Onions.
Oranges.
Phones, wireless head.
Pickles.
Pipes, cast iron.
Pipe fittings, cast iron.
Plated ware, other than spoons and forks.
Plow, stump, jump.
Pork preserved by cold process.
Rail dogs and spikes.
Rakes, horse-drawn hay.
Reapers.
Rivets.
Sanitary and lavatory articles of earthenware and glazed or enameled fire clay.
Sauces and chutney.
Scarifiers, agricultural.
Screws, engineers' set.
Seed, canary.
Shafting, other than flexible.
Soap and soap substitutes.
Spikes.
Starch and starch flour.
Tiles for bath and sinks.
Threshers.
Vegetables salted or preserved in liquid or partly preserved or pulped.
Vinegar.
Wire, barbed, wire and other nails.
Wireless receiving sets, partly or wholly assembled.

On the following list of commodities the duty in Australia will be increased 50 per cent.

Albums.
Almanacs.
Artificial flowers, fruits, plants, leaves, and grains of all kinds and materials.
Bags (traveling and sporting bags and leather cases).
Bamboo.
Bamboo, rules.
Baskets.
Belting, leather, rubber, canvas, and composition belting and green hide for belting, and other purposes.
Boats.
Boots, leather.
Boots, rubber.
Boxes.
Boxes, jewelery and similar articles.
Boxes, snuff.
Boxes, tobacco wholly or partly of gold or silver, except gold and similar articles.
Brooms.
Brooms, whisk.
Brushes: Cloth brushes, hair brushes, paint brushes, nail and other brushes, rubbing brushes, tooth brushes, and varnish brushes.
Calsomine water paints and distempers, in powder form.
Cameras and magic or optical lanterns.
Caps, paper.
Cartridges.
Cinematographs not otherwise specified, including arc lamps.
Cordage, rope and twine.
Dressings.
Dressings, blacking and polishes for boots, shoes, and other articles of attire.
Dryers, liquid.
Enamels and enamel paints and glosses.
Envelopes, straw.
Fancy goods: Cardcases, cigar and cigarette cases, hatpins, holders, purses, and match boxes.
Fancy goods, including snuff and tobacco boxes, wholly or partly of gold or silver, except gold or silver-plated and rolled gold, and similar articles.
Tubes.
Firearms.
Footwear: Clogs, boots, leather boots, rubber boots, rubber sand boots, galoshes, pattens and other footwear (of any material) not otherwise specified, including uppers, tops, and soles; plimsolls, shoes, slippers.
Games and articles for outdoor and indoor sporting games, including toys.
Glassware not otherwise specified.
Gold size and liquid stain for wood.
Goods, piece for the manufacture of apparel, knitted in tubular form or otherwise, of cotton, silk, or containing silk, of artificial silk or containing artificial silk, or being an admixture of wool with other fibers.
Gramophones, phonographs, and other talking machines and records therefor.
Greases and tallow, including axle grease and unrefined tallow putty.
Harness, leather.
Inks.
Ink, reducer, printers'.
Jelly, petroleum and toilet preparations (perfumed or toilet) not otherwise specified, spirituous or not.

Jewelry: Precious stones, unset, including pearls; jewelry and imitation jewelry; jewelry boxes and similar articles.

Knotting, patent.

Lacquers: Japans, Berlin, Brunswick.

Lead: White, dry, or ground in oil.

Leather manufactures, including harness; leather, rubber, canvas and composition belting and green hide for belting and other purposes; razor strops; saddles, buggy whips.

Liquids: Bronze and metal liquids, petrifying liquids, stain for wood and gold size liquid, sizes, liquid.

Matches and vestas of all kinds.

Mops.

Oils: Furniture oils, oil stains and varnish, oil and wood finish, sheep-marking oils.

Paper: Manufacturers of paper or partly manufactured paper, including frames or not frames, having advertisement thereon including price list; almanacs, billheads and other printed and ruled forms, catalogues, circulars and pictures for calendars, diaries, directories, paper containers; patty pans, paper; patterns, paper; posters; tickets, printed; wrapping paper printed.

Paints: Calsomine water paints and distempers in powder form, paints and colors ground in liquid and prepared for use, stains.

Parasols, sunshades, and umbrellas.

Pastes for leather.

Patent knotting.

Perfumes, artificial (synthetic) concentrated form, including synthetic essential oils and mixtures of synthetic and natural essential oils, nonspirituous.

Petrifying liquids.

Phonographs and other talking machines and records thereof.

Photograph frames and stands.

Pianos, player, grand, upright.

Polishes: Polishes for leather; polishes and dressing blacking for boots, shoes, and other articles of attire; floor polishes, knife, metal and stove polishes.

Refrigerators and parts of refrigerators.

Rope.

Rubber goods: Pneumatic rubber tires and tubes therefor.

Stationery, including bill files: Albums, bookmarkers, cards and booklets, Christmas cards and similar kinds, memorandum slates and tablets and menus.

Stationery, including bill files; sealing and bottling wax; paper knives, paper binders, and penracks; straw envelopes; tablets; writing cases; stoving blacks and substitutes therefor; sizes, gold, and liquid stain for wood; sizes, liquid.

Tallow and unrefined tallow putty.

Terebin.

Trunks.

Twine, rope, and cordage.

Umbrellas, parasols, and sunshades.

Varnishes.

Varnish and oil stains.

Varnish, lithographic.

Wicker, bamboo and cane, not otherwise specified, including bamboo rules, all articles of wood not otherwise specified, and mostly furniture.

Wrappings, paper, of all colors (glazed, unglazed, or mill glazed) brown, caps, sulphites, and sugars and all other bag papers, paper felt, and paper bags, not otherwise specified strawboard, corrugated; and others.

Yachts not otherwise specified, launches, and boats.

For the information of the Members of the House I wish to state that this list of commodities was furnished to me at my request by C. J. Hopkins, manager of the foreign department of the Crosley Radio Corporation, of Cincinnati, Ohio, They, like a number of other large corporations, are very much interested in seeing that nothing is done to hurt our export trade.

What Australia has already done other countries may do in the near future, and when we stop to consider that our exports have decreased over $400,000,000 the first five months of this year, while the total of our foreign commerce dwindled more than $700,000,000 under the total of the same five months of last year, we can realize why some of our large business men are very much worried about the effects of this tariff bill if passed.

To-day we have over 5,000,000 men out of employment and between five and six million men that are working only part time. Cut off our export business and the number of unemployed is bound to increase.

It is estimated that we have 2,000,000 men in this country producing goods for export and another million men earning their living in the manufacture of raw materials which we import in exchange for our exports. Our population has increased 10 per cent in the last eight years and our production has increased approximately 30 per cent. Our higher standards of living have absorbed some of this increased production, but most of it must find an export market. Cut off this market and we will have more unemployment, a lower standard of wages, and not only the manufacturers and labor will be effected but likewise every business man and farmer in the country.

Much has been said about this being a "billion dollar tariff bill." When we speak about a billion dollars there are very few of us that can even realize what it means, so in order that we may more thoroughly understand what it means let us take up a few of the items in the bill and see just what the increase in tariff really means.

First we will take the cement tariff, which is placed at 6 cents per hundred pounds, and affects every taxpayer in the country.

We find the imports, 1927, 1.18 per cent; 1928, 1.30 per cent; 1929, 1.01 per cent. So the imports do not affect us to any degree and are not on the increase.

The State highway systems built 5,908 miles; the county highway systems built 1,145 miles of concrete road in 1928, and if the same amount of road is built as was built in 1928, average 20 feet wide, 7 inches thick, under the new tariff schedules the extra costs will be as follows in the different States:

Additional costs of highway systems under H. R. 2667

State	Miles	6-cent rate
Alabama	136	$104,713.29
Arizona	1	769.95
Arkansas	50	38,497.50
California	182	140,130.90
Colorado	61	46,966.95
Connecticut	73	56,206.35
Delaware	41	30,567.95
Florida	28	21,558.60
Georgia	111	85,464.45
Idaho	5	3,849.75
Illinois	1,138	876,203.10
Indiana	392	301,820.40
Iowa	748	575,922.60
Kansas	97	74,685.15
Kentucky	60	46,197.00
Louisiana	14	10,779.30
Maine	12	9,239.40
Maryland	111	85,464.45
Massachusetts	20	15,399.00
Michigan	523	402,683.85
Minnesota	111	85,464.45
Mississippi	100	76,995.00
Missouri	144	110,872.80
Montana	4	3,079.80
Nebraska	5	3,849.75
New Hampshire	31	30,868.45
New Jersey	190	146,290.50
New Mexico	1	769.95
New York	705	542,814.75
North Carolina	313	241,094.35
Ohio	247	190,177.65
Oklahoma	118	90,854.10
Pennsylvania	58	44,657.10
Rhode Island	14	10,779.30
South Carolina	197	151,680.15
South Dakota	6	4,619.70
Tennessee	82	63,175.90
Texas	431	331,484.45
Utah	12	9,239.40
Vermont	52	40,037.40
Virginia	76	58,516.20
Washington	49	40,037.40
West Virginia	78	60,054.10
Wisconsin	226	174,008.70
Wyoming		

The extra costs per mile under the new tariff law are as follows:

Tariff rate at 6 cents, 6 inches thick, 16 feet wide	$528.07
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 6 inches thick, 18 feet wide	594.00
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 6 inches thick, 20 feet wide	659.92
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 7 inches thick, 16 feet wide	616.05
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 7 inches thick, 18 feet wide	693.00
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 7 inches thick, 20 feet wide	769.95
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 8 inches thick, 16 feet wide	704.02
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 8 inches thick, 18 feet wide	797.00
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 8 inches thick, 20 feet wide	879.97
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 9 inches thick, 16 feet wide	792.00
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 9 inches thick, 18 feet wide	891.00
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 9 inches thick, 20 feet wide	990.00
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 10 inches thick, 16 feet wide	879.97
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 10 inches thick, 18 feet wide	990.00
Tariff rate at 6 cents, 10 inches thick, 20 feet wide	1,100.02

Average road 20 feet wide, 7 inches thick, extra cost per mile, 6-cent tariff, $769.95.

A barrel of cement weighs 376 pounds. With a tariff of 6 cents per hundred pounds, the increased cost will be $0.2256 per barrel.

The total increase tariff on account of the tariff on cement is estimated as $60,000,000.

A few of the other increases in tariff under this law are as follows:

The woolen schedule alone is expected to cost $300,000,000 on clothes and wearing apparel.

Hides, leather, boots and shoes approximately $250,000,000.

Lumber, $50,000,000; brick, $15,000,000; tiling, $25,000,000; sugar, $32,000,000; in addition to the $216,000,000 that was paid under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law.

The following table shows how the family budget will be affected by the passage of this bill with the tariff increased on practically every article that has to be bought by the average family:

Cost of family budget under specified acts

	Hawley-Smoot bill of 1930	Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922	Underwood Act of 1913
Shoes (hides, 10 per cent; leather, 15 per cent).	20 per cent	Free	Free.
Wool (raw)	34 cents per pound	31 cents per pound	Do.
Wool rags	18 cents per pound	7½ cents per pound	Do.
Wool shoddy	24 cents per pound	16 cents per pound	Do.
Wool yarn	40 cents per pound	36 cents per pound	18 cents per pound.
Worsted and woolen cloth	50 cents per pound, plus 50 per cent.	24 cents per pound, plus 40 per cent.	35 per cent.
Wool hosiery	do	45 cents per pound. plus 50 per cent.	Do.
Wool gloves and mittens	40 cents per pound, plus 35 per cent.	36 cents per pound, plus 50 per cent	Do.
Wool underwear	50 cents per pound, plus 50 per cent.	45 cents per pound, plus 50 per cent.	Do.
Wool hats (including felts)	33 cents per pound, plus 50 per cent.	24 cents per pound, plus 40 per cent.	Do.
Wool clothing and wearing apparel.	66.29 per cent	56.40 per cent	Do.
Cotton cloth, bleached	39.73 per cent	31.12 per cent	25.59 per cent.
Cotton cloth, unbleached	35.58 per cent	27.90 per cent	22.27 per cent.
Cotton cloth, printed, dyed.	29.82 per cent	26.99 per cent	17.97 per cent.
Silk wearing apparel	65 per cent	60 per cent	45 per cent.
Hose, embroidered	90 per cent	75 per cent	60 per cent.
Silk velvet	65 per cent	60 per cent	50 per cent.
Handkerchiefs and other embroideries of wool, cotton, silk, and flax.	90 per cent	75 per cent	60 per cent.
Silk ribbon, figured	65 per cent	55 per cent	45 per cent.
Linen handkerchiefs	52.91 per cent	45 per cent	40 per cent.
Novelty jewelry, not gold or platinum.	110 per cent	80 per cent	60 per cent.
Leather handbags and other leather cases.	35 per cent	30 per cent	30 per cent.
Hats, straw	$3.56 per dozen, plus 50 per cent.	50 per cent, plus 25 per cent.	Do.
Shoe laces	15 per cent	Free	Free.
Agate buttons	358.11 per cent	15 per cent	15 per cent.
Wool blankets (not over 50 cents per pound).	37.27 per cent	61.65 per cent	25 per cent.
Wool tapestries and upholstering cloths.	80.90 per cent	68.81 per cent	35.28 per cent.
Wilton rugs	45 per cent	40 per cent	35 per cent.
Rayon fabrics	45 cents per pound plus 60 per cent.	Noncomparable	
Rayon wearing apparel	40 cents per pound, plus 65 per cent.	Noncomparable	
Linen table damask	45 per cent	40 per cent	35 per cent.
Cotton handkerchiefs	50.69 per cent	42.35 per cent	Do.
Cotton tapestries and upholsteries.	55 per cent	45 per cent	Do.
Cotton blankets, plain	53.09 per cent	25 per cent	25 per cent.
Velveteen	62 per cent	50 per cent	40 per cent.
Oilcloth	30 per cent	27.87 per cent	25 per cent.
Inlaid linoleum	42 per cent	35 per cent	35 per cent.
Silver-plated hollow ware	50 per cent	40 per cent	40 per cent.
Sterling silver tableware	65 per cent	60 per cent	50 per cent.
Gold-plated articles	do	do	Do.
Plain china and porcelain	76.76 per cent	do	Do.
Decorated china and porcelain.	81.05 per cent	70 per cent	55 per cent.
Glass tableware, blown	60 per cent	55 per cent	45 per cent.
Plain household crockery	62.25 per cent	45 per cent	35 per cent.
House or cabinet furniture	47.50 per cent	33⅓ per cent	15 per cent.
Mats of rattan or cocoa fiber.	8 cents per square foot.	6 cents per square foot.	3 cents per square foot.
Bamboo and straw baskets	50 per cent	35 per cent	25 per cent.
Papier-mâché and palm leaf.	do	do	Do.
Christmas-tree ornaments	60 per cent	55 per cent	45 per cent.
Manufacturers of india rubber known as hard rubber.	2 cents each, plus 35 per cent.	35 per cent	25 per cent.
Brooms	25 per cent	15 per cent	15 per cent.
Toothbrushes	72.54 per cent	45 per cent	35 per cent.
Sponges (general tariff)	25 per cent	15 per cent	10 per cent.
Clothespins (spring)	20 cents per gross	15 cents per gross	15 per cent.
Starches	60.45 per cent	43.99 per cent	24.96 per cent.
Matches, in boxes of 100	12 cents per gross of boxes.	8 cents per gross of boxes.	3 cents per gross of boxes.

A study of the following tables will show that this tariff bill will be of very little help to the farmers and no help whatever to the growers of corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, hay, cotton, cottonseed, and other staple crops:

GROUP 1. FARM PRODUCTS WHICH RECEIVE NO BENEFIT FROM THE EXISTING TARIFF AND WILL NOT BE HELPED BY INCREASED DUTIES

Commodity	Total farm value of production, 1928 (000 omitted)	Imports (000 omitted)	Exports (000 omitted)	Approximate ad valorem equivalents of duties		Increased benefit to farmers
				1922	1930	
				Per cent	*Per cent*	
Corn	$2,341,462	$628	$28,527	14	23	None.[1]
Wheat, other than high protein	666,554	(2)	193,743	33	33	Do.[1]
Oats	597,480	372	10,510	21	22	Do.[1]
Barley	204,751	174	48,445	16	16	Do.[1]
Rye	36,002	2	17,567	13	13	Do.[1]
Total grains	3,846,249	1,176	298,792			Do.
Hay	1,182,960	564	303	44	62	Do.
Cotton, short staple	1,224,502	28,620	798,552	Free.	Free.	Do.
Cottonseed	227,895	15	12,913	24	24	Do.[1]
Hogs and pork products	1,387,122	3,683	154,753	5	12	Do.[1]
Sheep, lambs, and mutton	197,406	698	298	23	40	Do.[1]
Horses and mules	52,204	701	3,617	21	21	Do.
Poultry	444,208	3,473	920	25	29	Do.[1]
Eggs	746,285	5,533	6,222	35	43	Do.[1]
Sweetpotatoes	72,680	(3)	(3)			Do.
Tobacco, other than wrapper and filler.	238,550	25,219	153,556	63	63	Do.
Apples	200,582	212	26,663	14	14	Do.
Peaches	63,649	15	730	11	11	Do.
Pears	24,167	(3)	4,143	11	11	None.
Oranges	142,285	111	13,912	16	16	Do.
Grapefruit	18,901	199	2,904	32	48	Do.
Total, other than grain	6,223,396	69,048	1,179,486			
Total, Group 1	10,069,645	70,224	1,478,278			

GROUP 2. FARM PRODUCTS ON WHICH INCREASED BENEFITS FROM SMOOT-HAWLEY TARIFF BILL ARE DOUBTFUL OR NEGLIGIBLE

Buckwheat	$11,794	$60	$169	6	14	Negligible.[1]
Rice	37,319	1,214	13,235	39	49	Do.
Cotton, long staple	[4] 76,000	14,178	123,296	Free.	24	Doubtful.[1]
Farm gardens	[4] 303,000	(3)	(3)			Negligible.
Cheese, American	[4] 83,812	17,118	798	25	40	Do.[1]
Truck crops (summer)	[4] 275,000	(3)	(3)			Do.
Wheat, high protein	234,200	(2)	(3)	33	33	None.
Total, Group 2	1,021,125	32,570	137,498			

GROUP 3. FARM PRODUCTS ON WHICH THE TARIFF IS PARTIALLY EFFECTIVE AND WHICH WILL RECEIVE SOME INCREASED BENEFIT FROM SMOOT-HAWLEY TARIFF BILL

Peanuts	$39,213	$2,613	$523	72	121	[5] $7,600,000
Grapes	49,601	318	2,505	11	11	None.
Potatoes, white	293,679	3,231	2,253	35	53	[6] 9,260,000
Beans, dry	73,815	5,640	1,177	38	66	[7] 8,000,000
Cattle and beef products	1,137,176	27,531	5,866	20	36	[8] 90,000,000
Milk and cream	[9] 1,032,639	7,771	15,836	13	35	(10)
Butter	[9] 228,139	1,562	1,861	33	39	[10] None.
Cheese, Swiss	[4] 7,250	5,649	(3)	38	40	[1] 155,000
Greenhouse products	76,839	(3)	(3)			Very small.
Onions	22,574	2,663	822	47	118	[11] 7,000,000
Total, Group 3	2,960,925	56,978	30,843			122,005,000

[1] Findings of group of economists at University of Wisconsin, headed by Prof. John R. Commons, as reported to Rawleigh Tariff Bureau in study of agricultural tariffs.

[2] Imports of wheat, for domestic grinding $208,000; for export, $22,908,000. Not segregated by varieties, but most imports are high protein.

[3] Import and export data not segregated.

[4] Estimated.

[5] Estimate based upon findings of University of Wisconsin economists that peanut duty is about 50 per cent effective.

[6] Estimate based upon study of relation of production to price of potatoes, Department of Agriculture Yearbook, 1930 (p. 589), indicating that exclusion of all imports will not increase price above level more than 2 cents per bushel.

[7] Estimate based upon study of relation between prices of beans and production, indicating that exclusion of net imports of about 2,000,000 bushels will increase price approximately 50 cents a bushel.

[8] Increased benefit computed on finding of University of Wisconsin group that higher duties on cattle and beef will increase price to farmers not more than 1 cent per pound. This is confirmed by analysis of study of relation of beef prices and production of Department of Agriculture Yearbook, 1930 (p. 590), indicating that exclusion of all imports would raise beef prices on the farm not more than two-thirds of 1 cent per pound.

[9] Figures for value of milk, cream, and butter produced on farms are for 1924.

[10] University of Wisconsin group found that increased duty on milk and cream will affect prices only in New York and New England, but held that it was impossible to estimate amount of increased benefit to farmers. They found definitely that the present tariff on butter is only partially effective, that its benefits are decreasing because of increasing domestic production, and that a higher tariff will not help farmers.

[11] Estimate based upon study of relation of domestic prices to supply of onions, indicating that exclusion of net imports will increase price approximately 30 cents a bushel.

GROUP 4. FARM PRODUCTS ON WHICH TARIFF IS FULLY EFFECTIVE AND WHICH ARE EXPECTED TO RECEIVE FULL BENEFIT OF INCREASED DUTIES

Commodity	Total farm value of production, 1928 (000 omitted)	Imports (000 omitted)	Exports (000 omitted)	Approximate ad valorem equivalents of duties		Increased benefit to farmers
				1922	1930	
				Per cent	*Per cent*	
Flaxseed	$37,316	$31,245	$8	23	37	[1] $5,163,000
Sugar beets	50,960	22	8,548	73	82	[1] 6,200,000
Sugarcane	24,669	159,240				
Lemons	22,720	2,190	1,430	64	80	[12] 3,620,000
Wool	109,209	39,432	180	43	47	[1] 4,000,000
Tobacco:						
Wrapper	9,262	13,050	574	97	105	750,000
Filler and binder	27,137	19,843		40	40	None.
Olive oil	250	15,348	None.	39	45	15,000
Soybean oil	840	777	756	41	57	136,000
Winter vegetables (estimated)	25,000	1,971	(3)			[13] 6,000,000
Cherries, sulphured and in brine	2,500	1,561	None.	21	67	1,150,000
Dates	63	2,312	(3)	20	20	None.
Dried figs	418	2,305	None.	27	66	345,000
Fresh pineapples	15	1,847	146	12	21	3,000
Mushrooms	[4] 15,000	1,970	None.	45	66	[14] 3,000,000
Almonds	4,760	6,417	(3)	39	46	330,000
Walnuts	11,160	6,321	(3)	44	55	1,225,000
Tomatoes (for table use)	27,480	3,837	(3)	16	94	[15] 10,000,000
Total, Group 4	368,759	309,688	11,642			41,937,000

[1] Findings of group of economists at University of Wisconsin, headed by Prof. John R. Commons, as reported to Rawleigh Tariff Bureau in study of agricultural tariffs.

[3] Import and export data not segregated.

[4] Estimated.

[12] Benefit calculated on assumption tariff on lemons is fully effective. It is almost certainly excessive.

[13] Estimate based on assumption that exclusion of winter vegetables will increase price about 25 per cent.

[14] Rough estimate based on best available data. Practically all benefit will go to small number of producers in eastern Pennsylvania.

[15] Benefits will be limited to producers of winter tomatoes, the exact value of which are not reported. The estimate shown is based on the best available information.

The above schedule shows that the only farmers that will be benefited to amount to anything by this bill are the cattle raisers and they are protesting against the passage of this bill as has been shown by statements printed in the RECORD, made by the officers of the American National Live Stock Association and others, as the increased rates on other commodities will more than counteract the increase granted them.

The tables plainly show that this tariff bill, when it becomes a law, will be against the interest of our average farmers and that it will not only increase the living costs of the farmers themselves but every householder in America.

The promises made to the farmers are still unfulfilled. The bill we are asked to vote for, in my opinion, is one of the most selfish, unfair, and indefensible tariff bills that has ever been considered by any American Congress and its passage means further depression in business, increased unemployment, and is against the interest of the farmer that it was supposed to help.

THE FLEXIBLE CLAUSE

The flexible clause in the present tariff law and in this bill which gives the President the right to raise or lower the tariff rates as it suits his whim or interest to do so is a dangerous one. Authorizing the President with the power to declare prosperity for his friends or those who have furnished his party with large campaign contributions was never intended by the founders of this Government. The power to tax and regulate tariff was delegated to their Representatives in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, selected as they are from every section of the Nation by the people themselves.

As has been said by some one:

> This bold effort of the Republicans to give the President the power of life and death over every community in America is but a part of the vast scheme to take power from the hands of the people and their representatives, and concentrate it in the hands of one man selected by a political party.

I do not believe the people of this country will stand for placing this power in the hands of any President. A power that enables him to injure one section of the country for the advantage of another section, or the power to destroy one kind of business for the advantage of another should never be granted to any one man. The power to tax belongs to the people themselves and they should never be robbed of this sacred privilege. Personally, I feel that they will repudiate this act when they understand what it really means.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, in a short time we are going to be called upon to vote on the tariff bill. Are we going to vote against the interest of our farmers, laboring men, and business men who are protesting against the passage of this bill; are we going to vote to continue the financial depression or Republican panic that is upon us at the present time by causing foreign countries to retaliate against importing American-made goods, if this bill is passed? I for one am not. A vote for this bill is against the interests of our farmers, for it will take $10 out of their pockets for every one it puts in. It is against the interest of our laboring men, for it will increase the cost of living and, in my opinion, will not give any additional employment to American labor. It is against our merchant marine, for it is bound to cut off our foreign trade and create a feeling of hatred and prejudice against us among the people of foreign nations. And it continues the flexible clause, which gives the President the right to raise or lower the tariff rates, which was never intended by the founders of this Government, and, in my opinion, is against the interest of the people in this country.

A vote for this bill, with our farmers, laboring men, and business men protesting against it, can not be justified; therefore I feel the so-called Grundy monstrosity, as it has been properly named, should never pass. [Applause.]

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER]. [Applause.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] is quite willing to entirely set aside the Republican achievements over a period of nearly nine years and call our attention to the temporary slump we have been in during the last five or six months. I suppose the gentleman has been doing some crystal gazing, as he did before when he made a speech in 1922, and he and the rest of the Democrats have painted a word picture of gloom and sadness as they did when they extended their remarks in the RECORD at that time. None of their doleful predictions, however, came true.

Mr. Speaker, demagoguery and untruth, scandalous untruth, have been rampant ever since this bill passed the House of Representatives. [Applause.] Ever since that date editors, newspaper men, columnists, magazine writers, Democrats, and internationalists have all tumbled over themselves in their anxiety to see how much tirade and abuse they could heap upon this bill. It is estimated that some 10,000,000 words have been used in the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol and in this House in abuse of the tariff bill. Here in Washington the Washington Post has been the exception and has defended the tariff bill consistently and persistently.

The Democrats, of course, ran absolutely true to form, and after their earnest and ardent protestations in behalf of protective tariff as outlined in their platform in 1928, when it came to action they were found short in the market. They are short on action but they are very long on promises. They promised the people of this country that business had nothing to fear if they were elected, for they had embraced the protective tariff faith. The necromancer, the prestidigitator, Mr. Raskob, by one touch of the telegraph key, claimed that he had transformed the Democratic congressional candidates into a group of protectionists and tried to sell them to the public with Al Smith as Exhibit A. But, of course, the folks at home did not quite get Mr. Raskob's point, and their common sense and good judgment resulted in the election of Mr. Hoover and a Republican Congress. [Applause.]

It will take more than one Raskob to make a protectionist party out of the Democrats. [Applause and laughter.] Just as soon as it came time for action on the tariff bill the Democrats on this side of the House, with the exception of a very few sterling Democrats who have faith in the policy of protection, some of the gentlemen from Louisiana, and my friend HUDSPETH, from Texas, whom I honor in the position he has taken [applause], when it came time for action the Democrats ran and bellowed like a herd of Texas longhorns in a thunderstorm when Mr. Raskob and Mr. Shouse cracked the whip and told them where to head in.

Mr. COLLIER. Do not forget Florida.

Mr. CROWTHER. Somebody says, "Do not leave out Florida."

Of course, chivalry would dictate that I speak of Florida, because it has a lady Representative and three others who voted for this bill. To my loyal friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] and all other Democrats who were for the bill I give credit for having the courage of their convictions. [Applause.]

The revision in this bill is concerned with only some 30 per cent of its items so that it qualifies as a limited revision of the tariff. If increased rates will help agriculture, then this bill provides them.

My friend the gentleman from Georgia found a great deal of fault in one of his speeches on the tariff bill, my good friend Judge CRISP, and yet I do not suppose there is a State in the Union that has had more benefit from the protective tariff along agricultural lines than the gentleman's State of Georgia. I think his State has also benefited by action of the Tariff Commission, who sent a report to the President which resulted in a raise of the duty in peanuts, which are an important product in the gentleman's State.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. For a short question.

Mr. CRISP. Before the duty was raised, peanuts were selling for $90 a ton, while this year they are selling from $50 to $60 a ton.

Mr. CROWTHER. Why blame that condition on the tariff? The tariff is not written to control the markets. We do not contend that it controls or raises prices. There is a law of supply and demand that is inexorable in the determination of prices in the markets of the world. Some gentleman over here wants to know what they would have sold for without a tariff in competition with Chinese peanuts?

This bill provides protection for many of our basic industries, which are suffering because of European competition in articles manufactured at practically starvation wages, where the people, in comparison with our American workers, do not live but just exist.

We have had a great deal of trouble with the textile industry in this country and there are reasons for it other than tariff reasons. You remember that a few years ago the fair women of our country, our wives, sisters, and sweetheart, decided to cut 13½ inches off up here and 13½ inches off down here. That meant 27 inches, three-fourths of a yard wide. A skirt in which you can get on a trolley car without giving an exhibition ought to be 2 yards and a half around, presuming we have 50,000,000 women in the Nation, that meant 125,000,000 yards of textile that were no longer needed.

If you multiply that by four for suitings, cloakings, and various other textiles, those four different fabrics total 500,000,000 yards of textiles that were no longer needed. However, the styles have changed now and they are getting longer. You do not notice it much but they are presumed to be getting longer. [Laughter.] The price, however, is no shorter than it was when they were shorter.

Mr. Speaker, the tanning industry and the pottery industry have been particularly hard hit during the last few years. In 1929 more than 60,000,000 square feet of calf and kip leather was imported into the United States and not 1 cent of duty was paid at the customhouse. Many tanners have been compelled to close their shops and discharge their employees.

The pottery industry is in competition with nearly every civilized country in the world. They all have a share in our American market. Imports are growing by leaps and bounds and as a result a vast number of our potteries are either closed or are running part time.

This bill gives relief to both these industries, and we hope to see beneficial results in a short time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the columnists, the newspaper reporters, magazine writers, and others who commented critically on the bill we had two tariff bureaus, the H. E. Miles free-trade league, called the Fair Tariff League, but if properly named it would be the Free Trade League, and they supplied the body at the other end of the Capitol with a great flood of figures as to what the cost of this bill would be to the consumer; then in addition to that we had the Rawleigh Tariff Bureau, which supplied considerable misinformation to the Members and carried the pictures of some of our good Republican Members on their front pages, Members who were dissatisfied with the bill. I am not going to mention any names but I see one of the gentlemen in the room and he is smiling at me as I mention this.

The H. E. Miles free trade league and the Rawleigh Tariff Bureau, together with the People's Legislative Service, can now occupy their time in practicing addition for a little while, in imitation of one "Andy," who repeats $6,000,000, $8,000,000, and $10,000,000. Those figures do not mean much to Andy, and the figures which these pseudo-tariff experts have been giving as regards the cost of this tariff bill to the general public are just about as senseless and as ridiculous and without foundation in fact as are the monotonous mutterings of the president of the Fresh Air Taxicab Co. [Laughter and applause.]

Then we have heralded in the press that great triumvirate that have set their faces against this bill—Raskob (of the Du Ponts), John J.; Sloan, of General Motors, "the generalissimo"; and Mr. Ford, of Ireland and Detroit. [Laughter and applause.] They all attack the tariff bill and make dire prophecies as to its destruction of industry in the United States. I rejoice in the fact that these self-annointed guardians of the public welfare are in no position now, and never will be, to control the protective-tariff policy of the Republican Party. [Applause.] Let them stick to the automobile business, and with a good tariff bill our folks will be able to buy them. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, it is with a feeling of chagrin and regret rather than bitterness that I realize that many who enroll under the Republican banner have not in the past and will not now vote for this bill. However, I have no further quarrel with them. I leave to them the task of squaring this action with their own consciences and explaining it to their constituents. [Applause.]

After all, I want to say to the Members of the House it is a blessing that the folks at home, that we are so much concerned about, have a heap more sense than some Senators and Congressmen give them credit for. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Of course, we are all patriots, as I have realized in the 12 years I have been on this floor, but when the paramount interests of our districts intervene we usually vote for the majority benefit in those districts. The gentleman has made a study of this bill and I have not, so I want to ask him if there is not more protection on agricultural products, on livestock, and on hides in this bill than under the present law?

Mr. CROWTHER. Certainly.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am willing to give the gentleman a duty on his shoes, because hides are rotting in Texas to-day because they can not be sold. Are they not higher, I will ask the gentleman, than they are under the present law?

Mr. CROWTHER. Absolutely. The gentleman is correct. They have been on the free list, but now carry 10 per cent ad valorem. [Applause.] And I fought for that duty on hides and for the compensatory duty on leather and shoes with all the force I had at my command. My only regret is that it is not higher.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And the duty on wool, the duty on meats, the duty on every product of livestock is higher under this bill, and at Houston we declared for a competitive tariff.

Mr. CROWTHER. The gentleman from Texas is always right. [Applause.]

Now, we hear talk about reprisals. Let us take Canada as an instance. Canada is finding a great deal of fault. Canada found fault with our duty on leather. Canada holds a 17½ per cent ad valorem against us and against the world on sole leather and has had a free market in the United States for her leather ever since 1922, when leather was put on the free list. She carries 30 per cent on shoes against the world. We only contemplate carrying 12½ per cent on leather and 20 per cent on shoes. What right has Canada to complain and to suggest reprisals? [Applause.]

In 1897, in the Dingley bill, we carried 15 per cent on hides, we carried 25 per cent on shoes, and in 1909, we carried 15 per cent on shoes. Does any man remember when shoes were cheaper than during the period from 1897 to 1913? [Applause.] From 1913 up to this good hour, 17 years, shoes have been admitted free and the price has mounted day by day and year after year. How do you account for that? [Applause.]

There is a 22½ per cent duty on brick in Canada and we propose a duty of $1.25 a thousand. At $15 a thousand this would be 8½ per cent ad valorem. They carry 22½ per cent on paving and building brick against us and against the world. They complain about lumber. They carry a 25 per cent ad valorem on all finished lumber, paneled, tongued, or grooved. They carry 25 per cent ad valorem on all lumber that is in any way processed or perfected by labor.

They are finding fault with our agricultural rates. That is the trouble with them. These rates were made for the benefit of the farmers of the United States. We are not writing a tariff bill for Canada, we are writing it for the United States of America. [Applause.] We do not interfere with other nations when they amend their tariff acts.

May I once more call your attention to the splendid service of the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY]. [Applause.] He has been a tower of strength in the preparation of this bill, always courteous, always considerate, always kind and zealous in his efforts to grant each Member exact justice. The House membership is indebted to him for his patience, his courage, his fidelity, and his untiring energy.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, once this bill becomes a law business confidence will be immediately restored. We shall gradually work out of the temporary slump we have been in for the last few months, and once more prosperity will reign supreme. Foreign reprisals will vanish into thin air and we shall continue to raise the standard of American labor and American wages. We shall dissipate the dark clouds of your

gloomy prophesy with the sunshine of a continuing prosperity. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, to be a good politician one must have a good memory and adopt a reasonably consistent course. John J. Raskob, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, can not qualify by any such standards. In a telegram to Senator ROBINSON, minority leader, made public to-day through the publicity bureau of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Raskob takes issue with the flexible provisions of the pending tariff bill as they are now written. He deplores the fact that the flexible tariff provisions as provided by the Simmons-Norris amendment were not retained. He holds that their elimination has so greatly weakened the bill that all true Democrats should vote against it. He hinges his whole appeal to the Democratic Members of the Senate for a defeat of the bill upon the fact that the Simmons-Norris amendment has been eliminated.

The fundamental difference between the flexible provisions as now phrased in the pending bill and those of the Simmons-Norris amendment is that under the Simmons-Norris amendment the Congress, instead of the President, would have the power to revise tariff rates upon the basis of findings by the Tariff Commission. The outstanding and practically sole argument advanced by the coalition in support of the Simmons-Norris proviso was that Congress, under the Constitution, is the only body empowered with the duty of writing revenue measures. Great outcry was made by the Democratic Members against what they claimed was a proposal to take from the Congress the taxing power. The sole virtue attributed to the Simmons-Norris amendment by the Democratic supporters of that amendment was the claim that it left the taxing power of the Government where the Constitution provided, namely, in the Congress. It is the Simmons-Norris amendment that Mr. Raskob now eulogizes and calls upon the members of the party to vote against the tariff bill, inasmuch as that amendment has been eliminated.

Mr. Raskob has experienced a complete change of heart, or is unfortunately possessed of a short memory, when he takes such a position. He was not always in favor of leaving the taxing power in the hands of Congress. He has not always held such a high regard of the ability of the representative branch of the Government to fix tariff rates that were just and equitable. In the closing days of the 1928 campaign, we are told by a news story in the New York Times of October 31, 1928, that two delegations of business men called upon Mr. Raskob at his headquarters in New York City "by invitation." Mr. Raskob invited those delegations, according to the news stories of October 31, 1928, for the purpose of telling them that both he and the Democratic candidate for President, Governor Smith, were in favor of taking tariff revision completely from the control of Congress, except upon a two-thirds vote in both the Senate and the House, and placing such tariff revision wholly in the hands of a Tariff Commission. This Tariff Commission, according to the New York Times in its quotation of Mr. Raskob, "should be protected by the Federal Constitution against any encroachment upon its powers or by ripper legislation by Congress for its abolition or for curtailment of its functions." Mr. Raskob further stated, according to the New York Times, that, if this could not be done under the present Constitution, he was in favor of a constitutional amendment which would create such a Tariff Commission free from control of the Congress and with term of office upon the same basis as the term of office of the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Raskob further stated that he would have such a constitutional amendment provide that Congress could not initiate any tariff changes except upon a two-thirds vote of both the Senate and the House.

In other words, in 1928 for the purposes of reassuring, in the closing hours of the campaign, business men that they need not be afraid of the tariff policies of the Democratic Party, Mr. Raskob goes on record as being in favor of taking away from the Congress the right to initiate and write revenue measures, except upon a two-thirds vote, and would vest the taxing power of the Government in a permanent bureau composed of members appointed for life, wholly unresponsive to popular will and wholly without and beyond control of the legislative branch of our Government.

To-day Mr. Raskob is on record as finding fault with the pending tariff bill because it does not retain the Simmons-Norris amendment keeping all control of even the slightest changes in tariff rates wholly within the province of the legislative branch of the Government.

The plain truth about the matter is that Mr. Raskob knows nothing at all about the tariff, and a great deal less about the legislative functions of the American Government. He took his position in 1928 neither as a statesman nor an economist. He took his position in 1928 as a tyro politician, hoping during the last few days of the campaign to stop the drift of business interests to the Republican ticket and in his frantic endeavor to do so, he went on record in favor of an utterly impossible and preposterous proposition, and not only went on record in so far as he was concerned but, according to the story in the New York Times, he assured the business delegations that if Governor Smith were elected President he would use his influence as President to bring about just such a monstrosity as Mr. Raskob outlined. It was the last throw of desperate Democratic politicians to save a forlorn cause. To-day, Mr. Raskob, in a last throw to defeat a tariff measure, completely reverses his position of October, 1928, and denounces the bill because it does not do exactly what he in 1928 said that under no conditions should be done. [Applause.]

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH].

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is perhaps useless for us to have any further discussion in reference to tariff to-day. Everyone, I am satisfied, has his own convictions, but as the "baby" conferee, I felt it my duty to say a few words about the conferees, both on the Republican side and the Democratic side.

We have been together 17 months, part of the time in committee, part of the time in meetings in executive session, and part of the time here on the floor. In these 17 months there has never been really a very substantial difference except in our personal, conscientious views.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] deserves everything that has been said about him by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER], and also my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has been a very able assistant to the gentleman from Oregon.

I want to make this statement for the benefit of the House. There have been many things said about the Republican conferees, but we have voted without exception as a unit on every item while it was in conference, and with respect to the Democratic members of the conference, Mr. GARNER and Mr. COLLIER, while these two gentlemen had views differing entirely from our views with respect to a Republican tariff policy, yet there has never been a time when anyone's voice has been raised in the conference. We have settled everything nicely and kindly, and this was only by reason of the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] always gave in with very good grace.

It is a privilege for me to say now that I do not believe any five men could have gotten along better during these 17 months than we have gotten along in this conference. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Before putting the question the Chair desires to make a very brief statement. We are about to vote on a bill which has occupied the attention of the Congress for more than a year and a half. With the tariff bill behind us it seems evident that Congress will be able to adjourn in a very few days. [Applause.]

For that reason the question of the suspension of the rules of the House, in order the last six days of the session, becomes peculiarly important. The Chair desires to say that for the protection of the House and incidentally his own he has decided that from now on to the end of the session he will in no case recognize an application for suspension of the rules unless it is made in writing, giving good and sufficient reasons why the rules should be suspended, accompanied by the bill, and report of the committee thereon.

The question is on concurring in the conference reports.

Mr. GARNER and Mr. COLLIER demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 153, answered "present" 1, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—222

Ackerman	Beers	Carter, Calif.	Connolly
Adkins	Blackburn	Carter, Wyo.	Cooke
Allen	Bolton	Chalmers	Cooper, Ohio
Andrew	Bowman	Chase	Coyle
Arentz	Brand, Ohio	Chindblom	Crail
Aswell	Brigham	Clancy	Crowther
Bacharach	Britten	Clark, Md.	Culkin
Bachmann	Brumm	Clarke, N. Y.	Darrow
Bacon	Buckbee	Cochran, Pa.	Davenport
Baird	Burdick	Cole	Dempsey
Barbour	Butler	Colton	Denison
Beedy	Campbell, Pa.	Connery	De Priest

DeRouen	Hooper	Michaelson	Spearing
Dickinson	Hope	Michener	Sproul, Ill.
Doutrich	Hopkins	Miller	Stafford
Dowell	Houston, Del.	Montet	Stalker
Drane	Hudson	Moore, Ohio.	Stobbs
Dunbar	Hudspeth	Morgan	Strong, Kans.
Dyer	Hull, Morton D.	Mouser	Strong, Pa.
Eaton, Colo.	Hull, William E.	Murphy	Sullivan, Pa.
Eaton, N. J.	Irwin	Nelson, Me.	Summers, Wash.
Elliott	Jenkins	Newhall	Swanson
Ellis	Johnson, Ind.	Niedringhaus	Swick
Englebright	Johnson, Nebr.	O'Connor, La.	Swing
Estep	Johnson, Wash.	O'Connor, Okla.	Taber
Evans, Calif.	Jonas, N. C.	Palmer	Taylor, Colo.
Fenn	Kahn	Parker	Taylor, Tenn.
Fish	Kearns	Perkins	Temple
Fitzgerald	Kelly	Pittenger	Thatcher
Fort	Kemp	Pritchard	Thompson
Foss	Kendall, Ky.	Purnell	Thurston
Free	Kiefner	Ramey, Frank M.	Tilson
Freeman	Kiess	Ramseyer	Timberlake
French	Kinzer	Ransley	Tinkham
Garber, Okla.	Knutson	Reece	Treadway
Garber, Va.	Kopp	Reid, Ill.	Turpin
Gifford	Korell	Robinson	Vestal
Golder	Langley	Rogers	Vincent, Mich.
Graham	Lankford, Va.	Rowbottom	Wainwright
Green	Lea	Sanders, N. Y.	Wason
Guyer	Leavitt	Schafer, Wis.	Watres
Hadley	Leech	Sears	Watson
Hale	Lehlbach	Seger	Welsh, Pa.
Hall, Ill.	Letts	Seiberling	Whitley
Hall, Ind.	Luce	Shaffer, Va.	Wigglesworth
Hall, N. Dak.	McClintock, Ohio	Short, Mo.	Williamson
Hancock	McCormick, Ill.	Shott, W. Va.	Wilson
Hardy	McFadden	Shreve	Wolfenden
Haugen	McLaughlin	Simmons	Wolverton, N. J.
Hawley	McLeod	Simms	Wolverton, W. Va.
Hess	Magrady	Sloan	Wood
Hickey	Manlove	Smith, Idaho	Woodruff
Hill, Wash.	Mapes	Snell	Wurzbach
Hoch	Martin	Snow	Yates
Hogg	Menges	Sparks	
Holaday	Merritt	Speaks	

NAYS—153

Abernethy	Dickstein	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parks
Allgood	Dominick	Johnson, Tex.	Patman
Almon	Doughton	Jones, Tex.	Patterson
Andresen	Douglas, Ariz.	Kading	Pou
Arnold	Doxey	Kennedy	Prall
Auf der Heide	Drewry	Kerr	Pratt, Ruth
Ayres	Driver	Kincheloe	Quayle
Bell	Edwards	Kvale	Quin
Black	Eslick	LaGuardia	Ragon
Blanton	Evans, Mont.	Lampert	Rainey, Henry T.
Bloom	Fisher	Lanham	Ramspeck
Box	Fitzpatrick	Lankford, Ga.	Rankin
Boylan	Frear	Larsen	Rayburn
Brand, Ga.	Fuller	Lindsay	Rutherford
Briggs	Fulmer	Linthicum	Sabath
Browne	Gambrill	Lozier	Sanders, Tex.
Browning	Garner	Ludlow	Sandlin
Brunner	Garrett	McClintic, Okla.	Schneider
Busby	Gasque	McCormack, Mass.	Selvig
Campbell, Iowa	Gavagan	McDuffie	Sirovich
Canfield	Glover	McKeown	Smith, W. Va.
Carley	Goldsborough	McMillan	Somers, N. Y.
Cartwright	Goodwin	McSwain	Steagall
Celler	Granfield	Mansfield	Stone
Christopherson	Greenwood	Mead	Sullivan, N. Y.
Claiborne	Gregory	Milligan	Summers, Tex.
Clark, N. C.	Griffin	Montague	Tarver
Cochran, Mo.	Hall, Miss.	Mooney	Tucker
Collier	Halsey	Moore, Ky.	Underwood
Collins	Hammer	Moore, Va.	Vinson, Ga.
Cooper, Tenn.	Hare	Morehead	Warren
Cooper, Wis.	Hastings	Nelson, Mo.	Welch, Calif.
Corning	Hill, Ala.	Norton	Whitehead
Cox	Howard	O'Connell	Whittington
Craddock	Huddleston	O'Connor, N. Y.	Woodrum
Crisp	Hull, Wis.	Oldfield	Wright
Cross	Igoe	Oliver, Ala.	
Crosser	Jeffers	Oliver, N. Y.	
Cullen	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Douglass, Mass.

NOT VOTING—52

Aldrich	Dallinger	Ketcham	Romjue
Bankhead	Davis	Kunz	Sinclair
Beck	Doyle	Kurtz	Sproul, Kans.
Bland	Esterly	Lambertson	Stedman
Bohn	Finley	McReynolds	Stevenson
Buchanan	Gibson	Maas	Underhill
Burtness	Hartley	Nelson, Wis.	Walker
Byrns	Hoffman	Nolan	White
Cable	Hull, Tenn.	Owen	Williams
Cannon	James	Peavey	Wingo
Christgau	Johnson, Ill.	Porter	Wyant
Cramton	Johnston, Mo.	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Yon
Curry	Kendall, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Zihlman

So the conference reports were agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

On this vote:

Mr. Dallinger (for) with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts (against).
Mr. Cramton (for) with Mr. Byrns (against).
Mr. White (for) with Mr. Wingo (against).
Mr. Hoffman (for) with Mr. Christgau (against).
Mr. Esterly (for) with Mr. Bland (against).
Mr. Ketcham (for) with Mr. Sproul of Kansas (against).
Mr. Beck (for) with Mr. Stedman (against).
Mr. Underhill (for) with Mr. Davis (against).
Mr. Aldrich (for) with Mr. Bankhead (against).
Mr. Harcourt J. Pratt (for) with Mr. Doyle (against).
Mr. Johnston of Missouri (for) with Mr. Peavey (against).
Mr. Sinclair (for) with Mr. Buchanan (against).
Mr. Reed of New York (for) with Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin (against).
Mr. Finley (for) with Mr. Stevenson (against).
Mr. Hartley (for) with Mr. Lambertson (against).
Mr. Gibson (for) with Mr. Maas (against).
Mr. Kurtz (for) with Mr. Williams (against).
Mr. Bohn (for) with Mr. Hull of Tennessee (against).
Mr. Wyant (for) with Mr. Romjue (against).
Mr. Cable (for) with Mr. Cannon (against).
Mr. Porter (for) with Mr. Kunz (against).
Mrs. Owen (for) with Mr. Nolan (against).
Mr. Kendall of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. McReynolds (against).

Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay" on the roll call. I wish to withdraw that vote, as I am paired with my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. DALLINGER. If present, Mr. DALLINGER would vote "yea," and I would vote "nay."

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a telegram from my colleague, HARCOURT J. PRATT, saying that if he were present he would vote "aye" on this bill.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CURRIER, is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. On this vote the yeas are 222 and the nays are 153, answered "present" 1; so the conference reports are agreed to.

The Chair takes great pleasure in signing the bill. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS ON THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have to the end of the session to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the tariff bill, which has just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, permit me to suggest to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, upon whose broad shoulders much wrath of public opinion is certain to fall because of the passage a few moments ago of the worst tariff bill ever written, that he and all of his Republican colleagues who supported this infamous measure will need considerably more time than to the end of the present session to explain their votes on the tariff bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, this bill carries the highest rates of any tariff ever passed by an American Congress. It is the most indefensible tariff bill ever presented to an American public. It creates the highest tariff wall that was ever built around the United States. The tariff rate on cement is estimated will cost the consumers $50,000,000 per annum. It adds about $1,000 to the cost of every mile of road on which cement is used. The tariff on sugar at 2 cents per pound will cost the consumer $250,000,000 annually. It is estimated that this Smoot-Hawley-Grundy bill will cost the American consumers $1,000,000,000 annually. Shoes, 20 per cent of the value, now on the free list, will cost the American consumers $188,000,000 annually. The existing Fordney-McCumber tariff law, passed in 1922, is estimated to cost the consumer approximately $4,000,000,000, of which only a little more than half a billion goes into the Treasury; the balance into the pockets of the protected industries.

I supported and voted for the farm relief bill, known as the agricultural marketing act, at the extra session one year ago. I do not know how much relief will be given farmers by that act. I think that it has done some good already and hope that it will accomplish all that its most ardent advocates claim for it. Much depends upon the cooperation of the farmers with the Federal Farm Board.

EXPORT DEBENTURE

I have supported and voted for the export debenture every time it has been presented. It has been defeated by the influence of President Hoover and his administration. The debenture provided for the payment of one-half of the tariff duties on agricultural products exported. For example, there is a tariff of 42 cents per bushel on wheat. Under the debenture the exporter of wheat would be paid one-half that amount, or 21 cents per bushel, in the form of a debenture certificate which would be accepted by the Government in payment of tariff duties. There is no tariff on cotton, so the debenture provided for the payment of 2 cents a pound, or $10 a bale, on all cotton exported. About 65 per cent of American cotton is exported. Some claim that the farmers would not get the benefit of this; but they would, and the psychological effect of it on the price of cotton would have amounted to probably more than 2 cents a pound. If necessary, the debenture could be so written that

the certificate could be given only to stabilized corporations of the Federal Farm Board authorized by the terms of the farm relief bill, and in that way the farmers would certainly receive the benefit on all agricultural products exported, including $10 per bale on cotton. I believe that the debenture is a necessary complement to the tariff structure. It is the only sure way of bringing some tariff benefits to the producers of our staple agricultural crops.

We have heard a great deal about the increased rates on agricultural commodities contained in the pending tariff bill. However, it must not be overlooked that the benefits accruing to agriculture from these rates are nullified by the higher duties imposed on manufactured products. The unwarranted disproportion between the protective duty of 10 per cent on hides and the compensatory duty of 20 per cent on shoes, together with the other duties on leather and harness, furnishes a conspicuous example. It is interesting to note that the longer the debenture has been debated and discussed, the stronger it has become. The first time it was voted upon it received little support. A year ago it received 113 votes. At this session it received 161 votes, indicating a growing sentiment that the debenture program is as defensible as the tariff itself, is in harmony with the present drawback provisions of the tariff, and is no more a subsidy than high or prohibitive tariff rates.

The cultivated area of American farms comprises 350,000,000 acres; of this total 47,000,000 acres is devoted to the production of cotton. Aside from the small quantity of long staple produced, this crop receives no tariff protection. Fifty-seven million acres is given over to the growing of wheat, while 100,000,000 acres is devoted to the production of corn. Owing to their exportable surpluses, both of the latter crops receive but negligible benefits from the tariff.

The upward revision of the tariff on manufactured commodities can not fail to increase the costs of production on the farm, besides curtailing foreign demand for agricultural products, while the grower of our staple crops must continue to sell their products at the world's price, unless some plan can be devised to give them at least a measure of protection under our tariff system. This is the purpose of the export-debenture plan.

It is claimed that this bill will aid the laboring man. It will compel every laboring man to pay more for all of the necessaries of life and will compel him to work longer in order to earn enough to support himself and his family.

This tariff bill will aid corporate and selfish interests and no one else. It is not the kind of tariff bill that President Hoover recommended in his message to the Congress, but it is generally believed that he will approve it if it is sent to him.

I am opposed to it because it is against the interest of the great masses of the people of the United States.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I have given considerable thought and study to the tariff bill which is now on its way to final consideration in order to weigh the advantages and disadvantages for the producers and consumers in my congressional district.

I voted against the Hawley bill when it first came up for consideration in the House, as the bill in no sense carried out the pledges of the President and of the Republican Party in bringing about a revision largely beneficial to agriculture.

I will frankly confess that the agricultural rates in the House bill were most desirable, but these were only secured through the organized effort of the Representatives from the agricultural States. It was only after the organized effort on the part of the friends of the farmers and fight, fight, every inch of the way, that we were able to secure the present increases on agricultural schedules.

I favored increases for those industries in distress, but no one will contend that the present revision has been limited to the distressed industries, as it is self-evident that the bill goes far beyond any conception of the President, the Speaker of the House, or the pledges made by the Republican Party.

As far as agriculture is concerned, even though equality does not exist, I would favor the retention of the act of 1922 as being more beneficial to the Northwest. Under the flexible provision of the 1922 act, substantial increases were made for agricultural commodities; in fact, under presidential proclamation, many increases were made which would have been of equal value to the rates in the present bill.

I object to the bill in its present form on account of the unwarranted increases on some of the industrial schedules and for the failure on the part of Congress to protect the American farmers from the importation of vegetable oils and fats, which now come in free of duty.

I object to the bill for the unjustifiable removal of lumber from the free list to the dutiable list of $1 per thousand feet. The failure on the part of the House conferees, after a vote of 106 majority to retain lumber on the free list, is inexcusable. I regard the vote on the part of the House as a mandate with definite instructions to the conferees to insist and stand firm for free lumber. This they failed to do.

I object to the bill because the debenture was not placed in it, as I feel that the debenture provision would be essential and beneficial to agriculture, if it were contained in the bill.

About a year ago the membership of the House was called upon to express its opinion on the debenture. I opposed the debenture at that time for two reasons. In the first place, I felt that since the debenture dealt with tariff duties, it had no place in the marketing act. In the second place, I was of the opinion that the issuance of the debenture on export agricultural products would in no way be reflected to the producers.

Conditions have changed. We have passed an agricultural marketing act and a board has functioned for nearly a year to aid the farmers. The tariff bill is the proper place for a debenture, if it is to be considered at all.

When the debenture was considered in connection with the agricultural marketing act, it was conclusively pointed out that the exporter would be the recipient of the debenture. At that time there were no farmers who were actual producers, and I felt that the exporter would be the individual to receive the benefit and that he would in no way reflect the price back to the producer.

Under the system established by the Federal Farm Board under the marketing act, several large nation-wide agricultural cooperative organizations have been created in cotton, wheat, and cattle, and this program will be continued under the supervision of the board, so that all agricultural products will eventually be organized into nation-wide marketing associations.

The National Wheat Stabilization Corporation, a cooperative, is the owner of millions of bushels of wheat. This cooperative deals in both domestic and foreign commerce, and has actually made sales of millions of bushels of wheat in foreign countries, and it is my opinion that with the gradual expansion of the program, the National Wheat Stabilization Corporation will eventually handle and market more than 75 per cent of the export wheat produced in this country. Under this system, the debenture of 21 cents a bushel, which was the maximum amount fixed by the amendment, would be paid to the cooperative association, and the association would pay it to the producer members in patronage dividends. In this way the actual producer would receive the benefits of the debenture, if he were a member of a cooperative association.

The debenture is workable. If the farmer is to receive the benefit of the tariff on his surplus products, this important provision is essential in the make-up of the present tariff bill.

There is no comparison between a manufacturer of industrial products and the farmer. The manufacturer may control his production, which is not subject to climatic conditions and the elements. The farmer, on the other hand, is subjected to all of the hazards of floods, draught, hail, rain, and sunshine, and therefore has very little to say as to the amount he will be permitted to produce on his small or large acreage.

I am a protectionist, but I feel that Congress has gone too far in the present bill, and that the welfare of the country would be much better off under existing law. The present bill does not meet the pledges of the Republican Party. It does not comply with the President's message, nor does it comply with the suggestions made to us by our Speaker, Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the present tariff bill gives more to the farmer than ever before but it also, in many respects, takes more from him than ever before. I believe it does my people more harm than good, therefore, while I appreciate the protection given peanuts, cowhides, long-staple cotton, pitch and tar of wood, turpentine, and several other farm products, I must vote against the bill as a whole. The bill consists of 280 pages and every time there are a few words in favor of the common people there are scores of pages against them. This bill demonstrates the difficulty of securing helpful legislation for the farmer. Every time a dollar is put in one pocket several dollars are taken out of the other pocket.

For instance, we all fight for better freight rates for the farmer, and yet when he gets a little help with one commodity there is an increase of rates somewhere else to cancel his apparent benefit. In the end he pays it all and does not gain. This is almost always the case. It is especially true with tariff and freight rates.

The present tariff bill would be very much better for the farmer if it contained the export debenture plan advocated by the farmer's friends. This plan would have given the farmer some real help and yet it can not be said to be all that has been promised the farmer. Ever since I first heard of the export debenture, even before I came to Congress, I advocated it as a step toward putting the farmer on an equality with industry. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that for several years a few

of us here—four or five—have urged the adoption of the export debenture plan.

My views as expressed on this floor and by bills from time to time still remain unchanged. The scheme is becoming more and more popular. Most of the Democrats and some Republicans are now for it. Soon there will be a stampede for the plan and it will be put into effect, but there is danger of some scheme being adopted along with it nullifying, to a large extent, its benefits. One great danger is that it will be urged as genuine complete farm relief as promised by both major parties and thus become a delusion and a snare. Having advocated it for years I want to say the export debenture should only be expected to operate as an offset to the evils of high tariff on what the farmer buys.

In and of itself it will not be found to be a complete remedy for the farmer's troubles. It will only be a step in the right direction. It will not be the complete victory which should come as the result of the farmer's age-long battle for justice and economic freedom.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, those who contend that the tariff act approved June 17, 1930, will be of any benefit to the agricultural class are either humorists who should be put in a class with Will Rogers or Mark Twain, or be qualified for mental clinics.

Congress was called in session April 15, 1929, to enact legislation for the benefit of the farmers. Two remedies were proposed:

One was the farm bill, which was approved June 15, 1929. The farmers of the country are asking that the broad powers granted in that act be fully exercised and are asking that it be given a fair trial to see if it proves effective.

Second, a "limited revision" of the tariff was recommended to place the farmers on a parity with the industrialists of the East.

I represent a great agricultural district, Unfortunately, the farmers have been greatly depressed and every business depending upon them has felt the effect of this depression for the past 10 years. As a result, the agricultural counties are losing their population in great numbers to the cities. The farmers are trying to better their condition. Mortgages have been foreclosed in large numbers, lands have been sold for taxes, and a general depression has been felt by all. This is not overdrawn, and truth and candor compel me to say as much.

It is estimated that the slump in grain prices and in cotton will decrease the income of the farmers $1,125,000,000 this year, as compared with 1929. This estimate, apparently authentic, extensively carried in the press, is based upon present prices for the staple farm products of wheat, corn, oats, rye, and cotton, compared with those of 1929.

Wheat is quoted at around 90 cents per bushel on the Chicago market, netting the farmer about 70 cents, a price comparable with the low marks at the outset of the World War, and is practically 30 cents below last year's price. Corn is 17 cents per bushel lower, oats 8 cents, rye 34 cents, and cotton $27 per bale.

The farmers, under these circumstances, are entitled to all of the relief which the Farm Board can grant them, and they should not be compelled to pay increased prices for the necessities they must purchase.

There are eight counties in the district which I represent, and the consumers, including the farmers, have a right to ask in what way they would be benefited by the enactment of this tariff bill. I have asserted time and again that this bill can be of no possible benefit to the people of my district but that it will greatly increase the amount they will have to pay for the things they must buy. Of course, this is an additional burden upon the consuming public because of the tariff. But some argue that prices will not be raised because of the tariff. Let me answer by asking the question, Why do the manufacturers come to Congress asking for increased duties if it is not to their interest and if it will not enable them to sell their manufactured products for more?

In the consideration of any measure I try to imagine myself in my own district confronting the people who commission me to represent them, and I ask myself the question, How will this bill affect them?

There are eight counties in the second congressional district of Oklahoma, consisting of Adair, Cherokee, Haskell, McIntosh, Muskogee, Okmulgee, Sequoyah, and Wagoner Counties. How will this tariff bill benefit any of the residents of these counties?

MAJOR FARM CROPS RAISED

The major crops raised by the farmers in these counties are wheat, cotton, and corn. Let us take them in their order.

It can not possibly help the wheat farmer for the following reasons: First, the duty of 42 cents per bushel on wheat is not changed by the bill. How, then, can anyone say that this bill can possibly help the wheat producers? Second, we export approximately 200,000,000 bushels of wheat and wheat products, and the price of wheat is governed by the foreign market. In 1929 we produced 806,508,000 bushels of wheat and imported only 37,231 bushels, or one two-hundredths of 1 per cent of the amount produced. I submit that anyone who argues that the importation of this negligible quantity can be of benefit to the price of wheat qualifies himself for admission to a mental clinic. In 1929 we imported from Canada 37,231 bushels of wheat and exported to Canada 23,068,068 bushels.

Canada has no tariff on wheat, but the price of wheat in Canada every day for the past two years has been higher than in the United States.

Now, let us take cotton. The cotton farmers in my district are asking how this bill will benefit them. They will rightfully argue that Congress has raised the prices of everything they and the members of their families must buy and will insist upon a direct answer to their question as to how this bill will help the cotton farmers. Of course, it will not help them. Last year we produced 14,545,000 bales of cotton and exported 7,580,383 bales. There is no tariff on the ordinary staple cotton; and, in fact, there is no tariff on any cotton grown in my district. There is a small duty carried in the bill on long staple or sea-island cotton, 1⅛ inch staple, not a lock of which is grown in my district.

Surely no one can successfully contend that inasmuch as this bill makes every consumer pay more for the things he must buy, including hats, shoes, rayon, and every kind of clothing, and lumber, sugar, and cement, that it can be of any benefit to them. You can not convince the cotton farmers that this bill, which is an additional burden upon them, can be of any possible benefit to them.

Now let us take corn. In 1929 we produced 2,622,189,000 bushels, and imported 407,085 bushels, mostly from South American countries, or about one sixty-fifth of 1 per cent of the corn we produced. We exported 33,745,270 bushels of corn in 1929. Of course, the corn we produce is largely consumed in our own country but we regularly export our surplus and the foreign market in part governs the price of corn in our own market. No corn producers can possibly be deceived by the duty of 25 cents per bushel placed on corn. It is a mere gesture. It does not help them. If we excluded every bushel of corn imported into the United States which, as I have stated, is but one sixty-fifth of 1 per cent of the corn we produce, it would not affect the price of corn. If the farmers were not so depressed the argument that the way to relieve their condition is to add to their tax burdens, would be humorous, but with the farmers seeking to better their condition, and leaving the farms and flocking to the cities in search of other employment, it is a tragedy.

Most of the defenders of the tariff bill attempt to use percentages to mislead the farmers. They tell them they get 42 cents per bushel duty on wheat, when everyone can see that this is ineffective. They point out that they have a duty of 25 cents per bushel on corn, while everyone knows this does not add to the price they will receive for their corn. Then they refer to sugar, saying the duty is raised from $1.76 to $2 per hundred pounds, when the truth is no sugar is raised in my district and instead of being of benefit it will place an additional burden upon the breakfast table in every home in my State. Then the tariff advocates will include, as another benefit to the farmers, the increased duty on wool, which is increased from 31 to 34 cents per pound, but instead of that being of benefit to the people of my district it is an additional burden and will cause the people to pay more for the clothing they buy, which contains wool. The bill also carries a duty on lumber and cement and steel products which go into the farming implements they buy, which will increase the prices on these articles to the farmers.

THE DEBENTURE PLAN

We made an effort to make the duty of 42 cents per bushel on wheat and 25 cents per bushel on corn effective through the debenture plan, which would require the issuance of a certificate in the sum of 50 per cent of the duty on the farm products exported, which to that extent would enhance the selling price to the farmers and be of financial benefit to them. There being no duty on cotton, 2 cents per pound, or $10 per bale, was included in the debenture provision. Everyone knows and everyone admits, except the old standpatters that whistle to keep up their courage, that the duties carried in the bill are not effective as to those agricultural products of which we produce regularly an exportable surplus, the price of which is governed by the foreign market.

To illustrate, every cotton grower knows that the cotton market at New York and New Orleans is governed by the Liverpool market. Every daily paper in the country will first

comment upon the Liverpool price and then give the New York and New Orleans prices. These determine the local price of cotton, as every farmer knows.

Let no one be deceived as to the effectiveness of the debenture provision. It would have added 50 per cent of the 42 cents duty per bushel on wheat, or it would have added 21 cents per bushel to the price of wheat, and would have added 12½ cents per bushel to the price of corn and $10 per bale to the price of cotton. This provision was optional, to be invoked by the Farm Board if found necessary to protect the farmers.

THE FLEXIBLE PROVISION

Now, let us examine the flexible provision that is so little understood by the masses of the people. The tariff act of 1922 provided that the Tariff Commission should make a study of the cost of production at home and abroad and make recommendations to the President, who was authorized to issue a proclamation either increasing or lowering the duty on any commodity, not to exceed 50 per cent.

The consuming public ought not to be deceived about this flexible provision. The manufacturers of the East employ the shrewdest experts that can be found to juggle the figures to be placed before the Tariff Commission in order to have the duty on every article which the consumer must buy increased but never lowered. Now, just hold your breath for a minute. During the years in which the flexible provision has been in operation the Tariff Commission has lowered the duty on just four commodities—long-handled paint brushes, bobwhite quail, phenol, and mill-feed bran.

It will be seen, therefore, that this flexible provision is always used against and never in the interest of the masses of the people. This year Congress appropriated $785,000 for the Tariff Commission and its body of experts and clerical force in order that they might find excuses to justify the raising of duties and placing additional burdens upon the people. The people are led to believe that the Tariff Commission removes the question of the tariff from politics, but do not be deceived by this statement. The President selects the personnel of the commission. The members are all inoculated with high-tariff ideas. Let me remind you that just as long as there are members on this commission who are in favor of increasing duties it will result in the duties always being increased and never lowered.

This bill will increase the tax burdens upon every humble home in my district. The people ought to study the provisions of the bill. There is not an item in the bill that will aid the farmers in my district, and inasmuch as farming is the basic industry and the happiness and prosperity of everyone depends upon the farmer, this bill can not possibly help any other class of business that depends upon the prosperity of the farmer.

A thousand economists from educational institutions throughout the United States protested against the enactment of this bill.

We can not sell farm products to foreign countries unless we buy from them. If we raise our tariff walls so high as to keep out articles manufactured in foreign countries and their trade is diverted to other countries, they will buy farm products of those other countries in exchange for their goods and to that extent we will lose a foreign market for our products.

I have never heard an argument on the floor of the House or read one in the press which would show that the tariff bill will be of any possible benefit to the wheat, cotton, and corn producers of the country. The farmers are dependent upon this foreign market to absorb their surplus wheat, corn, and cotton.

I trust that the farmers of my district, when platform orators commence talking in general platitudes about the glories of the tariff they will insist upon their putting their feet upon the ground and explain in detail in what way this bill can possibly aid the wheat, corn, and cotton producers. Don't let them evade; make them answer.

It is a novel argument that to make the farmer more prosperous we should not enhance the prices of the things he produces but add to his tax burdens by making him pay more for the things he and the members of his family must buy.

It has been insisted repeatedly that the tariff is in the interest of labor. The truth is the laboring men get but a very small percentage through increased wages. They only get what their organizations enable them to wring from the manufacturing classes.

The reports for 1928 indicate there were 14,000 millionaires in the United States. Of course none of these are of the laboring class. To illustrate, in the beet sugar industry, in the West, cheap Mexican labor is bootlegged into this country. The protected interests, therefore, are not eager to help labor but only yield to them such increases as they are compelled to do by the demand of labor organizations.

I was born and reared on a farm and have owned farm land all my life and know that I understand the problems of the farmers. I am in sympathy with them. I know their depressed condition and I urge that each for himself study the provisions of this bill from a nonpartisan standpoint and decide whether he will continue to pay tribute to the protected interests of the East, the privileged few, or assert his independence and vote for the best interests of himself and the members of his family dependent upon him.

Let me invite attention to the fact that practically all of the Senators, regardless of party, representing the great agricultural Middle West, including North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma, voted against this tariff bill.

Experts have estimated that this bill will place an additional burden of a billion dollars annually upon the consumers; farmers, laborers, business and professional men, and all other classes, through the added cost they will have to pay because of the increased duties carried in this bill, and certainly this legislation can not be classed as a limited revision. Neither will it place the farmers upon a parity with the industrialists of the East.

Mr. BRIGHAM. In the discussion of farm relief during the past 10 years the phrase "equality for agriculture" has been the slogan of those who have been most earnest in their advocacy of the farmer's cause. By 1928 the appeal of this phrase had become so great that both great political parties wrote into their platforms promises to attempt to give agriculture equality with other industries.

The Democratic platform said:

> Farm relief must rest on the basis of an economic equality of agriculture with other industries.

The Republican platform contained a definite pledge in these words:

> The Republican Party pledges itself to the development and enactment of measures which will place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with other industries to insure its prosperity and success.

The candidates of the two great parties, in their speeches during the campaign of 1928, gave their views as to what would be their policies, if elected, to carry out the promises of their respective platforms. The result of the election is now history. Herbert Hoover received the electoral vote of every one of the great agricultural States of the Union, which means that the plan he proposed appealed to the farmers of America as the best one to give relief to their industries.

The plan of President Hoover was essentially:

First. Tariff revision to protect farm products from foreign competition.

Second. Legislation to give agriculture a commercial system equal to that of industry.

Soon after the inauguration the President called the Congress into special session to enact the legislation necessary to carry out the policies he advocated in the campaign.

I shall attempt to show that the legislation enacted has gone far to fulfill these promises.

THE FARMER AND THE TARIFF

The Hawley-Smoot tariff places upon farm products rates of duty which are the highest in history. The case for increased farm rates was ably presented by representatives of farm organizations and by farmers from all parts of the country. No request for an adequate protective duty, if supported by conclusive evidence of need, went unheeded. Surely the farmers of America can not complain that agriculture is not now placed upon an equality with industry in so far as rates of duty are concerned.

Attempt, however, has been made to show that our tariff system does injustice to agriculture, in that rates levied upon farm products do not raise the prices of the products to which they apply, while it is contended that rates of duty applied to manufactured products always are effective to raise the price. It is even contended that equalization of rates as between agriculture and industry by applying to farm products rates as high as those applied to the products of industry is not sufficient, but that a debenture plan applying only to farm schedules should be made a part of our tariff system. This contention is based upon the premise that the tariff is not effective upon farm products of which we produce an exportable surplus. But do we produce a net export surplus of all farm products, and do we not also produce an export surplus of many industrial products?

About a year ago the Alexander Hamilton Institute published a compilation of the gross income of farms, by commodity groups, as follows:

Gross income of farms, by commodity groups, year ending June 30, 1929

Commodity group	Income	Per cent of total
Dairy and poultry products	$3,840,000,000	30.7
Meat animals	3,016,000,000	24.1
Grains	1,540,000,000	12.3
Cotton and cottonseed	1,479,000,000	11.8
Fruits and vegetables	1,436,000,000	11.4
Other farm products	1,216,000,000	9.7
Total	12,527,000,000	100.0

Those who contend that all farm products are on an export basis and that farmers, therefore, get no benefit from the tariff will find little in this table to support their conclusion. It shows that American farmers derive the largest portion of their income, over 30 per cent of it, from dairy and poultry products. These are not on a net export basis, and the tariff rates are generally effective in maintaining a higher price here than in the world market. The same is true of some classes of meat animals, such as beef and mutton. Many fruits and vegetables and many special farm products listed in the last group are not on an export basis and benefit by the tariff. Even in the grains classification, which accounts for only 12.3 per cent of the American farmer's income, flaxseed is on an import basis and benefits from the tariff. And who shall say that cottonseed products do not benefit from the tariff rates placed on competing oils and grain by-products. Careful analysis will show that the greater part of the farmer's income is derived from those commodities which are not on an export basis or which, with some slight adjustment of production, can be reduced to the demands of the home market, and upon which tariff rates are usually effective, or can easily be made so.

INDUSTRY AND THE TARIFF

Those who make the loudest outcry that the tariff is not effective for agriculture imply that the tariff is effective on every industrial schedule and will raise the price of manufactured products here above the world price by the amount of the tariff. Let us examine the statistics for exports to determine if this is true. The Department of Commerce places the total value of United States exports at $5,030,099,000. Of this total, farm products comprised 38 per cent. The balance, or 62 per cent, were manufactured articles.

Surely if the tariff is not effective on farm products which are on an export basis, the tariff should be equally as ineffective on many items of industrial production which are also on an export basis. When our Government fixes an import duty upon a commodity it does no more to make the duty effective in raising the price here on an industrial product than it does on a farm product. The steel industry, for instance, has been in a prosperous condition. Is the tariff responsible for it? Many would say, yes. But the steel industry exports over 5 per cent of its total production and its product is, therefore, on an export basis. Then why is the tariff more effective on steel than on wheat?

ORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY AND AGRICULTURE

We are told that industry, by its organization into great corporations, which control the processes of manufacture and sale, is able to command a price here in the home market which is higher than the world price by the amount of the tariff. Let us admit, for the sake of argument, that this is so. Has the Government of the United States organized these industries to such complete perfection that they can do this? No. On the contrary, the Government has enacted stringent laws against industrial combinations in restraint of trade, and has declared such combinations illegal and makes the monopolization of trade a misdemeanor punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both. Antitrust laws, however, specifically exempt organizations of farmers from their provisions and authority is given to farmers to form cooperative associations, with exemptions from prosecution under antitrust laws, unless the Secretary of Agriculture, the representative of the farming industry in the Cabinet, thinks the result of the operations of such associations is to unduly enhance the price of the commodities in which they deal.

Therefore, as far as the Government is concerned, it requires organized industry to prove in court that its operations are not in restraint of trade and it permits farmers to organize without fear of prosecution unless the Secretary of Agriculture thinks the result has been to unduly enhance prices. Surely no fair-minded person can say that the Government has discriminated against agriculture in legislation relating to the tariff or relating to organization for purpose of price control. The reverse is true.

THE FEDERAL FARM BOARD AND EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE

The answer of the Congress to the second part of President Hoover's plan for farm aid, viz, to provide a commercial system equal to that of industry, was the passage of the farm relief act, which became a law on the 15th of June, 1929.

The act established a Federal Farm Board of nine members, including the Secretary of Agriculture. It authorized the use by the board of $500,000,000 from the Federal Treasury to carry out the purposes outlined. The act, furthermore, specifically directed the board to promote education in the principles and practices of cooperative marketing of agricultural commodities, to encourage the development of cooperative associations, to report upon factors affecting supply and demand of crops with the effect upon prices here and abroad, to study conditions of overproduction, and to report methods of preventing such overproduction by curtailing the supply and increasing market outlets. Authorization was given the board to make liberal loans to cooperative associations from the $500,000,000 fund to enable these associations to acquire the necessary facilities to do business and to advance money to producers upon delivered produce. Authorization was also given to the board to make loans to stabilizing corporations formed by cooperative associations to more effectively market surpluses once produced so that fair prices to producers would result.

Let us consider what this means in the way of aid to the farmers of America. It means that our Government has set up a board, has placed at its disposal a fund of $500,000,000, with instructions to that board to assist farmers to organize their industry to promote better marketing and cut down the costs of getting produce from the farm to the consumer, to loan money to finance the operations of these associations and to enable them to hold off the market surpluses which unduly depress the price. This board is also instructed to make studies, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, of the factors which affect the prices of farm products; in fact, to act as economic advisers to our farmers.

When the farmers of America make insistent demand for equality for agriculture and complain that the farm relief act does not go far enough, let them consider that the Government of the United States has not gone so far as this in the organization or relief of any other industry. If the steel industry, for instance, is able to control the marketing of its product so that the price here is higher than its price abroad by the amount of the tariff, that industry must organize itself, it must satisfy the Department of Justice that its operations are not contrary to the antitrust act, it must borrow its capital at current rates, and do its own planning and formulate its own policies. If the wheat growers of America want to organize, they have the assistance of the Federal Farm Board, they are exempt from all danger of prosecution under antitrust statutes, money is loaned by the Government at a rate of 3⅝ per cent to the cooperatives to acquire facilities and carry on the business, and, if conditions warrant, the Farm Board will loan money to hold off the market a surplus which threatens to depress the price.

In other words, if American wheat farmers want to organize to control the marketing of their wheat so they can sell the surplus on the world market at the world-market price, and at the same time sell the requirements of the American market at the world price plus the tariff the Government of the United States, through its agency, the Federal Farm Board, which is headed by one of the ablest and most successful business men in the country, will help wheat farmers to organize, will furnish guidance and supervision, and will loan the money to do it at a rate of interest much below the market rate. Is not this going a long way on the part of our Government to carry out the promise made to farmers to give them a commercial system equal to that of industry?

The Federal Farm Board has been in existence less than one year. It has had to blaze a new trail, and what it does must be with the cooperation and support of the farmers of America. The board can make progress no faster than our farmers will go along. No one can say that the board has not been aggressive or that it has not sincerely and earnestly tried to carry out the provisions of the farm relief act. Farmers' cooperative organizations have been assisted in the conduct of their business and with loans. Efforts have been made to support the prices of several farm products which have suffered the effects of a supply greatly in excess of market demands, and effort has been made by the board to advise farmers as to policies which will lead to better conditions.

The board, in the face of great overproduction of certain farm products, have advised reduced acreage and reduced production as a method of adjusting the supply to the demand for the commodity. This has met with strenuous objection in

certain quarters. Demand has been made upon the board to propose a solution for the farmer's difficulties without asking for curtailment of production and some very well-meaning people have felt that such a program involves asking agriculture to do something which industry is not called upon to do. This is entirely contrary to the facts. There were times in 1929 when the steel mills of the country were operating at nearly 100 per cent of capacity. To-day they are operating at 69 per cent of capacity. In this business depression, the answer of the steel industry to lessened demand is to reduce output.

Let the farmer who is disposed to criticize Alexander Legge for advocating a program of adjusted agricultural production as a remedy for the farm depression read the following from the address of Charles M. Schwab to the steel industry:

There are apparently three ways in which the stabilization of the iron and steel industry on a prosperous basis can be legitimately maintained. These are (1) by stimulating the demand for steel; (2) by discouraging by every lawful means the construction of additional capacity at times when the capacity is already overexpanded; and (3) by the avoidance of uneconomic price cutting.

The law of supply and demand is inexorable, and if the producers of steel in this country do not voluntarily refrain from expanding capacity beyond the needs of the country they can expect only one consequence. The law of supply and demand will promptly operate, reducing profits to the extent necessary effectively to discourage new construction, and that condition will continue until demand has increased sufficiently to take up the excess capacity.

The Federal Farm Board in advocating a policy of adjusting our agricultural production to world competition and demand, is simply advocating a policy which is followed by every great industry to-day.

The farm-relief program of President Hoover, which has been enacted into law in the tariff act and the farm marketing act is sometimes referred to as an experiment and such it is. It is an experiment based upon the premise that the farmers of America want protection for their products on an equal basis with other industries, but no debenture or bounty which other industries do not have; it is an experiment in the way of Federal assistance in setting up a marketing system with full recognition of the fact that the organization of several millions of independent farmers scattered over wide areas is a difficult problem requiring special aid; and, finally, it is an experiment based upon the known initiative and self-reliance of the American farmer who will desire a minimum of Federal aid and direction in setting up a system which he will look forward to operating himself with the Government retiring from the field at the earliest possible date if the experiment is successful.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Smoot-Hawley bill is a protective tariff measure. In its drafting the question of revenue, while important, has been incidental. The chief purpose in the minds of its authors has been to provide a tariff measure that will give reasonable and adequate protection to American industry, American agriculture, and American labor against foreign competition. In my judgment, this general purpose has been accomplished.

I believe in a protective tariff that will in fact protect. If there is doubt as to the rate of duty on an item necessary to afford adequate protection, I favor resolving that doubt in favor of American labor and American industry rather than in favor of foreign labor and foreign industry. This policy has been followed in the Smoot-Hawley bill. It has been written by Americans in the interest of the American people. It will stimulate business. It will give employment to hundreds of thousands of American laborers in the production of American-made commodities which are now made in foreign countries by foreign labor.

Our country can not enjoy substantial prosperity unless our labor population is given employment at a wage in keeping with our American standard of living which will enable them to enjoy the necessities and comforts of life and lay aside something for the inevitable rainy day. The American wage must be sufficient to enable our vast labor population to buy the products of the American farmer and the American manufacturer. Such a condition can be produced and maintained only by our adherence to the policy of American tariff protection. There are those who would let down the tariff bars so as to permit cheap foreign commodities to supplant our American-made goods in our home market. Such a tariff policy would result in the crippling and crowding to the wall of our American industries, depriving American laborers of employment and destroying their power to buy the farmer's products. It would turn over our American market to foreign producers whose commodities are made by foreign laborers while hundreds of thousands of our own laborers would be reduced to idleness and want. I can not subscribe to such a tariff policy.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

A large number of American laborers are in idleness to-day because laborers in foreign countries are employed in the manufacture of foreign goods that are being sold in America, while such goods should be manufactured here by those idle American laborers. I believe the passage of this tariff bill will mean jobs for many of them. I am vastly more interested in starting the wheels of American industry that have been stopped or slowed down by the importation of foreign-made goods, so as to create jobs for idle American laborers, than I am in passing legislation providing for governmental bureaus to seek for them jobs that do not exist.

Their vote on the Smoot-Hawley bill is a fair test of the sincerity of those Members of Congress, who, for months, have wailed lip sympathy for our vast army of idle American laborers. "By their fruits ye shall know them." American laborers will not be convinced of the sincerity of those politicians who have shed crocodile tears over our unemployment situation, but who now, when they have opportunity to help bring relief, vote instead to give employment to cheap foreign laborers and shut the door of hope to our own people.

PROTECTS SOUTH'S INTERESTS

This bill provides greater protection to American agriculture than any other tariff act in our history. The interests of the South have been cared for better than ever before. Duties have been increased on almost every product of the farm—dairy products, beef, cattle, hides, peanuts, long-staple cotton, vegetables, especially potatoes, trucking products, fruits, cottonseed-oil products, grain, forest products—in fact, every important agricultural product produced in the South in competition with foreign products. Southern minerals and the products of southern manufacturers have been treated fairly in most instances. Especially is this true of the mineral products of the South. Mica, porcelain, feldspar, kaolin, and other valuable minerals in the South have been given added protection, which will greatly benefit our section of the country.

Not only does this bill carry higher duties on agricultural products than any tariff act in our history, but many items in the bill have been adjusted so as to be indirectly beneficial to the farmers of the country. In fact, no class of our people is benefited more by a reasonably protective tariff on manufactured goods than our farmers. There is a great cry about overproduction of farm products. The trouble is more largely underconsumption in our home market. If every family in America were well fed according to our American standard of living, there would be no surplus foodstuffs and farm products. The farmers can not prosper without a healthy home market for their products. The home market can be developed to its limit only by providing jobs at fair wages for our working people. Jobs can be so supplied only if our factories can run full time at a reasonable profit.

INTERESTS ARE ONE

The interests of our farmers, our laborers, and our manufacturers are one. Neither can hope for permanent and substantial prosperity at the expense of the other. All must prosper or suffer together. How can the manufacturer prosper if labor in his own or any other industry is underpaid or idle and unable to buy his products? If every family in America were adequately housed, clothed, and provided with the necessities and comforts of life in keeping with our American standard of living, there would be no idle manufacturing plants. Millions are without these necessities and comforts because of lack of employment at adequate wages.

How can the farmer prosper unless he has a home market? He can not have a home market if laborers are without profitable employment. How can labor hope for employment at adequate wages unless the manufacturer can run his business and make a reasonable profit? If wages do not come from profits made by the manufacturer, where will they come from? Our laborers, producers, and manufacturers benefit alike from protection against unreasonable and destructive foreign competition.

The tariff is not a panacea for all industrial and economic ills. This bill will not solve entirely the unemployment problem. No thinking man is deceived to so believe. New inventions, improved labor-saving machinery, curtailment in the use of many of our manufactured products heretofore staple, by reason of new discoveries, substitutes, and changed habits and fashions of life have all conspired to reduce the number of laborers necessary to operate the industries of the country.

In the last few years improved machinery has replaced manual labor to such an extent that world-wide unemployment has resulted, creating a problem that is entirely economic and

that will be difficult of satisfactory solution. No tariff legislation can solve this problem. This technological unemployment, occasioned by improved machinery replacing probably one and one-half million American laborers, injuriously affects the prosperity of every class of our citizenship. The question is how to take up the slack and place these unemployed back at work. Where will they go? What will they do? But one step in the solution of the problem is apparent. Our whole industrial structure must be rebuilt to meet the new conditions resulting from technological unemployment.

These replaced laborers must have work. Industry must provide that work. Again the farmer, the laborer, the manufacturer all are injured as the result of this idleness and resulting inability of the unemployed to buy the comforts of life and provide a home market for the farmer and manufacturer. Probably the labor cost of manufactured articles will have to be increased and spread among the producers of the raw material, the manufacturer, and the consumer, in order to so adjust the labor element in manufacture as to give employment to a large number of laborers. This will necessarily call for readjustment of hours and working conditions.

A WORLD PROBLEM

One thing is very certain. This world problem can not be solved by loud-mouthed politicians whose only knowledge of the problem or its solution is that this suffering on the part of a large part of our population affords opportunity for them to cover up their own shortcomings by cheap appeals to prejudice and partisan demagoguery.

Some of the rates of duty in the bill I do not personally approve. Some of them will be of no direct benefit to the people I represent. No tariff bill ever passed was perfect. But as a whole it is a good bill, and it has my hearty support. I am a protectionist from principle. The man who desires a high duty on the industries in his own district or section but fights protective duties on industries in other sections of the country is not a protectionist. He is a common mountain razorback hog in his tariff philosophy. I stand for the reasonable protection of every product and every industry in this country which has to meet foreign competition.

FLEXIBLE CLAUSE BEST FEATURE

The flexible clause of this bill is its best feature. It will tend to take the tariff question out of partisan politics. It is especially a godsend to the people of the South as well as to its politicians. Strange indeed that the southern Democrats in Congress have fought this provision above all others. This provision will save them of the inconsistency and embarrassment of slipping around committee rooms while protective bills are in the making, urging protection for products in their own districts and buttonholing protectionists to solicit their influence in favor of protection for their own industries, and then raising cane on the floor in opposition to "robber tariffs," "settling campaign contributions of soulless corporations," "saddling a billion dollars consumer's tax on the people for the enrichment of the trusts and monopolies," and such other illuminating froth (of which most of them are ashamed personally) blown off to keep alive sectional and class prejudice at home, but for which most of them would be relegated to oblivion.

This provision will enable producers and manufacturers in the South to present their claims for needed protection to an impartial nonpartisan body with hope of adjustment, and with hope of securing for industry in that section its fair share of the benefits of the American protective policy which has up to now been denied it, largely because of misrepresentation in Congress. What a price the South has paid through the years for the sake of a party name.

I am not impressed by the opposition of American manufacturers who have grown rich in this country from the energy and efficiency of American laborers and because of the benefits resulting from our protective-tariff policy, and who now have taken their wealth earned here and invested it in foreign countries in the manufacture there of motor vehicles and machinery by cheap foreign labor to be imported back into their own country, thus helping enrich other countries at our expense and providing employment to foreign laborers that should be given to our own. As a result of their deceptive cry for cheap motor vehicles and machinery for American farmers, backed by the lip sympathy of partisan demagogues, this bill permits those foreign-made goods, produced by renegade American industrialists, to be imported into this country free of duty. The American farmer is handed a gold brick under the specious plea of giving him cheap farm implements. He will get his cheap tractor made by foreign labor, while his own fellow Americans are idle, and he will fill his granaries with grain he can not sell because Henry Ford and others of his kind have helped destroy our home market for farm products by taking employment away from American laborers and giving it to citizens of other countries. But certain appropriately characterized politicians will rise on their hind legs and bray about overproduction of farm products and the hopeless plight of the farmers of America—a condition of their own making.

FAVORS RESTRICTED IMMIGRATION

There is another element in Congress opposed to this bill to which I desire to pay some attention. I refer to those Members from the southern and rural districts who label themselves "100 per cent Americans" and talk long and loud in favor of restricting immigration in the interest, as they profess, of the American laborer. I agree with them, but they go only half way. I favor restricted immigration for the same reason I favor a protective tariff. I am opposed to foreign laborers coming to this country to undermine and cut American wages and secure here in America jobs that belong to our own people. I also favor a tariff policy that will not permit them to produce abroad goods for America that should be produced by our own laborers.

The insincerity of this element I refer to is manifest in their vote on this bill. They work to prevent foreign laborers coming here to take the jobs of our laborers, and then vote to make it possible for them to stay abroad and produce foreign-made goods under much more undesirable living conditions than exist here, to be sold in this country, instead of protecting our own laborers in their jobs by insuring the manufacture of those goods here in America.

Necessarily a protective tariff means increased prices in most cases. But the opponents of protection are entirely unfair in their dire predictions of enormous increases in prices to the consumer. Their theory that all the raise in a tariff duty is reflected in the increased price of the commodity is unsound. It does not take into account American competition. So long as this Government properly regulates and controls trusts and monopolies and interstate commerce so as to protect the principle of home competition there can be no serious danger of exorbitant prices.

The difference between the Republican theory and that of the Democrats is that the Democrats would insure low prices by forcing the American laborer, the American farmer, and the American manufacturer to compete on unequal terms with foreigners, while the Republicans prefer to protect equally all our American interests from destructive foreign competition, and secure reasonable prices by lively competition among our own American people.

SIMPLE AMERICANISM

The Republican tariff philosophy may be expressed briefly in a paraphrase of a statement by Abraham Lincoln when he said in substance, that if one buys a suit of clothes abroad, he gets a suit of clothes, a foreign country gets the money, and a foreign laborer gets a job an American laborer ought to have had. But if one buys a suit of clothes made in America, he gets the suit of clothes, America keeps the money, and an American laborer is given a job. This is my tariff philosophy. It is good old simple Americanism. And that policy must be maintained in this country until the nations across the sea raise their standard of wages and living conditions among the laboring class to a parity with our own, which is the highest standard in the whole world.

Mr. SHOTT of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the principle of the protective tariff can not be successfully assailed. Only a faulty application of the protective principle enables criticism. To fix import duties so as to equalize the difference in labor and other costs of production here and abroad is a necessity that no one can gainsay in the face of the experience of many years. American workers can not live on a scale of wages as low as those paid in the countries of the Old World, and the other costs that enter into production are such that there is a wide difference in the sum total of costs of a commodity in the United States and in those foreign countries that would come into competition with us. Without tariff duties to equalize the difference, American investment and industry would be ruined. What other policy could be adopted that would secure and hold the American market for American enterprise and industry?

If we should wipe out the protective features of our tariff laws and undertake to compete we would be compelled to reduce wages, cut down the price of raw materials, decrease the outlay for distribution, lessen the profits of all who handled the commodities. To do this would take something out of the pay envelope of every worker and something from the returns of the investor in industry, and affect and injure the normal flow of business in every line. The farmers' products would have fewer buyers, the storekeeper fewer customers, the bank fewer depositors, the insurance companies smaller policies, and everything we eat, wear, use, or enjoy would have to be cheapened—

in fact the great mass of the American people would be compelled to reduce their standards of living. They would be able to buy some things cheaper, but it is certain that they would not have much to buy with.

The wealth and power of the United States have been built up under the operation of the protective tariff. I can testify—and many others with whom I have discussed the matter—that what small part of this world's goods I have accumulated were acquired during those years I lived under a protective tariff. The years under a nonprotective tariff were lean, and while they were passing, not only industry was paralyzed but business generally "marked time."

To the workingman, the small contractor, merchant and trader, professional man and teacher I desire to say that I want you to look up the record of your home and see if you did not pay for it during the years the Nation was under a protective tariff. Take your other investments—are they not on the same basis?

Every time the tariff is revised there is a flood of calamity prophets vociferous in their denunciation. Did any of their prophesies of dire results ever come true? Not one. The fact is known to all that the Nation has gone forward in industrial, commercial, and financial growth until it is the wonder of the world. Another fact that can not be disputed is that every new protective tariff has speeded up business, raised the standard of living, and opened wider the door of opportunity to the thrifty. I am not trying to prove this by figures or theory or speculation, but to prove it out of the experience of men who have toiled and saved.

The new tariff bill, all during its preparation and consideration, has been attacked by some so-called economists who are notoriously impractical; by some newspapers that specialize in attacks and select matter for display, not because of its constructive qualities, but because they pander to a taste that seeks destruction in all fields, whether they be governmental, social, moral, economical, or spiritual; and by those who through long years of opposition have become "set" in their hostility, like Ephraim was joined to his idols. The experience of the country, the results achieved, the building up of American industry, the advancement that has been accomplished means nothing to them. Facing the facts does not alter their unreasonable and faulty opinions. They are "that way" simply because "they are that way." They will appear when the next tariff revision takes place, and they will revamp all of the old frayed and frothy denunciation and calamity howling and spread it abroad again, just as they have done in the past, and just as they have done over this bill.

The wing of the Democratic Party which met at Houston in 1928 declared in favor of protection, but many of them did not live up to that profession. However, while only a few of that party favored the whole bill, nearly all of them voted for some part of it—in each case that part of the measure which extended protection to the districts they represent. They wanted protection from a selfish standpoint, as far as it would benefit them locally, but would not join in extending the benefits to the great mass of the American people.

There are those who are pointing to the foreign nations and pretending to shiver over what they are saying about this tariff. Most of this howl comes from American manufacturers who were so patriotic (?) that they established factories in countries where they could hire workers at pauper wages, and, of course, resent a duty on goods made on the starvation basis. These manufacturers wanted to beat the United States immigration laws and also to put Americans, working at the same kind of production, on an equality with the poorly paid people in their factories abroad. Let the foreign countries recognize that those who work are human beings, pay them better wages, and enable them to raise their standard of living, and then they might have some justification for an outcry. We are making this tariff for the American people, and making it on the principle of protecting our workers and keeping American markets for American enterprise and industry.

Canada objects! Yes; Canada has a duty on many things. Among these, coal. We must pay a duty on every ton of coal shipped into Canada from West Virginia. It is a poor rule that does not work both ways.

Other Members have discussed the various schedules and set forth the number of items increased and the number decreased and the percentages in comparison with former bills. I only care to say, as I did in the beginning, that no criticism can be raised against a protective tariff law except on those items where the duty is made more than it takes to equalize the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. After many months' study, and on the testimony of experts and practical, experienced manufacturers and agriculturists, unlimited discussion and the facts gathered through years by the Tariff Commission, the rates in this bill have been fixed, and I believe that the most of them are sound and will result in great good to the American people. If experience should develop that some of the schedules are too high to bring about a proper balance in domestic and world trade, the flexible provision under which the Tariff Commission and the President can adjust such duties, will prevent a continuance of any inaccuracy or abuse.

The protective tariff does not take from the poor and give to the rich; it does not take from the rich and give to the poor; it does not take from the worker and give to the employer; it does not take from the employer and give to the worker, but it provides a system under which both may give and both may take and both be benefited.

When labor and agriculture are prosperous the Nation is prosperous and the people hopeful and happy. This is what the new tariff bill will accomplish. A few months will bring a great business revival in this country. We will adjust our industry and commerce to the new conditions and go forward to greater prosperity.

The protective tariff laws passed from time to time by the Republican Party have been the Nation's stepping stones to better wages, higher standards of living, general prosperity, and national growth and progress—stepping stones that have kept the feet of millions of American men and women and children from the muck and the mire of poverty and d stress.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, the President called Congress in special session April 15, 1929, for the purpose of enacting legislation for the relief of agriculture and to consider a limited revision of the tariff for the purpose of putting agriculture on a parity with industry. Congress almost unanimously passed the farm relief bill, which was simply a marketing measure.

Although this law has been in operation for over a year, and the members of the board have had at their disposal half of the $500,000,000 authorized to be appropriated, there has been no appreciative benefit realized. The great boast that this board would stabilize price, particularly the great products such as wheat, corn, and cotton, has come to naught. Wheat is selling the cheapest in the history of the Nation; selling for less than $1 per bushel on the Chicago market to-day and about 75 cents on the farm; cotton is in the same condition, selling around 12 cents per pound. This condition exists, notwithstanding the fact the board has loaned almost $150,000,000 to stabilize prices. I had hoped this would not prove an experiment nor the fulfilling of a political pledge but would be of real benefit to agriculture. It is still to be hoped that good will result from this legislation, and the money placed in the hands of the board will not be a loss to the Government.

As soon as this law was enacted the trust barons dictated and caused to be enacted the most outrageous tariff law that was ever placed upon a just and forbearing people. It enables the great monopolies, by taxes, to drain the lifeblood from the people. There was no demand from the people or from either political party for such an unjust law. Speaker LONGWORTH, in his address to the Members of the House when Congress was assembled in special session, asked for modification of tariff rates, "as few in number as possible."

The President has never dared to state his position on the tariff, yet it was well known he would sign any bill which the monopolies demanded. When the unemployment condition became desperate, he called a conference of big business men last winter and they came by thousands from all sections of the Nation representing the big industries. It was then settled they would dictate the exorbitant rates in this tariff bill and the President would sign it.

To ascertain how the tariff affects you, compare the following rates, provided in the new law, with your income and figure how much you pay to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Then answer the question: Are you for this high protective tariff tax and will you vote to continue these Republicans in Congress?

WOMEN'S WEAR

Woolens, worsted dress goods now costing $4 will cost $6.25. Silks increased from $5 to $5.75 and cotton dress goods from $3 to $3.50. Woolen underwear now selling for $2 a suit will cost from $2.40 to $2.50, and a $4 suit will cost $5. Untrimmed hat now costing $1 will cost $1.45; $3 hat will cost $4.66, a $3 felt hat, light weight, will cost about $5.45. Leather gloves now costing $2 will sell for $3 and, in proportion, for more expensive ones. Women's, men's, and children's gloves are increased from 50 cents to $1 per pair, according to the length and quality. Cheap jewelry is much higher than ever before, while we will be required to pay $12 for a pair of shoes which now cost us $10. These figures are based upon the fact there is already a high tariff on all these items except shoes.

MEN'S WEAR

In addition to the high tax now upon a standard suit or overcoat which now sells for $35 will be added $5 by reason of this tariff. The heaviest percentage on men's clothing is in the cheaper-priced suits, made in large part from woolen rags. The present duty of 7½ cents per pound has been increased to 18 cents—an increase of 140 per cent. This will add several dollars to the price of every suit of clothes by the time it reaches the consumer. Sweaters now costing $3 will cost $3.50. Woolen underwear now selling at $2 per suit will cost $2.50. Men's shirts selling for $1.50 will cost $2; a shirt now selling for $3 will sell for about $4.50; the workman's shirt now costing 50 cents will sell for 75 cents. Inexpensive hats will be increased 75 cents. The estimated increased duty on the cheaper felt hats and derbies will be from $1 to $1.50.

HOW IT TAXES NEW HOMES OR IMPROVEMENTS

Those who are able to improve or those desiring to build a new home will be required to pay their tax to the tariff barons. Lumber, heretofore on the free list, now carries a tariff of $1 per thousand, although it was provided that telephone poles and railroad ties—needed by great corporations—should be free. Why should they be free and the humble home of the workman taxed? This is more atrocious when it is considered the Government guarantees to the railroads a fair dividend upon their investment.

Cement, heretofore on the free list, was given a protection of 6 cents per hundredweight, and will add at least $1,000 per mile to every mile of good road hereafter built in the United States. Senator BORAH estimates the cement tariff will cost the farmer $16,000,000. Cement industries are multiplying by the hundreds, selling more products and are in better financial condition than ever in their history, and it is a well-known fact they belong to a price-fixing association and you can not buy cement from one cheaper than from another.

Brick, formerly on the free list, bears a tariff of $1.25 to $1.50 per thousand. Glass, which goes into the windows and doors and the glassware used in the home, bears an increased rate, as well as paint. This tax on building material will add approximately $100 to the cost of a cheap humble home and have a tendency to retard building and improvements except by the wealthy.

HIDES AND LEATHER

A 10 per cent duty is provided on hides on the theory it is in the interest of agriculture. If the farmer were to receive practically all the benefit of this tariff on hides, he would reap about 30 cents for each hide. As a matter of fact he will get nothing; the benefit will be reaped by the livestock commission men and the packers. Whoever heard of a farmer figuring on the value of the hide, especially at a 10 per cent increase when he sold or bought a cow? This is only a smoke screen to cover up the duty of 20 per cent on shoes.

One hide will make about 10 pairs of shoes, and shoes which are now selling for $5 will hereafter sell for $6. Multiply the price you pay for shoes by 20 per cent, and it is easy to ascertain how much this tax will affect you. For the first time in tariff legislation leather of all kinds, from shoe soles to harness leather, bears a higher tariff rate. The Democrats of the House on a roll call endeavored to place hides, leather, and shoes on the free list, but were defeated.

SUGAR

Most of our sugar comes from Cuba, which bears a tariff of $1.76 per hundred. The bill as originally introduced carried a rate of $2.40 per hundred, but such a protest came from the Democrats and the people all over the country that the Senate reduced it to the present rate carried in the bill of $2 per hundred. Not long ago, after a thorough investigation, the Tariff Commission recommended to the President that the rate of $1.76 per hundred was too high and should be reduced under the flexible provision of the tariff, but no action was taken. This increase was for the benefit of the beet growers and the sugar refineries, principally of Colorado, and the sugarcane industries of Louisiana. The Great Western Sugar Co., of Colorado, which produces 48 per cent of the beet sugar of the United States, is one of the wealthiest corporations in this country. For each $100 originally invested in the stock a profit has been made amounting to $1,042.48, and each year it continues to pay handsome dividends in cash as well as in stock. Through the influence of this corporation, and in order to obtain the votes of the two Senators from Louisiana, this high tax was placed on sugar.

Congressman RAINEY, of Illinois, establishes the fact, if you were to divide the total increase of the cost of living caused by the sugar tariff each year in this country, by 1,000,000, which is the number of acres in sugar beets and cane, you would find the levy on the people of the United States is $300 per acre, for all land used for growing beets and sugarcane. In other language, the tariff paid on sugar each year in the United States is sufficient to pay $200 per acre for all the beet and sugarcane lands and to pay for all the refineries and equipment of those engaged in the production and refining of sugar in this country. This tariff on sugar is estimated to cost the average family of this Nation $7.50 per year. Is it fair, honest, or right that each year the people of the United States should pay enough tax on sugar to pay for all the money invested in these industries? All seed for beets are imported from Germany, free of tariff, and the work is principally done by Mexicans. It is a well-known fact that the cane fields of Louisiana are diseased and no longer in their present condition can sugarcane be grown in that State at a profit.

THE HOME

When we come to the home, we find every necessity of life is taxed. The cheaper the article, the more the tariff. Blankets, quilts, linens, glassware, china, knives and forks, dishes, cooking utensils, and everything about the kitchen bears a higher rate; queensware and crockery, of the cheap grade, now selling in the 5 and 10 cent stores for 10 cents, will cost 21 cents hereafter.

Not only will the tax apply to food, clothing, furnishings, rugs, and everything about the home, but on medicine and surgical instruments. The increased rates on cheaper jewelry, watches, and clocks are astonishing, although the rates on pearls and diamonds have been reduced 10 per cent. Toothbrushes, razors and razor blades, brushes, brooms, combs, electrical equipments, radios, musical instruments, and records all pay tribute to these tariff barons.

Eight hundred and twenty-five specific increases have been made in this bill, making a 20 per cent increase over the tariff bill of 1922. It is estimated the average rate carried in this bill is 40 per cent. It is fair to estimate a man making $1,200 a year will spend $200 of that amount for other than the necessities of life, which are not taxed, and 40 per cent of the remainder, or $400, is the tax which he will pay under the tariff law.

The old saying is true. Under the terms of this bill everything is taxed from the swaddling clothes which greets a newborn babe, as well as the baby carriage, medicine, and surgical instruments, which preserve its health, life, and happiness, and when the child grows older and dies its estate pays a tax on its burial shroud and the tombstone erected to its memory.

FARMER

The farmer is the worse hit of any class; he not only uses the necessities of life, such as those living in the cities, but he is required to equip himself for farming. Harness leather, which has heretofore been free, although harness is higher than ever before, under this bill bears a duty of 12½ per cent; and leather strips and saddles, heretofore free, bear a tax of 15 per cent. Forks, hoes, and rakes, formerly on the free list, are taxed 30 per cent. Most farming implements were placed on the free list, which is nothing but a camouflage to fool the farmer; everything in the way of steel, copper, aluminum, iron, timber, and other metals which go into these farm implements are protected by high import duties, which is added to the manufactured article and charged to the farmer. One of the biggest monopolies of this country is the manufacturing of farm implements and machinery; all fix the same prices and are charging more for farm implements to-day than during war times, yet no effort is being made by the party in power to dissolve this trust and combination.

The Republicans claim this bill is greatly in the interest of agriculture because a tariff has been placed on many agricultural products. There are some rates on agricultural commodities which will benefit the farmers in some sections of the country, such as small fruit and vegetable farmers, but they are negligible as compared with the industrial rates. Where a 10-cent benefit is given the farmer a dollar is taken away from him.

Tariff on wheat, corn, oats, pork, beef, and other staple farm products are ineffective as we produce a large surplus of these commodities and must depend upon the foreign markets. These nations do not have money to buy our farm products and depend upon exchanging their products for ours. Under this high protective tariff they can not afford to exchange or buy our products and it will mean more surplus and a cheaper price.

Take for instance a duty of 42 cents per bushel on wheat, provided for in this bill, and tell me how the wheat grower can be protected or the price of wheat raised by this tariff? We export approximately 200,000,000 bushels of the wheat produced each year, and the price of wheat is governed by the foreign market. In 1929 we produced 806,508,000 bushels of wheat and there was only imported into this country 37,231 bushels, or one two-hundredths of 1 per cent of the amount produced. Anyone with two ideas above the savage in the jungle of Africa

could readily see the importing of wheat into this country does not affect the price and there is not a chance in the world for the tariff on wheat to give any relief to the farmer. Instead of relief it is an injury to him because the other nations of the world revolt at the high tariff they have to pay on the products they import into this country and exchange for our wheat.

The same is true of corn, oats, cotton, and most of the other staple crops of this country.

THE DEBENTURE PLAN

The only way to make the tariff benefit the farmer is through the export debenture plan. This plan, coupled with the agricultural rates carried in the bill, would be of great financial benefit. If we are to have a high protective tariff for the industries of the East, why not an export debenture for farm products? The debenture was placed in the bill by the Senate but unfortunately eliminated by the overwhelming Republican majority in the House. The debenture provided that on all commodities exported the Government should issue a certificate to the owner of the product for one-half the tariff on that item, and these certificates would be redeemable in paying tariff. The operation of this plan would mean if a farmer exported wheat, the Government would issue a certificate for 21 cents on each bushel, being one-half the tariff on wheat. These certificates could be sold to those paying tariff on goods imported into this country. Cotton having no tariff rate was provided for under the debenture plan at 2 cents per pound and would thus benefit to the extent of $10 per bale. It is claimed that this would be a subsidy and require the Government to lose money which it would otherwise collect on tariff. But if these high tariff rates are good for the Government and the eastern industries, it is nothing more than fair that one-half of the tariff on exported surplus should go to relieve the farmers in their distressed condition. It would stimulate business, give foreign nations better chance to exchange commodities, and bring in more goods upon which a tariff would be paid to the Government.

Republicans formerly claimed the tariff did not raise the price of articles and the consumer was not required to pay this tax, but it is now conceded that such an argument was false. Under the tariff law when goods are imported into this country they are met at the seaports and required to pay to the custom officers the import duties specified in the tariff law. For instance, if the suit of clothes I have on could be made and sold in this country at a reasonable profit for $30 and there was a tariff of $10 placed upon this suit, it would mean before the foreign merchant could compete with the domestic merchant he would have to pay into the Treasury of this country $10 on the suit as a tariff or import duty. As a result of this high tariff, he can not compete with the American merchant and pay this tariff; therefore, the American merchant adds this protective tariff onto the price of the suit, sells it for $40, and places the $10 profit in his pocket. A high protective tariff means what it says. Its friends want a tariff so high that it will protect American industries and keep out competition. If this is not the working of the tariff, why is it these great industries demand it? It can thus be readily seen that the tariff is nothing but a tax and the protection is not the protection the consumer receives, nor the laborer receives, but the protection the manufacturing industries receive, which protection goes, not into the Federal Treasury but into the treasury of the protected industries. It is the pursuing of this policy that has caused the wealth to accumulate into the hands of a few, and has caused so many millionaires to be made in this country, all to the detriment and injury of the poor, laboring, and agricultural people of this country. Its tendency is in keeping with the policy of the Republican Party—a strong centralized Government and the accumulation of the wealth into the hands of a few.

Not satisfied with the higher rates contained in this bill, the flexible provision was inserted which gives the President authority to raise or lower the tariff 50 per cent. Of course, the producers know they will not be represented. The future will be a repetition of the past. All changes will be increases. It is this provision that President Hoover so strenuously insisted upon. This changes the taxing power, delegated to Congress under the Constitution, and vests it in the President. A vicious President could use it for political purposes and obtain large campaign contributions from highly protected monopolies and thus perpetuate his party in power.

It has never been the policy of Democracy to be opposed to a protective tariff, and, in fact, in the early history of our Government, when this party was in power for many years, it initiated and pursued the policy of a protective tariff; but when these protected industries became rich and opulent and came to Congress and made demands the party then realized it was time the people of the country should be taken into consideration and given protection. To-day it stands for a reasonable and fair protection for industries and certainly for labor and agriculture. It stands for equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

In keeping with the policy of my party and to protect the infant industries of this country, I collected the facts and made the only speech before the committee and the House on canned tomatoes. Under the Democratic tariff law, the tariff rate was 25 per cent but in 1922 the Republicans, evidently through oversight, cut the tariff rate down to 15 per cent, and placed a 10 per cent tariff on tin, which caused the tomato-canning industry to become almost insolvent.

This bill originally carried 25 per cent, but after my argument the House and Senate increased the rate to 50 per cent, which is now the law. This was required to protect the canners on account of Italy being able to employ labor at 8 cents a day and flood the American market with cheap canned tomatoes. In my congressional district there are approximately 100 canneries, and the Ozark region cans 30 per cent of all the tomatoes of the United States. This tariff will benefit the tomato growers and the canning industry and enable them to prosper.

This country is committed to the policy of a tariff, but the day has come and gone when the American public will stand for such exorbitant taxation as contained in this measure. Foreign nations are up in arms and protesting against America building a protection wall so high and strong that it can not be penetrated or scaled by foreign commerce. It means they will go elsewhere to exchange their products for such things as America has to sell. This tariff law has been denounced by most of the leading newspapers and journals of this country, irrespective of politics. Over a thousand leading economists recently set forth their reasons in opposition to this bill; the farm organizations are bitterly opposed to it and the hardships which it works upon agriculture. Many of the great captains of industry are bitterly denouncing the measure, claiming the rates are shocking and will kill business with foreign nations, stagnate business, and lower prices on commodities produced in this country.

If a voter is in favor of this tax he should vote to keep the Republican Party in power. It is high time the rank and file should quit voting the Republican ticket simply because their fathers and mothers were Republicans. Most of the fathers and mothers who caused the Republican Party to be what it is to-day, if living, would not approve of such a policy. The Senators from Wisconsin and practically all of the other progressive Republican Senators west of the Mississippi fought and voted against this infamous tariff bill.

The day the President announced he would sign this bill one of the greatest crashes occurred on Wall Street. Where is this prosperity which the Republicans claim they always produce when in power? If it does not exist, who is responsible? Banks are failing all over the Nation, interest rates are sky high, land banks no longer make loans on farms because the rate of interest is too low, Wall Street has a crash every few days, the unemployment situation is distressing, bread lines are formed in the larger cities to take care of the hungry, mortgages are being foreclosed, business and agriculture is depressed, and still the Republican Party now in control places a higher tax and burden upon the people than was ever thought of before. It is time to decide whether you will join with Democracy and the progressive Republicans in their fight for equal rights to all—consumers, labor, and agriculture—or be caught in the avalanche which will bury in November those defending and protecting special interest. Think it over.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the producers of long-staple cotton in the South and Southwest are gratified that the tariff act of 1930 carries a duty of 7 cents per pound on cotton having a staple of 1⅛ inches or more in length. The average ad valorem rates under the tariff act of 1922, calculated upon the basis of 1928 imports, is 38.75 per cent, while the average rate, under the act of 1930, is 41.14 per cent. The average of Schedule 7, covering agricultural products, is 35.07 per cent, while the average of Schedule 9, embracing the manufactures of cotton, is 46.42 per cent. The duty of 7 cents is equivalent to an ad valorem rate of approximately 25 per cent on Delta staples.

POLITICAL PARTIES

Prior to and certainly since 1928 both the Republican and Democratic Parties have stood for the protective theory and for the protective tariff, as opposed to free trade or to a tariff for revenue only. The platforms of 1928 recognized the inequalities of tariff legislation between manufacturing and agriculture. The Republican platform declared that the home market belonged to the American farmer, and that it should be reserved to him. Differences between foreign wages and foreign costs

of living are to be considered in agriculture as well as in manufacturing. President Herbert Hoover asserted that the tariff is the major factor, if not the basis, in legislation for farm relief. Thert is an ideal opportunity for the application of the doctrine of protection in the case of long staple cotton. The producer will be benfitted if the American market is reserved to him. Both political parties promised to remove the inequalities between agriculture and manufacturing.

A great deal has been said about a Democratic tariff and a Republican tariff. The object of tariffs is to improve and not destroy trade and commerce. The real measure of tariff duties in the platform of both parties is the difference between domestic and foreign costs of production. The parties differ not so much on tariff principles as in their application. Republican tariffs on the manufactured products are high. Democratic tariffs have undertaken to do equal justice to industry and agriculture. Republican tariffs carry higher rates in the manufacturing schedules.

Agriculture is discriminated against. Tariff rates on manufactures are effective, while tariff rates on agricultural crops of which there is a considerable exportable surplus are not generally effective. The purpose of a tariff is to protect the American producer by reserving to him the American market, which is the largest market in the world. The aim is to protect the American producer against imports. Who needs the protection, the farmer or the manufacturer? Four-fifths of the total imports in 1927 were agricultural. The real competition is between the domestic and foreign producers of agricultural products.

WORLD TRADE

The domestic trade aggregates $90,000,000,000 annually, while our foreign trade, including imports and exports, aggregates $9,000,000,000. The domestic market is therefore ten times greater than the foreign market. It is easily seen, therefore, that the domestic manufacturer is greatly benefited by excluding the foreign manufacturer from the greatest market on earth. The Republican Party undertakes to justify high industrial rates by asserting that our foreign trade has increased under Republican tariffs. They boast of the increase. They neglect to say, however, that the chief item of our exports is cotton. It is approximately one-fifth of the value of our exports. It is the determining factor in our world trade. Under protective tariffs heretofore no part of this, the greatest of all domestic crops, was protected. The Republican Party might as well claim credit for our increase in population, wealth, and education.

I submit that domestic production and general expansion are in a large measure responsible for the increase in foreign trade. It results not because of but in spite of high industrial rates. The fair question is not whether there has been an increase in foreign trade but whether the United States has increased its share in the foreign trade. The fair question is whether our foreign trade has kept step with our increase in domestic trade and with our increase in production. It is significant when we consider the effect of the tariff that the American share in world trade has declined slightly since 1922, according to the statement of E. Dana Duran, chief of the division of statistical research, Department of Commerce, on May 18, 1929, although exports and imports have increased in volume. The increase has followed the expansion of trade. It is not a question of whether our export trade has increased or not. It is a question of whether our share has increased.

COMPETITIVE TARIFF

Progressive manufacturers are in favor of the principle of protection, but they suggest caution in the application of the principle. They will be satisfied with a competitive tariff. They do not want the case overstated. They know that prohibitive tariffs will hinder our foreign trade and end in reprisals. Personally I oppose free trade. I oppose a tariff for revenue only. I believe in a reasonable and effective tariff that will foster agriculture and manufacturing at home and promote trade and commerce abroad. I supported many of the rates in the present bill, but I could not support the act, because the benefits to agriculture, and particularly to the cotton growers are small compared with the burdens imposed upon the cotton grower.

The duty on staple cotton is more than offset by the increased duties on the necessities of life. A prohibitive tariff, an unjust tariff, is one of the greatest obstacles to an economically sane and balanced agriculture. I favor a competitive tariff, which is the only reasonable tariff.

AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY IN THE ACT OF 1930

In the older countries agriculture has been subordinated to industry. The protective tariff in the United States to-day promotes industry at the expense of agriculture. When the farmer asks for equality of treatment he is told that economic laws must run their course and that the price of farm products is governed by the law of supply and demand. This is rank hypocrisy. I would gladly have supported a tariff act that provided equality between industry and agriculture and that contained legislation to make effective the tariff on agricultural crops of which we produce an exportable surplus. An honest tariff act should contain the provisions that give the farmer the equivalent benefit of the tariff. It may be bounty or debenture. The manufacturer profits by a tariff; while the farmer, with other consumers, pays the price. In the last analysis the tariff, the bounty, and the debenture are all subsidies.

President Hoover advocated a limited revision of the tariff, primarily in aid of agriculture. There are rates that will benefit certain farmers, but the benefits are more than offset by the increased cost of living and of production.

The farmer will pay $10 for every dollar in increase that he receives. There is a tariff of 42 cents a bushel on wheat and a tariff of 25 cents a bushel on corn. All statesmen, however, are agreed that a duty on agricultural products of which we produce an exportable surplus is not effective as a matter of protection. I repeat, a fair tariff should contain provisions to make these rates effective. The remedy is a reasonable tariff. There is no reason why every article or product that is imported, where there is domestic production, should not pay a reasonable duty. Foreign manufacturers and foreign producers should contribute to the expense of the Government. The public interest is promoted by free coffee and free rubber, because there is no domestic production. Such is not the case, however, with cotton. Moreover, the agricultural problem is national. Manufacturing can not prosper permanently without agriculture.

PROTECTION

It matters but little what our theories on the tariff are. Protection now obtains in all countries. There must be protection for all or none. We are face to face with conditions and not theories to-day. Forty years ago it looked as if free trade would dominate the world. England had free trade before the World War for 75 years. She was the great creditor nation of the world. But the World War changed conditions. The leading nations of the world have gone to protection.

The Democratic and Republican Parties recognize that the protective theory now obtains. The difference between the two parties, as I have said, is in the application, rather than in principle. I favor a tariff that permits imports on a competitive basis. I oppose a tariff that prohibits imports. I advocate a tariff that promotes trade and commerce. I believe in America. The domestic producer, whether manufacturer or grower, with his undisputed efficiency should be placed on equal or better terms than his foreign competitor.

The theory of a tariff to promote infant industries was discarded long ago. Those who advocate unjust industrial rates now offer as their favorite plea the protection of American labor. This is bolstering high protection by mere claptrap. Other countries have higher tariffs than the United States. Laboring classes are not maintained by high tariffs. Their standards are promoted by efficient production.

Furthermore, it may be said that unfair protection leads to antiquated and inefficient methods of production. May not this be the trouble with shoe manufacturing in New England to-day? May not this be the difficulty with the textiles of New England? If New England textiles had kept step with the progress in improved methods and machinery that has obtained in other industries, their situation would undoubtedly be better. It may be that the sons of former manufacturers are losing because they continue to use machinery that is antiquated and should have been discarded long ago.

One of the dangers of high and dishonest tariffs is monopoly. It is easy for manufacturers to organize. They can control production. They can close down factories. The difficulties of both production and organization in agriculture are almost insurmountable. A fair and just tariff act that may result in monopoly to the manufacturer should give equivalent relief to agriculture.

THE DUTY BENEFICIAL TO ALL COTTON

The rate on staple cotton will be beneficial to all cotton. At present the premium on long-staple cotton is depressed, largely as a result of importations of Egyptian cotton. The manufacturers have been buying long-staple cotton for substantially the same price that they usually pay for short-staple cotton. The result has been competition between long-staple and short-staple cotton that has resulted disastrously to short-staple cotton. It is a fallacy to say that the duty on any import will automatically increase the price by the amount of the duty. Production, competition, supply, and demand play their part. Stabilization of price will undoubtedly result, and I believe that there will be an increase in price to the producers of long-staple cotton. Staple cotton will be diverted from uses to which short cotton is

adapted, and another result will be the elimination of competition between staple and short cotton, with an increase in the price of short cotton. The purpose is to reserve the American market to the American producer. It will be helpful to analyze production and consumption in the light of imports and exports.

CLASSES AND ESTIMATES

Domestic cotton is divided into two classes—American upland and American Egyptian or Pima cotton. There are two kinds of American upland cotton. Cotton having a staple of 1⅛ inches or more is called long-staple cotton, and cotton having a staple under 1⅛ inches is classed short-staple cotton. The American Egyptian or Pima cotton usually has a staple of 1½ inches or more. Formerly there was produced in the Southeastern States a long-staple cotton known as sea-island cotton, but in recent years its production has largely disappeared because of the ravages of the boll weevil as well as the importation of Egyptian cotton. One hundred and seventy-nine bales were produced in 1928. The seed practically disappeared. Fortunately, the Department of Agriculture had saved some seed, and it is believed that the tariff on staple cotton will encourage the production of sea-island cotton. All cotton throughout the Cotton Belt is produced under boll-weevil conditions, hence the national interest in a tariff on long-staple cotton. The United States should not be dependent upon any foreign country for the production of its staple cotton. We now have reliable statistics on the domestic production of staple cotton. For the first time Congress provided some two years ago for estimates of the grade, staple length, and tenderability of domestic cotton.

PRODUCTION

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics in their report of April 19, 1929, estimated the production of staple cotton 1⅛ inches and more in length in 1928 to be 632,216 bales, while the production of American Egyptian cotton was 28,310 bales. The total crop was 14,296,500 bales.

CONSUMPTION

For the year ending July 31, 1928, the United States consumed 537,826 bales of domestic staple cotton and 15,137 bales of Pima cotton, while there was consumed 217,584 bales of Egyptian cotton and 16,106 bales of Peruvian cotton, which latter cotton is about 1 5/16 inches and longer in length. The United States therefore imports about one-third of the staple cotton consumed and exports, as I shall show hereafter, about one-fourth to one-third of its production. It consumes approximately 800,000 bales of staple cotton, and there is a domestic production of approximately 700,000 bales. A reasonable tariff would stabilize the price of staple cotton and lead to the domestic consumption of practically all of the staple cotton produced in the United States.

EXPORTS

There are no Government statistics as to the exports of long-staple cotton. I quote from page 2306 of the Summary of Tariff Information, 1929:

> There is some confusion in the trade as to how staple length is to be measured, and cotton considered 1⅛ inches in certain localities is considered short staple in others. The discrepancy can merely be pointed out, not satisfactorily explained here.

I call attention, however, to the fact that domestic producers of staple cotton had accurate records covering their exports, and, as shown by page 4481 of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, 70 to 75 per cent of Delta staples are consumed in the United States. The lack of Government statistics accounts for the discrepancies in the statements as to the exports of long-staple cotton. The figures frequently quoted are furnished by exporters. The discrepancy may also be explained by the fact that staple cotton is usually sold on types. The Government statistics cover staples based upon the official cotton standards of the Department of Agriculture. The Government collects statistics covering the domestic production, and it is sufficient to say that exports could not exceed production.

IMPORTS

The chief imports of long-staple cotton are from Egypt. For the year ending July 31, 1928, there were 202,000 bales. These imports are increasing. For the year ending July 31, 1929, they amounted to 296,286 bales. I may add that the imports of all foreign cottons are increasing. For the year ending July 31, 1929, there were imported 457,804 bales, the imports for 1928 having been 338,226 bales.

EGYPTIAN COTTON

Egyptian cotton is all long staple. There are two classes: Uppers, which is 1⅜ inches in length and shorter, and Sakellarides, which is 1 7/16 inches in length and longer.

As I pointed out in my argument before the Finance Committee of the Senate (Hearings, p. 208), Egyptian export statistics indicate that 30 per cent of the cotton exported from Egypt to the United States is 1⅜ inches in length and longer, while 70 per cent is 1⅛ to 1⅜ inches.

DELTA STAPLES

Delta staples are generally 1⅛ to 1⅜ inches in length, and are largely grown in the Delta of Mississippi, which district I have the honor to represent. The average annual production is around 500,000 bales. In 1929 there were produced in Mississippi 515,300 bales of staple cotton 1⅛ inches and longer, while the total domestic production was 683,200 bales according to the report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics April 18, 1930. Much short cotton is now being grown also in the Delta of Mississippi. Delta staples are also grown in Arkansas and Louisiana, while staple cotton comparable to Delta staples is raised in the Southwest and to a limited extent throughout the Cotton Belt. American Egyptian or Pima cotton is grown in Arizona, New Mexico, and California, but principally in Arizona.

SUBSTITUTION

Egyptian uppers are competitors of Delta staples. Two-thirds of Egyptian imports are uppers. Deltas and uppers may be used substantially interchangeably. Delta staples can be substituted for Egyptian uppers. This is the great benefit of the duty on staple cotton. The Mississippi Delta will be the chief beneficiary. Sakellarides is the competitor of Pima cotton. The duty will benefit Pima cotton. It can be substituted for Sakellarides.

PREMIUMS

Ordinarily, there is a premium or difference in price between short cotton and long-staple cotton. It varies from 2 to 10 cents per pound. There is a similarity between prices of domestic staples and foreign staples. The relative price of staple and short cotton depends upon importations and upon productions. There is no fixed difference and the price varies from year to year, and is determined by productions and importations. Importations have increased in recent years. There has been a larger carry-over, which constitutes a weight on the market, and this has resulted in an unprecedented depression in the price of domestic staples. The premium received for staple cotton usually determines its production.

It is more hazardous to grow staple cotton than it is to grow short cotton, particularly under boll-weevil conditions, and hence it is that with foreign competition, the production of the longer staple cotton has decreased in the United States. It costs more to produce long-staple cotton than short cotton. The yield per acre is much less. The growing season is much longer. A reduction in premium or price results in small production. While staple cotton is produced in Texas, and to a limited extent in all of the cotton-growing States, the production is more largely established and more extensive in the Mississippi Delta than in all other cotton-producing States combined.

The industry is now depressed. Very small premiums have obtained for the last three years. I should say that the average has been less than one-fourth the average premium of former years. A reasonable tariff with an increase in premiums and a stabilization in price will do much to rehabilitate the growing of long-staple cotton in the Mississippi Delta and elsewhere.

COSTS OF LABOR

Labor is the major cost in any production. This applies to the raw as well as the manufactured material. It is generally conceded that foreign costs of labor are 40 per cent less than in the United States. The costs of labor in Egypt are probably one-fourth what they are in the United States. A report from the American consul at Alexandria, Egypt, Mr. Raymond H. Geist, dated December 22, 1928, stated that the daily rates of agricultural workers were from 30 to 50 cents for men and 15 to 25 cents for women and children in Egypt. The wage rate in the staple areas of the South and Southwest is from $1.25 to $3 a day. Again, the American vice consul at Alexandria, Egypt, Mr. Joseph I. Touchette, on September 30, 1927, in submitting a report on the cost of the production of cotton in Egypt, among other things, said:

> The pickers, mostly children, are divided into groups of from 10 to 15, with an overseer in charge who does not spare the lash, which he usually carries, if any ripe cotton is left behind by the children.

Cotton pickers in Egypt are paid from 7½ to 25 cents per day for picking staple cotton. They earn from $1 to $3 per day in the United States.

FOREIGN TARIFFS

Other countries producing cotton, and particularly staple cotton, have a duty on imports. The tariffs as compiled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce on January

29, 1929, show that Mexico has a duty of 5.1 cents per pound; Peru, 6.6 cents per pound; Brazil, 7.19 cents per pound; and Egypt, 8 per cent. Since 1916 Egypt has had an embargo on cotton. No cotton can be imported into Egypt. The Egyptian Government also imposes an export tax of 2½ per cent on all cotton exported. Egyptian cotton has, therefore, had access to American markets without contributing in any wise to the costs of our Government, while the American consumer is paying a part of the costs of the Egyptian Government. Surely the United States should treat domestic producers as well as other governments treat their cotton growers.

There was a tariff on all cotton in the United States, beginning with the act of 1790, which levied a duty of 3 cents per pound, including the act of 1866, which also levied the same duty. Raw cotton was eliminated first by the act of 1883, and has been exempt from duty since, except for the period of the emergency act of 1921, which was in effect from May 7, 1921, to September 21, 1922, and this act provided for a tariff of 7 cents per pound only on cotton 1⅜ inches and longer. The act of 1930 provides for a tariff on Delta staples for the first time since the Civil War. Raw cotton is included in the tariff picture for the first time since the War between the States.

TARIFF EFFECTIVE

The emergency tariff act of 1921 was effective. I refer to page 2304, Summary of Tariff Information, 1929: Sixteen thousand bales of Sakellarides cotton were imported during the emergency tariff act in 1921 and 31,000 bales in 1922, while in the year 1928 approximately 66,000 bales were imported. The duty was beneficial. It has been tried and found effective. Imports will be decreased and there will be stabilization, as well as increase in price.

AMERICAN USES OF EGYPTIAN COTTON

From 50 to 60 per cent of Egyptian imports are used in making tire fabrics. The annual importation has been around 225,000 bales, and uppers are largely used in tire fabrics, while Sakellarides is used in fine threads and fine fabrics. The hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and before the Finance Committee disclosed that Delta staples can be substituted for Egyptian uppers, especially in the tire trade. The mills have substituted when the premium on Egyptian uppers was too high. The manufacturer himself has answered the argument as to substitution. Until the growth of sea-island cotton has been resumed it may be admitted that 50,000 bales of Sakellarides, the longest Egyptian cotton, are needed by American industries, particularly in fine fabrics and in the manufacture of heavy tires suitable for trucks or busses. Pima cotton has been substituted.

IMPORTANCE

The question is: Will the American grower of staple cotton be denied the benefits of the tariff for the advantage of those who consume 50,000 bales of imported cotton? While there are thousands of employees in the comparatively few mills that use Egyptian cotton, there are hundreds of thousands of Americans toiling in the fields of the South to compete with the cheapest labor in Africa.

Staple cotton averages about 5 per cent of the domestic production, and the value of the annual crop ranges from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000. Only 2 per cent of the textiles used in the United States is imported, while approximately 35 per cent of the staple cotton consumed is imported. If the tariff should be denied to 5 per cent production, affected by 35 per cent imports, by the same token there would be no tariff on cotton manufactures, for only 2 per cent is imported.

COMPETITION

The Tariff Commission has investigated the question of competition. Their conclusions are impartial. I quote from page 2304, the Summary of Tariff Information, 1929:

> Egyptian cotton is the most important competitor of American-grown cotton in the domestic market, as all of the imports from Egypt are over 1⅛ inches in staple length.

I quote again from page 2305:

> Average annual imports of cotton having a staple of 1⅜ inches and over are more than four times as large as the domestic Pima crop, with which such imports are competitive.

I quote further from page 2306:

> Domestic long-staple cottons are subject to foreign competition, which varies with the length of staple.

THREAD AND TIRES

The representatives of the thread and tire industries opposed a tariff on staple cotton. Both have a tariff. The thread and tire manufacturers use domestic and foreign staple cotton. The tariffs on the manufactures of staple cotton have been increased materially in the act of 1930. The opposition to the proposed duty on staple cotton is protected. The manufacturer has been protected through the years. The textile industry favors free raw cotton. It favored free raw cotton when there was ample sea-island cotton. The opposition to a tariff on staple cotton is based upon the contention that there is no real competition between domestic and foreign staples. The opponents asserted that there could be no substitution. The manufacturers are interested. They want cheap cotton. That is natural. The manufacturer wants free material. That is selfish.

The chief increases in the tariff act of 1930 on cotton manufactures are on the manufactured products of staple cotton. It is most inconsistent in the textile manufacturers, the chief beneficiaries of the protective system, to oppose corresponding benefits to the growers.

I shall not repeat the arguments that I made in support of a tariff on staple cotton on January 25, 1930, as shown by page 2396 of the RECORD, nor shall I repeat the arguments that I made on May 11, 1929, as shown by page 1159 of the RECORD, but the fair conclusion is that the manufacturers have substituted and can use Egyptian and domestic staples interchangeably. I pointed this out in my arguments before the Committee on Ways and Means and before the Finance Committee of the Senate. I emphasized the matter in my remarks on Monday, May 20, 1929, as shown by page 1591 of the RECORD.

The Tariff Commission has stated that there is competition which involves substitution.

There is a tariff on all the manufactured products of staple cotton, including thread and fine fabrics. There is a tariff of 25 per cent ad valorem on tire fabrics, and approximately 25 per cent on threads. There is a tariff of 10 per cent on automobiles. The tariff on fine fabrics has been materially increased. The American market has been reserved to the thread and to the tire industry. Cotton manufacturers have a monopoly.

OPPOSITION INCONSISTENT

In addition to the 10 per cent ad valorem on automobiles, there is a duty of 25 per cent on automobile trucks, and as I have stated, there is a duty of 25 per cent on tire fabrics. It is estimated by the Tariff Commission in their summary, 1929, that at the beginning of 1928 there were 29,700,000 automobiles, of which 82 per cent, or 24,200,000, were in the United States and Canada. In 1927 exports were 15 per cent of the domestic production. The Tariff Commission also finds that the United States produces over 80 per cent of the tires of the world. The importations are negligible. Tire fabrics have no competition from abroad. The American market has been reserved to them. Surely, neither the textile manufacturers nor the tire manufacturers can complain if the American market is reserved to the growers of staple cotton, who are only asking that they be given the very market that has been reserved to American textiles and American tires.

Ex-Senator Henry F. Lippitt, representing the New England textile manufacturers, Mr. F. O. McDevitt, representing the Page Mills, Mr. John B. Clark, and Mr. R. C. Kerr, representing the thread industry, and Mr. M. E. Clark, representing the tire-manufacturing industry, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. They all admitted that staple cotton needed relief, and ex-Senator Lippitt actually proposed a bounty for long-staple cotton. The product is certainly entitled to protection, and the case is fully made out when a New England statesman advocates a bounty in its behalf. Our opponents are the high priests of protection for manufactures but free traders when it comes to raw materials. They conducted a vigorous campaign in opposition to the proposed tariff on staple cotton. I answered their contentions and replied to their arguments during the consideration of the tariff legislation. I made the opening argument for a duty on staple cotton before the Ways and Means Committee on February 23, 1929, as shown by page 8438 of the hearings. I answered the criticisms and misrepresentations on the floor of the House on January 25, 1930. I invoked the doctrine of President Hoover, who maintained that the tariff was the chief factor in agricultural relief. I pleaded that the platform declarations of both parties be followed. I urged that there is a place for the application of the protective policy in the matter of staple cotton. I endeavored to be just, fair, and reasonable. I appealed to reason. I relied upon facts and presented reliable statistics. I invoked fair play and equal treatment. I maintained that if the tariff is to be utilized in aid of agriculture, a reasonable tariff should be granted to the growers of staple cotton.

During the conference on the tariff bill a desperate effort was made by the tire-manufacturing industry to defeat the duty on staple cotton. The tire industry uses from 700,000 to 1,000,000

bales of cotton annually. Approximately 600,000 bales of this cotton is 1⅛ inches and longer in length. Heretofore 150,000 bales of Egyptian have been used. The tire industry uses largely Egyptian uppers. The duty on staple cotton should result in their using Delta staples.

SHORT-STAPLE COTTON

There is no good reason why there should not be a reasonable tariff on all cotton. We import about 25,000 bales of Peruvian cotton, but it is fair to state that it is not used in either the tire or thread industry. The annual imports of all cotton now aggregate 500,000 bales. Those who enjoy our markets should contribute revenue to the support of our Government. Domestic cotton can be substituted for practically all foreign cottons, whether they are raised in Mexico, China, India, Russia, Brazil, Peru, or Egypt.

There is no reason for a tariff on a product where there is no domestic production, but if the tariff is to be used to protect domestic industries, it should be utilized to protect American agriculture where there is any domestic production.

Our total cotton production is approximately 15,000,000 bales annually. From 50 to 60 per cent is exported. A tariff on short cotton without the debenture or bounty to make it effective would not result in protection, and it would not be treating agriculture fairly.

A tariff on staple cotton will be of benefit to the growers of short cotton. The consumers will now use short cotton where they formerly used staple cotton. A premium on staple cotton will be insured and there will be a better demand for short cotton. There is no good reason to deny the tariff to staple growers merely because the manufacturer now needs some 50,000 bales of Sakellarides. The domestic grower should be encouraged because domestic requirements are being so fully and completely met. A tariff on short cotton was voted down in the Senate. An amendment by Senator HEFLIN for a tariff on short cotton was defeated.

We do not produce enough sugar for domestic consumption. We produce only one-fifth of our domestic requirements for sugar and only two-fifths of our domestic requirements for wool. If the arguments of the opponents of a tariff on staple cotton had obtained, there would be no tariff on either sugar or wool.

COMPENSATORY DUTIES

Generally a duty on the raw product implies a compensatory duty. I pointed out in the arguments that I made during the consideration of the tariff that the growers had no objection to a reasonable compensatory duty. Ex-Senator Henry F. Lippitt, as shown by page 8484 of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, and as shown by his statement on page 182 of the Senate hearings, maintained that in the event of a tariff on staple cotton there should be a compensatory duty 40 per cent greater than the duty on raw cotton. This would have made a compensatory rate of 9.7 cents per pound.

The tariff act of 1930 is more generous to the manufacturer. In addition to the general duties on tire fabrics, thread, and cotton manufactures there is, as shown by paragraph 924 of the tariff act of 1930, an additional or compensatory duty of 10 cents per pound on the cotton contained in all the manufactures of cotton having a staple of 1⅛ inches or more in length. There can be no just cause for further complaint by the manufacturers. There is generally a loss of 30 per cent in spinning cotton. The loss in manufacture is considered in fixing an accurate compensatory rate. Ten pounds of raw cotton yields 7 pounds of spinnable cotton. The act of 1930 follows the recommendation of the Tariff Commission in fixing compensatory rates. Generally, compensatory duties are designed to offset the disadvantages which may accrue to manufacturers, because of duties on their raw materials. To offset accurately such a disadvantage, compensatory duties must be based not on the amount of the raw material in the finished product but on the quantity of the raw material required for the manufacture of the finished product.

The history of compensatory duties is interesting. The emergency tariff act of 1921 carried a compensatory duty of 7 cents per pound. The act of 1930 is more liberal. The manufacturers are accorded every protection because of the duty on staple cotton. Most of the early tariff rates levied a single ad valorem rate upon cotton manufactures, but in some of the acts, especially from 1861 to 1866, compound rates were applicable to the manufactures of cotton.

Dr. F. W. Tausig, in his Tariff History of the United States, states that the compensatory duties on wool manufactures designed to offset the duties on raw material in the tariff act of 1861 constituted the first appearance in our tariff history of the device of exacting compensating duties. Many rates, which include compensating duties, are expressed now as compound rates, and they obtain at the present time on the manufactures of wool. Compound rates include specific or ad valorem rates and compensating rates.

SPECIFIC RATES

The act of 1930 very materially increases the rates on the manufactures of fine fabrics and fine yarns. Staple cotton is used in these manufactures and in the manufacture of thread. The Tariff Commission advised me on January 15, 1930, that yarns finer than 40s usually require staple cotton of 1⅛ inches or more, but staple cotton is also employed usually for strength in some coarser yarns. As shown by pages 178 and 180 of the Senate hearings, Ex-Senator Lippitt emphasized the fact that the paragraph on countable cloths is really controlling as to the rates on cotton manufactures. Rates are sometimes deceptive, particularly in cotton manufactures. Some acts contain ad valorem rates, others specific rates on the manufactures of cotton. I requested the Tariff Commission to give me the equivalent specific rates and equivalent ad valorem rates in the tariff acts, beginning with 1890. The comparison of both rates is helpful in determining the amount of protection under the tariff acts.

In addition to the ad valorem rate of 25 per cent on tire fabrics, there is the additional compensatory rate of 10 cents, where these fabrics contain staple cotton, which is 3 cents per pound more under the tariff act of 1930 than under the emergency act of 1921. Surely the tire industry should be satisfied.

The rate of countable cotton cloths in the act of 1922 is 28.76 per cent ad valorem, while under the act of 1930 it is 40.24 per cent, and at the same time the equivalent specific rate has been increased from $0.067 to $0.105 per square yard. The price of Delta staples is now depressed, the premium is very small and if the average price for the past 10 years is used as a basis, the equivalent ad valorem rate is far less than 25 per cent which is 10 per cent less than the average duty on agricultural products under the act of 1930. Inasmuch as staple cotton is used in the higher numbers of yarns, countable cloths, and in sewing threads, I give below a statement of the average rates of duty covering cotton yarn, sewing thread, and countable cloths, which are the principal and controlling items in cotton manufactures furnished to me by the Tariff Commission on June 18, 1930:

Tariff acts	Average rates of duty						
	Cotton yarn		Cotton sewing thread and handwork cottons		Countable cotton cloths		Total manufactures of cotton
	Equivalent ad valorem	Equivalent specific	Equivalent ad valorem	Equivalent specific	Equivalent ad valorem	Equivalent specific	Equivalent ad valorem
	Per cent	*Per pound*	*Per cent*	*Per 100 yards*	*Per cent*	*Per square yard*	*Per cent*
Act of 1890	49.96	$0.232	56.33	$0.006	47.26	$0.061	56.77
Act of 1894	39.49	.146	49.05	.005	41.35	.049	46.05
Act of 1897	32.32	.149	34.63	.005	39.50	.059	54.05
Act of 1909	31.43	.177	23.78	.006	42.30	.068	55.65
Act of 1913	22.94	.281	15.30	.005	21.56	.059	34.28
Act of 1922 [1]	28.02	.338	20.18	.018	28.76	.067	45.54
Act of 1930 [2]	40.64	.520	24.15	.020	40.24	.105	([3])

[1] Averages for period from Sept. 22, 1922, to Dec. 31, 1928, inclusive. Averages for entire act of 1922 (from Sept. 22, 1922, to June 17, 1930, inclusive) not obtainable because final figures for the year 1929 not yet published and figures for the first part of 1930 not yet compiled by the Department of Commerce.

[2] Averages on basis of imports in the calendar year 1928. Include compensatory duties.

[3] Not yet computed. Figures shown in this column are average rates on total manufactures of cotton, including not only imports under Schedule 9 but also lace, embroidery, braid, etc., made of cotton.

The cotton manufactures schedule is always difficult. There should be the equivalent specific as well as the ad valorem rates for comparison. There has been an increase in the equivalent specific rates as shown by the above table in all the tariff acts, beginning with the act of 1890.

Purchasers are interested in cotton yarns by the pound, in thread by the yard, and in countable cotton cloth by the yard. The specific rates on these items are now the highest in history. If Henry Ford is manufacturing tractors in Ireland to avoid American tariffs, so are the manufacturers of thread. I understand that the manufacturers of thread operate factories in the United States and in England and Scotland.

CONCLUSION

The rate of 7 cents per pound is reasonable and beneficial. The costs of producing Pima cotton and the costs of producing Delta staples are substantially the same. The rate was based upon the difference in the costs of production. Labor is the principal item. Personally, I advocate a higher duty on the longer staples. Rates are generally the result of compromise. The rate of 7 cents per pound on Delta staples is reasonable and is based upon facts and careful investigations.

The cotton grower is interested in the prosperity of the cotton manufacturer. I know the manufacturers will be good sports. They opposed the duty on staple cotton and they lost. I opposed the rate of the compensatory duty. It is my view that it is too high.

The act has passed. I am asking that the growers and manufacturers cooperate to promote the growing of staple cotton and the prosperity of cotton manufacturers.

We rejoice in the prosperity of the manufacturers, but we advocate equal treatment for the cotton grower. Wool, sugar, wheat, corn, cattle, hogs, and pork products are protected by the tariff. The growers of staple cotton ask for similar protection. There is a duty on pork products. The industry is on an export basis. The United States is by far the world's greatest exporter of pork, while Great Britain is the largest importer. It is so in the case of cotton. We export from 50 to 60 per cent of all cotton. This is not true in the case of staple cotton. The domestic production, as shown by Government statistics, is not quite equal to the domestic consumption. A tariff on short-staple cotton would be as effective as the tariff on pork products. However, the tariff on staple cotton should give to the producer, just as it now gives to the manufacturer, the benefits of the American market, the best and largest market in the world.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, after 15 months of anxious waiting by an all-suffering and oppressed people, the Congress of the United States has finally passed one of the most merciless and indefensible high-protective tariff laws ever put upon the backs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the exorbitant tariff rates that are carried in the present bill, which is but a reenactment of the ever-increasing and growing tariff rates heretofore carried in other tariff bills, had its beginning as a revenue measure, to finance the War between the States, and is the outgrowth of that fratricidal catastrophe that rent our Union in twain over 65 years ago.

After the close of the Civil War the manufacturing industry of New England, realizing that the levying of large import duties on commerce entering into the trade of the United States during and after the Civil War was a distinctive favoritism to them, in that by levying a tariff tax on the imported commodities that they were manufacturing insured them immense profits that their competitors could not share, have ever insisted that this unjust system of taxation be maintained for their special benefit.

During the years prior to the Civil War our Government was administered under low-tariff conditions, which every reader of history must admit was beneficial to the citizenship of this country and was in no way detrimental to the growth of the industries of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic and the Republican Parties of this Nation have always held and hold now two diverse theories on the question of tariff legislation.

The Republican Party has always been for a staight out-and-out-protective tariff system, and it believes in levying the tariff rate so high that it will prevent competition in the manufacturing and selling of merchandise that goes to make up every article used in the everyday life of our people. The Democratic Party at no time in its history has ever advocated or believed in the doctrine that the taxing power of the Federal Government in levying import taxes should be exercised in such an unjust manner that one class of our citizens shall be favored and made rich and another class poor.

The Democratic Party has always believed and has always advocated that in the exercise of the taxing power of the Federal Government that such taxes only should be levied as were necessary to obtain revenue to run the Government economically administered, and that in levying such a tax for revenue purposes the Congress should take into consideration the differences between the cost of production of the article at home and abroad, so that the American manufacturer would be placed at no disadvantage by his foreign competitor, but would be on equal terms with him, and that the consuming public would become the beneficiaries of legislation founded upon this principle in purchasing the necessaries of life; but the bill passed by this Congress goes far beyond that, and places such exorbitant duties upon food, clothing, metals and implements, drugs and chemicals, household and kitchen furniture that it can be termed nothing more nor less than a great profit-fixing piece of legislation, enacted in the interest of the great industries of the country which are to enjoy its blessings, while its burdens are passed on to the great masses of the people who are made to pay these exorbitant rates when they come to buy all the things that go to make up the common necessities of everyday life.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been and am now unalterably opposed to the exercise of the taxing power of the Federal Government to pile up immense profits for one class of citizens while all others are made to bear the burden of such legislative favoritism.

What moral right, may I ask, has the Congress of the United States to levy a tariff tax in such a manner and at such high rates as will absolutely guarantee a certain and fixed profit for those engaged in manufacturing in this country by saving them from all competition by those who wish to sell to our people from other lands?

Do we in America believe that we can always maintain the selfish doctrine of selling our surplus of billions and billions of dollars' worth of cotton, oil, wheat, rice, cattle, poultry, and merchandise of all kinds to our foreign neighbors and never buy any of their goods in return?

May I call the attention of the House to the fact that the commerce of Texas ports alone for the year 1929 totaled $1,733,450,259, and of this amount the sum of $731,387,876 was exported to foreign countries, and while Texas was exporting over $730,000,000 we imported into Texas about $32,000,000. My home city, Houston, the largest city in the Southwest, exported $302,640,269 worth of commerce to foreign countries and imported $13,513,292.

Now, the question may well be asked, why do not our people buy more liberally from our foreign neighbors who have bought so freely from us? Do not our people believe somewhat in cooperative reciprocity? Are we not willing to trade with other nations who so freely trade with us?

Yes; but this can not be done as long as we continue to build around ourselves a high protective-tariff wall that shuts out all competition and denies to our people the right to have a competitive market in which to buy merchandise that goes into their everyday lives.

Mr. Speaker, our people have been groaning under the burden of the high cost of living for a long time, which has been largely due to our high protective-tariff system already in force, but what may the consuming public expect under the present bill, which carries an average protective rate of 48 per cent on all items in it—the highest average rate of all the bills that have gone before.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to quote here from a speech recently made by my colleague from Indiana [Mr. CANFIELD], giving 12 reasons why the present tariff bill should not pass:

> The leading economists of the country—1,028 of them in number, coming as they do from 179 of the leading colleges of the country; also from some of our largest banks and most important industries—set out 12 points as to why the so-called "Grundy billion-dollar monstrosity tariff law" should never be passed by this Congress.
>
> They are as follows:
>
> First. It will increase the general cost of living.
>
> Second. It will subsidize industrial waste and inefficiency.
>
> Third. It will inflate profits of the few at the expense of the many.
>
> Fourth. It will hit city workers hardest.
>
> Fifth. It will rob the farmers it is supposed to enrich.
>
> Sixth. It will cripple manufacturers through raw material rates.
>
> Seventh. It will lower the buying power of our foreign customers.
>
> Eighth. It will provoke foreign retaliation against our exports.
>
> Ninth. It will violate the resolution of the world economic conference.
>
> Tenth. It will jeopardize payments from our foreign investments and debts.
>
> Eleventh. It will increase unemployment.
>
> Twelfth. It will poison world peace.

Mr. Speaker, already many nations who have been our best customers in the past, are beginning to retaliate against us by passing tariff laws which impose the same tariff duty on articles of commerce shipped from our country to theirs, that we impose on articles of commerce coming into our country from theirs.

Our far-sighted business men see this—and they know that such an international war of tariff retaliations will mean economic and commercial disaster to our country, and that is why they are against a continuation of this short-sighted policy.

You can take the item of sugar alone, and the duty on sugar as carried in the tariff law to-day will place a burden on the consumers and users of sugar in America the tremendous sum of $350,000,000, and the experts tell us that the bill is so drawn that refined sugar from Cuba comes in cheaper than raw sugar which our own sugar refiners have to buy, which does not cheapen the price of sugar to the consumer, but will put our own sugar industries out of business. This was done to protect large American investments in Cuba. Can you imagine a greater abuse of legislative power?

Mr. Speaker, the farmers, laboring people, and the consuming public generally should not be compelled to bear the enormous tax burden that this bill imposes. They had a right to expect more favorable consideration at the hands of Congress, and, in my opinion, they will rebel against this unjust and indefensible system of taxation, and will hold the party in power responsible for its enactment just as they did in 1892, after the passage by the Republican Party of the Dingley tariff bill, when Grover Cleveland was elected President on a Democratic tariff platform, which reads as follows:

SEC. 3. We denounce Republican protection as a fraud—a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

After the close of the storm-racked administration of Mr. Cleveland's second term the Republican Party again came into power and enacted the famous Payne-Aldrich tariff law, and remained in power until the coming of that crusader of progressive Democracy, apostle of civic righteousness, and defender of human rights—Woodrow Wilson. In 1912 the Democratic Party nominated Woodrow Wilson for President. Mr. Wilson, together with a Democratic Congress, was overwhelmingly elected.

President Wilson convened the Congress in extraordinary session and delivered his first famous message to the House and Senate in person, calling upon them to keep faith with the people by redeeming every pledge made in the Democratic platform. Under the leadership of President Wilson, the Democratic Party immediately passed a new tariff law by making substantial reduction in rates all down the line, and, in keeping with its platform, put many articles of everyday necessity on the free list. There was no economic upheaval following this reduction of tariff taxes, but, upon the contrary, an era of prosperity followed that stands without a parallel in the history of our Republic. Business was good everywhere; farmers were reaping abundant harvests and enjoying rich reward for their labors; laboring men and women were enjoying good wages on full time. But what of to-day? I shall let the millions and millions of unemployed men and women who walk the streets and highways of this country seeking employment make answer.

Mr. Wilson was not only a statesman and a scholar but he was a historian as well, and he understood full well the economic and political conditions of his day and time. He knew and proclaimed that a private monopoly was indefensible and intolerable. He knew that the high-protective tariff was the legitimate father of the gigantic trusts and monopolies that had grown up in this country, and the Democratic platform, upon which he was nominated and elected, with reference to the tariff declared:

The high Republican tariff is the principal cause of the unequal distribution of wealth. It is a system of taxation which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. Under its operations the American farmer and laboring man are the chief sufferers. It raises the cost of the necessaries of life to them, but does not protect their product or wages. The farmer sells largely in free markets and buys almost entirely in the protected markets. In the most highly protected industries, such as cotton and wool, steel and iron, the wages of the laborers are the lowest paid in any of our industries. We denounce the Republican pretense on that subject and assert that American wages are established by competitive conditions and not by the tariff.

We favor the immediate downward revision of the existing high and in many cases prohibitive tariff duties, insisting that material reductions be speedily made upon the necessaries of life. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products and articles of American manufacture which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home should be put upon the free list.

It is well known that large tariff protected industries in the United States, have and do now, sell much of their goods cheaper in foreign countries than they do to the people in America. But none of these trust-made articles are found upon the free list in the present bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is very hard, unjust, and oppressive upon our people. How long will they endure this burden? Will there follow in the wake of this legislation another political upheaval in America? We shall wait and see.

The Democratic Party has always contended that many articles which go to make up the necessaries of life should go untaxed and be placed on the free list—but not so with the present bill; it almost wipes out the free list, and taxes everything the people eat and wear from head to foot—from the cradle to the grave—and, not content with that, places a tariff on the tombstone that marks the last resting place of its oppressed victim.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, availing myself of the general privilege granted, I shall refer briefly to some features of the tariff bill. For many years we have been on a highly protective tariff basis for articles of manufacture, and the system seems to be satisfactory to a majority of the voters of the United States.

In the campaign of 1928 the Republican Party promised that if successful in the election a special session of Congress would be convened to enact a farm-aid measure and, in connection therewith, to provide a limited tariff revision to place agriculture more nearly on an equality with industry. The President in a public statement now gives the country the information that the present tariff bill is a fulfillment of that pre-election promise.

Many Republican Senators, misconstruing the election promise, undertook to enact a tariff law in accordance with their own, but erroneous, interpretation of it. For this error of judgment, they were designated by a high authority as first degree descendants of a certain wild animal, more noted for the length of its ears and the tones of its voice, than for its scope of vision and depth of understanding.

It is not my purpose to engage in that controversy. I simply want to call attention to some of the difficulties in the way of equalizing agriculture with industry by means of a protective tariff.

In the first place, a vast majority of manufactured articles can be effectively protected by import duties, while only a limited number of farm crops can be so protected. Cotton, corn, and wheat, come under this class which can not be so protected. They constitute our three most important farm commodities. To leave them unprotected, while protecting industry at such enormous cost, can not be justified from any standpoint.

Cotton, corn, and wheat all enter largely into the export trade. Approximately 60 per cent of cotton and 25 per cent of wheat grown in the United States must seek a market abroad. Corn is exported to a considerable extent, while much more of it is fed to hogs whose meat product is exported.

So far as I am informed, no import duty has ever been placed upon cotton, nor has it been contended that a duty would benefit the cotton farmer. I believe the export debenture would have benefited the cotton farmer. The debenture for cotton was placed in the present tariff bill by the Senate but stricken out by the House.

It was thought that a tariff duty would benefit the wheat farmer, and it has been tried. It was afterwards increased by the President to 42 cents per bushel. Under it, wheat has gone to almost record low prices, several times being less than $1 per bushel, when it should have sold for two and one-half times that much to have been on an equality with industrial products.

The export debenture would very materially have benefited the wheat farmer. The debenture for wheat was placed in the tariff bill by the Senate. It was stricken out by the House. Canadian wheat, in the Canadian market, is now selling at a higher price than American wheat in the American market. This has continually been the case since the tariff was applied eight years ago.

Sugar, though so largely an import commodity, can not be effectively protected by an import duty, so far as continental United States is concerned. We produced last year 3,396,936 tons of sugar and imported from Cuba 3,704,213 tons, making a total consumption of 7,101,149 tons. Only about one-seventh of this amount was produced in continental United States.

The sugar production for 1929 was as follows:

	Tons
Northern United States beet	901,713
Southern cane (Louisiana)	178,223
Philippine Islands, cane	750,000
Hawaii, cane	815,000
Porto Rico, cane	745,000
Virgin Islands, cane	7,000
Total United States production	3,396,936

The cost of producing this sugar was entirely different in each section or insular possession. Owing to both labor and climatic conditions, the cost of cane sugar in our insular possessions is far less than in Louisiana.

The cost of producing cane sugar in our insular possessions is also materially less than that of producing beet sugar in the Northeastern States. The cost of producing beet sugar is also considerably less than the cost of cane sugar in Louisiana. This was recognized by the Hoover commission during the war, when it made a differential in the price of cane and beet sugar.

Our island possessions, having the cheaper production cost, both as to labor and climatic conditions, then the higher the tariff against Cuba the more the industry will develop and expand in those possessions. Northern beet and southern cane have no protection against our insular possessions, and therefore can not compete with them on the same tariff basis.

Even if all our island possessions were eliminated, still a tariff duty would not protect equally the cane-sugar grower with the beet-sugar grower, owing to the great difference in cost of production. To fail to give them equal protection would be a disaster to the one thus discriminated against.

All things considered, sugar ought to be on the free list, and if protection is to be awarded it ought to be done by a bounty rather than by tariff giving the domestic cane a differential sufficient to equalize it with beet sugar.

Such a system would save the American consumers many millions and at the same time give equal protection to both cane and beet sugar producers.

Our insular possessions are probably on an equality with Cuba in cost of production. Their only disadvantage is in having a longer water haul. Corresponding differentials could be made to each respective possession to equalize cost of ocean freights.

The bounty on sugar under the McKinley law was far more equitable than the present sugar tariff. It afforded better protection and at less cost. If failed, however, to provide for equalization between domestic cane and beet sugar.

Domestic production of sugar increased enormously while the Underwood free duty law was in operation, going from 968,674 tons in 1914, to 1,254,865 tons in 1921.

Under the Fordney-McCumber high-tariff law the production has considerably reduced, being 1,344,962 tons in 1922 and only 1,079,936 tons in 1929. Practically the only domestic beneficiary has been the Great Western Sugar Co., of Colorado.

Production in our insular possessions has greatly increased under the Fordney-McCumber tariff, going from 1,352,731 tons in 1922 to 2,317,000 in 1929. This included Porto Rico, Hawaii, Virgin Islands, and the Philippines. The greatest percentage of increase was in the Philippines, where the production has gone from 286,544 tons in 1921 to 750,000 tons in 1929.

The sugar tariff has been a burden upon American consumers. It has reduced sugar production in continental United States. It has not benefited the domestic-sugar farmer. On the other hand, it has built up a large profit for the great American Sugar Co. of Colorado and for the sugar producers of our insular possessions, particularly of the Philippines.

The most unjustifiable levy in the present bill is that upon leather and shoes, imported from Czechoslovakia, Germany, and Austria. The small duty of 10 per cent placed upon hides was used as a lever to pry a very high levy for leather and shoes. It is estimated that the 10 per cent duty for hides will become effective to the extent of 30 to 35 cents per hide. The leather made from that hide is given a 20 per cent duty, and then the shoes another 20 per cent.

An average hide will make from 9 to 12 pairs of shoes. It is difficult to estimate what the combined duty of 40 per cent on leather and shoes will amount to. Leaving out of the calculation altogether the 20 per cent on leather, the duty of 20 per cent on shoes alone will amount to enormous burdens if it should become fully effective.

If it should become only 50 per cent effective it would increase the price of an average pair of shoes about 50 to 75 cents per pair. If the manufacturers, through combinations, should succeed in making the tariff effective to 100 per cent, which may be possible, then the increase in the price of a pair of shoes would be practically a dollar to a dollar and twenty-five cents additional.

There are many other features in the bill which have been fully discussed, and to which I do not intend to refer herein. There are many features which I fully indorse and voted for in the make-up of the bill. At the same time there are many burdens involved in it which the masses of the people can not well assume at this time.

Mr. STONE. Mr. Speaker, the tariff bill has just passed Congress, has been signed by the President, and is now a law. The question of levying a duty on foreign products for the purpose of protecting American industry and American labor has always been an issue between the two great political parties.

The present bill just passed, known as the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930, is an exception to the rule. This bill was written by both parties. The rates finally decided on by Congress were arrived at by a process of trading. In practically every State and district in the United States where the benefit under the tariff was favorable to that particular State or district their representatives voted for the bill regardless of party. In other States and districts that were not benefited by the bill they voted against it regardless of party.

I am in favor of equal protection to all American institutions regardless of district, State, or party affiliation, but I will not support any legislation that deliberately seeks to give an unfair advantage to one section of the country to the detriment of the other. I considered the bill just passed very carefully before making up my mind as to its ultimate benefits to the American people and with a special interest to my State and district. I could not find any special reason for this legislation at this time, and therefore I voted against the bill.

I think I would be a traitor to my State and to my district if I voted for a tariff bill that gave other States and districts protection to their industries and denied to my State and district the just protection which it is entitled to for one of its major products. I refer to the independent oil industry, and at this time will present to you some of the reasons why the independent oil industry of America justly deserves to be protected and encouraged by the Government. It is the duty of Congress to enact the necessary law that will prohibit the importation of crude petroleum or its refined products into this country, and especially during that period when the oil fields of America are being shut down and the wells prorated on account of this importation of foreign oil by a foreign-owned oil trust.

As an example of the injustice of the present law that permits a foreign-owned and operated oil corporation to ship into this country crude petroleum and its refined products duty free for the purpose of creating a surplus and injuring the independent oil operator, I am submitting a table which shows the condition with reference to supply and demand and foreign importation of crude petroleum from 1918, including 1929.

Importation of crude petroleum, 1918–1929

Year	Domestic production	Total demand	Surplus	Shortage	Imports	Drawn from storage	Added to storage
1918	355,928,000	420,418,000		64,490,000	37,736,000		26,754,000
1919	378,367,000	426,169,000		47,802,000	52,822,000		5,020,000
1920	442,929,000	549,012,000		106,083,000	106,175,000		92,000
1921	472,183,000	529,671,000		57,488,000	125,364,000		67,876,000
1922	557,531,000	610,533,000		53,002,000	127,308,000		74,306,000
1923	732,407,000	731,540,000	867,000		82,015,000		82,882,000
1924	713,940,000	766,435,000		52,495,000	77,775,000		25,280,000
1925	763,743,000	811,540,000		47,797,000	61,824,000		14,027,000
1926	770,874,000	860,603,000		89,729,000	60,382,000	29,347,000	
1927	888,432,000		12,897,000		58,383,000		71,080,000
1928	901,474,000	962,773,000		61,299,000	79,767,000		18,468,000
1929	1,005,598,000	1,035,784,000		30,186,000	78,915,000		48,729,000

NOTE.—Table indicates barrels of oil.

I will now quote the words of one of the best-posted independent oil men in the United States, which will explain the above tabulated schedules:

The total supply of crude oil produced within the borders of the United States in 1929 was approximately 1,005,000,000 barrels; but the total demand for crude oil in the United States in 1929 to meet refinery needs, exports, and the crude oil used for other domestic purposes was approximately 1,035,000,000 barrels. In other words, our crude-oil supply in 1929 lacked 30,000,000 barrels of meeting our total demands. For years we have listened to appealing arguments, principally from the Standard of New Jersey, as to the danger from the rapidly accumulating stock of crude oil in the United States. Hence one would think that if in 1929 our crude-oil supply was 30,000,000 barrels less than our total demand that it were the part of wisdom to draw 30,000,000 barrels from the already heavy stock of oil in storage, especially since the Standard of New Jersey has long sounded warnings against these heavy stocks. However, in 1929 we imported approximately 79,000,000 barrels of crude oil, principally from Venezuela, Colombia, and Mexico, and the Standard of New Jersey was one of the large importers of crude oil, which fact leads one to doubt the sincerity with which they have opposed further increases of our crude in storage.

You readily see that of this 79,000,000 barrels of imported crude it required only 30,000,000 barrels to make up our shortage and that the other 49,000,000 barrels went into storage. The responsibility for the increase in the crude oil in storage rests directly with the people who have imported surplus amounts of foreign oil. If heavy stocks of crude oil depress the crude-oil price structure, and if the Standard of New Jersey is one of the large importers of foreign oil, and if the Standard of New Jersey is one of the makers of crude-oil prices, then who do you suppose would be beneficiary of a reduced price in domestic oil resulting from heavy stocks caused by surplus imports of foreign oil?

The above statement is true in every respect, as shown by the official figures furnished from the most reliable sources of information, and illustrates fully that the great oil trust deliberately ships foreign oil into this country for the purpose of destroying the independent oil industry.

I now wish to call your attention to the operation of that great foreign oil trust, the Royal Dutch Shell. This great oil octopus reaches all over the world, and is owned and operated by foreign capital, employs foreign labor and foreign-built machinery and transports, to produce and transport its products to America, where it comes in direct contact with the products of the independent oil producer and in direct competition with American labor.

I am going to give you at this time a comparative statement of the cost of production and delivery by the oil operators in the mid-continent field in the United States as compared with the cost of production of petroleum from the South American field, which is owned and operated by the Royal Dutch Shell and other interests, laid down at the Atlantic ports.

COMPARATIVE COST OF PRODUCTION AND DELIVERY OF UNITED STATES AND SOUTH AMERICAN CRUDE OIL TO ATLANTIC PORTS

In March, 1929, the daily production per well in the United States was eight barrels. The lifting expense would average approximately 57 cents per barrel. The cost of production per barrel of oil in the United States is as follows:

Lifting expense	$0.57
Overhead expense	.20
General expense, including lease, rentals, royalties, etc	.70
Depreciation of machinery and equipment	.23
Transportation charge from the mid-continent area to Atlantic seaport by pipe line	.76¼
Cost of mid-continent crude at Atlantic ports	2.46¼

The above shows the cost of producing a barrel of oil in the mid-continent oil field in the United States and transporting it to the market where it must compete with the foreign oil produced by foreign corporations refined in a foreign country and retailed to the American consumer by foreign citizens, and the profit accumulated by foreign capitalists. I will now insert what it cost the Royal Dutch Shell and other foreign companies to produce and transport a barrel of oil from its field in Venezuela to the same American market, where it comes in direct competition with the oil from the mid-continent field of the United States. This oil is now admitted to the United States without duty.

Cost of delivering Venezuela oil to Atlantic seaports

Cost of production at well	$0.18
Transportation to terminal point	.22
Transportation from terminal point to Atlantic seaports	.35
Total cost, delivery of Venezuela oil to Atlantic seaports	.75

These statistics were furnished by the United States Bureau of Mines, the American Petroleum Institute, and the United States Department of Commerce.

This statement, which is authentic and from the most reliable sources, shows by actual figures that the Royal Dutch Shell and other foreign-owned oil corporations are delivering oil at the Atlantic seaports for 75 cents per barrel, while at the same time it costs the independent oil producer of the mid-continent oil field $2.46¼ to produce and deliver the same amount of oil to the same location. This allows the foreign oil companies a profit of $1.71¼ for every barrel of oil they can produce and ship into this country. Besides this profit they make an additional profit over the American producer and refiner by refining the crude oil in Venezuela and other foreign fields with cheap labor which comes into direct competition with American labor, and as a direct result thousands of American laboring men are now walking the streets looking for employment. I trust that the Members of Congress who are so enthusiastic in support of the American manufacturing interest, and who have voted a tariff on everything that the independent oil man of the United States uses in the production of petroleum and the refining of its products will be fair enough to support legislation that will stop the importation of crude petroleum and its refined products by foreign-owned companies, from foreign fields, and for foreign profit.

I would like to call your attention to the actual condition that exists at this time with reference to the independent oil man. The statements which I will give you are taken from information furnished from the most reliable sources and expresses in plain language a partial expression of their opinion with reference to conditions at this time.

In a hundred years of industrial history in the United States there are very few instances where the powerful interests within an industry have voluntarily and of their own initiative righted the wrongs, the use of which gave them their tremendous power. With few exceptions, flagrant abuses of the industrial power have been righted only when the minority interests, the "independents," if you please, actively exposed the fallacies and the crushing conditions of that industry and then took their cause to the common people, never forgetting that the common people had a pocketbook interest that only the independents could be depended upon to safeguard.

The archives of the American petroleum industry reveal that many a worthy independent has, after years of hard and conscientious work, suddenly found himself adrift and penniless. Not because of any lax management on his part but because of an avaricious desire on the part of the majors to acquire his properties at a price far below their actual worth. In the past the independent has been permitted by the majors to sweat through that period of organization that usually precedes success, and then he was regarded as ripe for picking—and was usually picked.

The independent never has been in business for himself. He is in business for the majors. He is working under a delusion and is permitted to remain in that state of mind until he is on the verge of success, and then the majors remove the mirage.

The independents always have been, now are, and always will be willing in every manner possible to cooperate in preventing any unnecessary waste of oil in this country. They are willing to prorate to any necessary degree, provided, however, that such proration is to protect the prosperity of the United States and not to make room for foreign imports. If it is a question of providing for their own families, as against providing for laborers of South America and other foreign countries, the independents naturally choose to provide for their own flesh and blood.

The statements which I have just quoted are representative of the independent oil producers, and I can state from my actual experience of over 15 years in the mid-continent field as an independent oil operator that I have found the American oil man always ready and willing to make any sacrifice if he is convinced that it is for the general good of his district, State, or the Nation in general. During the World War when America needed extra production to meet the demands the independent oil operators, at a great financial sacrifice, went out into new fields and, with their own funds, took the risk and secured additional production of crude oil which was one of the most vital elements in the winning of the war.

The question is usually asked, Will the price of gasoline to the consumer be materially raised should the importation of foreign oil be prohibited during the period of overproduction or when American wells are being prorated? I will state that the price of gasoline is undoubtedly based upon the price of crude oil in the United States and not upon the price of imported oil. The consumer is not taken into consideration and allowed to share in the reduced price of gasoline which is produced from this imported oil, but the entire profit on the imported oil and its refined products goes direct to the big importers who own and control this foreign production. I think I can safely state the price of gasoline to the consumer would not be raised should

an embargo be placed on the importation of foreign oil and its refined products.

Another question with reference to the importation of cheap oil is the fact that it comes in direct competition with the coal industry, and as a result of the use of this cheap fuel oil, the great per cent of the coal mines in this country are running on short time and in some fields thousands of men are idle. In fact, it is a very serious condition, and the importation of crude petroleum which is used for heating and power purposes is the direct cause of thousands of men in the United States walking the streets, looking for employment. The great mills of the East have secured a tariff on their products, but they are not satisfied with this concession; they ask that cheap fuel be furnished them by foreign corporations, transported in foreign-owned vessels—the oil which is produced in foreign countries and the profit of which goes to foreign capital.

I can not see the logic of those who advocate a tariff to protect the great American manufacturing interest, but who at the same time encourage the importation of foreign-produced petroleum by the Royal Dutch Shell and other foreign interests.

As an illustration of the actual condition of the oil industry, I wish to present to you the tabulation showing just what is being done in the State of Oklahoma at this time with reference to production in the various fields. You will note that the oil fields in my State are all shut in and not allowed to flow, because there is not a market for their production, which is the direct result of the importation of 79,000,000 barrels of oil during 1929 by the companies I have just named. The list is as follows, and is compiled and agreed to by the State proration committee of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association:

The committee estimated the State's potential production for July at 1,361,945 barrels daily, for August at 1,347,861 barrels daily, and for September at 1,305,604 barrels daily.

Daily potential and allowable production by pools for July

Pool	Potential	Allowable
Oklahoma City	500,000	130,037
Konawa	80,000	20,000
East Earlsboro	60,000	20,000
Little River	48,907	32,805
St. Louis	40,000	28,666
South Earlsboro	35,000	11,666
Seminole	30,296	20,197
Bowlegs	30,056	20,037
Earlsboro (old)	29,585	19,723
East Little River	20,000	13,333
Allen	18,433	12,289
Asher	16,000	4,000
Mission	15,714	10,476
Searight	14,235	9,490
Carr City	11,252	7,501
Sasakwa	10,800	7,200
Earlsboro town	9,000	6,000
Chandler Perry	8,000	2,000
Allen (Wilcox)	7,000	4,667
Maud	6,262	4,175
Lovell	6,000	4,000
East Seminole	4,450	2,397
Outside areas	251,000	251,000
Daily total	1,361,945	650,000

The proration of the various fields affects either directly or indirectly the entire population of the State of Oklahoma and of the mid-continent oil field in general. All kind and character of business is directly affected by this necessary shutting in and closing down of these producing wells.

Not only does it affect all the various industries and activities, but it directly affects practically every landowner, as his rental and royalty depend upon the prosperous condition of the oil industry.

At this time it is very difficult to obtain any relief through tariff legislation, as the tariff bill as passed by Congress had no reference and made no provision for the protection of the independent oil industry of this country.

The history of tariff legislation indicates that it is practically impossible to secure any relief for an industry that is not included in the general tariff bill. Considering these facts, I deemed it advisable to introduce a bill which does not provide for any tariff on imported oil or its refined products but does provide that no oil or the refined products therefrom can be imported into the United States when it is shown that there is sufficient oil being produced within the United States to meet the consumption and to take care of the import trade.

I will make a special effort to get this bill before the committee and will ask for a special hearing when Congress convenes in December, and I trust that the Members of Congress who have seen fit to protect their own industries will show by their actions that they are not only in favor of protecting their own selfish interests but are willing to come to the aid of an industry that is in need of assistance at this critical time. I am attaching a copy of the bill, which is H. R. 12482, for reference, and will ask that you give it very careful consideration and lend your assistance in securing its enactment into law.

A bill to relieve unemployment, to protect American labor, to encourage industry, and regulate commerce with foreign countries

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act crude petroleum, or the refined products therefrom, produced or refined in a foreign country, shall not be entitled to entry at any port of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 2. Crude petroleum may be imported into the United States for the purpose of refining for export to a foreign country but not for sale or disposition in the United States or any of its possessions, upon the execution of a bond given in double the amount of the actual market value of said petroleum and its refined products, conditioned that such crude petroleum or the refined products therefrom shall not be used, sold, or otherwise disposed of in the United States.

SEC. 3. The provisions of sections 1 and 2 of this act may be suspended upon a statement furnished to the President, by the Secretary of Commerce, showing that the gross unrestricted production of crude petroleum is not sufficient to supply the actual domestic consumption in the United States; and that the production of crude petroleum or the refined products therefrom is not sufficient to meet the export demands; or that the production of crude petroleum or the refined products therefrom is not being restricted or prorated in the United States; and that crude petroleum or the refined products therefrom is not being run to storage in the United States; then and in that event the President shall issue an order allowing the importation of crude petroleum from a foreign country, but only in such quantities and for such period of time as are necessary to insure the domestic supply of crude petroleum and its refined products in the United States and to meet the export demand therefor.

SEC. 4. It is declared to be the policy of the United States Government that only crude petroleum or the refined products therefrom produced or refined in the United States shall be purchased or used in any form by the United States Government.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby empowered and authorized to make all orders and regulations necessary to carry into effect or suspend the provisions of this act. He shall send orders to all officers and agents of the United States and to such officers and agents of foreign countries as are necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of June 6 the Wall Street Journal took issue with the statement I made in a speech in this Chamber on May 28, 1930, on the subject of The 1930 Tariff and the Farmer, with special reference to the benefits derived from the protective tariff by the growers of high-gluten wheat of the Middle West, and particularly criticized the comparison made by the United States Tariff Commission of No. 1 Minneapolis dark Northern with Winnipeg No. 3.

The editorial writer, in his smart-aleck way, insisted that the comparison should have been made with Canada's No. 2. In my speech I stated that, according to the table furnished me by the Tariff Commission, the average price received by the American farmer above his Canadian competitor for comparable quality of high-gluten wheat at Minneapolis as compared with Winnipeg was 18 cents a bushel for the period of 1921–1929. Upon this the Journal commented, in part, as follows:

Canada has six grades running from 1 to 6 according to milling and baking qualities. The basic grade is No. 1, which averages a little higher quality than the Minneapolis No. 1. Canada's No. 2 is fairly comparable with Minneapolis No. 1. This is what Mr. WILLIAMSON should have used in comparison with Minneapolis No. 1. Instead, he used No. 3, which is worth from 2 to 3 cents a bushel less than No. 2, and compares it with a premium wheat in Minneapolis.

This is equal to going into the cotton market where middling is the basic grade and comparing "middling fair," which is a high-premium grade, with "low middling," a grade selling considerably below the basic. There used to be a rule of evidence invoked in trials to the effect that "False in one thing false in everything." Mr. WILLIAMSON'S comparison of two grades of wheat, one a premium and the other a middle grade, and calling them "comparable" does not create respect for his argument.

On June 7, in reply thereto, I wrote the Journal, among other things, as follows:

The Tariff Commission, ever since I have been in contact with it, has taken the position that Minneapolis No. 1 is comparable with Winnipeg No. 3. I think I have a right to assume that the Tariff Commission is as good an authority upon the subject as is available.

Even upon your own statement it is very clear that the American producer of the high-gluten wheats has derived a benefit of from at least 15 to 16 cents a bushel during that period. This is based upon your

statement that Minneapolis No. 1 is comparable with Winnipeg No. 2 and your further statement that Winnipeg No. 2 is worth from 2 to 3 cents a bushel more than No. 3, which still leaves us to the good, as above stated, between 15 and 16 cents a bushel.

To this the editorial writer of the Journal, Mr. W. A. Korsmeyer, replied at length on June 10, and in trying to justify the editorial stated, among other things:

The editorial stated that No. 3 at Winnipeg sells at a discount of from 2 to 3 cents under No. 2. (That is the present discount; in some years the spread is far greater.) You then subtract 2 cents from the 18 which you had claimed as a differential in favor of Minneapolis, and get 16 cents differential. You are still in error, as you are not comparing comparable grades.

When the Journal insists that I am still in error in my statement that upon its own admission the tariff has benefited the American farmer to the extent of 15 to 16 cents a bushel, he is clearly begging the question, as I am comparing No. 1 Minneapolis dark Northern with Winnipeg No. 2, taking for granted for the purpose of the comparison that the Journal is right in stating that Minneapolis No. 1 is comparable with Winnipeg No. 2.

Most of us in the Middle West are fairly conversant with wheat. It is our chief cash crop. I venture to say that I have produced more wheat upon my own farms than the Wall Street Journal writer has ever seen. I am still producing it, and am as much concerned as any farmer with the effect of the tariff on wheat, and my statement that we have benefited on the average 18 cents a bushel on comparable qualities of high-protein spring wheat still stands.

In order that the editorial writer of the Journal may not have to take my word for it, I asked the Tariff Commission to have a further study made by its experts as to whether No. 1 Minneapolis dark Northern was fairly comparable with Winnipeg No. 3. I am now in possession of this study, and while it may not be understood by our Wall Street "expert," it will be understood by our wheat growers of the Middle West. The discussion of the Tariff Commission of this matter is as follows:

COMPARABLE GRADES OF AMERICAN AND CANADIAN WHEAT

There has been some difference of opinion as to what grades of our domestic wheat are comparable to Canadian wheats. It has been recognized that the tariff on wheat has its primary and direct effect on the price of hard spring wheat grown in the Northwest Central States from Minnesota to Montana. Furthermore, it has been recognized that our No. 1 dark Northern hard spring wheat, our No. 1 hard spring wheat, and our No. 2 hard spring wheat are lower in grade than Canadian No. 1 hard spring wheat. Some students of this subject have claimed that our No. 1 is nearer in grade to the Canadian No. 2. Others have claimed that it is nearer in grade to the Canadian No. 3. The determination of what grades should be compared is, of course, necessary in order to determine the effect of the tariff on prices of our domestic wheat.

The commission in its studies has been inclined to accept as valid a comparison between our domestic No. 1 dark Northern as quoted at Minneapolis and the No. 3 Manitoba Northern as quoted at Winnipeg. Studies made and opinions offered by individuals and institutions who have specialized in this matter appear to agree that our dark Northern No. 1 and the Canadian No. 3 are comparable.

Probably the most important reason for comparing our No. 1 dark Northern hard spring wheat with the No. 3 Canadian hard spring wheat is given in a publication entitled "American Importation of Canadian Wheat," issued by the Food Research Institute of Stanford University, California, in November, 1926. Vol. III, No. 1, November, 1926.) The following is a quotation from the report:

SUPERIORITY OF CANADIAN WHEAT

"Apart from cleanness, high percentage of vitreous kernels, and low count of deteriorated kernels, the chief superiorities of Canadian wheat for millers lie in the heavy weight and the high protein content. On the average, Canadian hard spring wheat is several pounds heavier per volume-bushel than American hard spring wheat. Hard spring wheats sold on the sample market in Minneapolis are in ordinary years rarely overweight; at Winnipeg elevator-run wheats are often, indeed, in good years usually overweight, the exact weight, however, being known. This high weight finds direct expression in a heavier yield of flour, which has the effect of making the heavier wheat cheaper for the miller. Average No. 1 Manitoba Northern will yield per 5 bushels in different years from 11 to 15 pounds more straight flour than may be secured from average No. 1 dark Northern spring; average No. 3 Manitoba Northern will yield about 4 to 6 pounds more straight flour per 5 bushels than average No. 1 dark Northern. Not only are the specifications for weight consistently higher in the case of Canadian wheat, but overweight is common in Canadian wheat and uncommon in American wheat. The high-protein wheat gives stronger flour so that the net result is a larger yield of a stronger flour to the unit for wheat. For practical purposes, we may say that Manitoba Northern wheats are purchased and milled on the basis of official grades, whereas most dark Northern wheats are purchased and milled on the basis of premiums for qualities lying outside of the grades. The influence of this state of affairs on merchandising practices is obvious.

"Within the official grades, year in and year out, No. 3 Manitoba Northern is comparable with average No. 1 dark Northern, usually with a slight superiority on the side of the Canadian wheat. It is commonly heavier, has a higher percentage of vitreous kernels, is cleaner, and gives a somewhat larger outturn of comparable flour. When an American miller contemplates an importation, he first considers No. 3 Manitoba Northern as alternative to average No. 1 dark Northern spring."

During the course of the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means in 1929, with respect to the pending tariff revision, Mr. M. W. Thatcher, of St. Paul, Minn., representing the Northwest Agricultural Foundation, stated, in reply to a question offered by Mr. CHINDBLOM (see p. 4362, Vol. VII, Tariff Readjustment, 1929): "Canadian No. 3 and our No. 1 Northern would be about the same."

The Hon. Sidney Anderson, representing the Millers' National Federation, testified before the same committee with respect to wheat and wheat flour (see p. 4370, supra):

"Mr. RAMSEYER. Can you tell this committee just what you mean by comparable wheat?

"Mr. ANDERSON. I mean wheat of comparable intrinsic milling value. For example, comparing Winnipeg with Minneapolis, No. 1 Northern at Minneapolis is comparable in intrinsic value to No. 3 Northern in Canada for the reason, particularly, that No. 1 Northern in Minneapolis is a wheat weighing 58 pounds."

COMPARISON OF PRICES OF UNITED STATES AND CANADIAN SPRING WHEAT

The following table gives the prices of No. 1 dark Northern hard spring wheat and No. 1 Northern spring wheat at Minneapolis, and of No. 2 and No. 3 Northern spring wheat at Winnipeg, for the crop years 1920–21 to 1929–30, inclusive. The table also shows the amount by which the domestic grades of wheat quoted exceed the Canadian grades. It will be noted that in the crop year 1920–21 Canadian grades, as a rule, sold at higher prices than the domestic grades, but that after the enactment of the emergency tariff act of May, 1921, the prices of the hard spring wheats in the United States have been, as a rule, higher than the prices for the Canadian wheats. There have been exceptions to this in certain years, when large domestic crops of hard spring wheat marketed during periods when the Canadian crop of hard spring wheat was short have sold at prices below the Canadian wheat at times or at prices which reflected only slightly the existing tariff. As a general rule, however, the table shows that our No. 1 dark Northern hard spring wheat has been higher in price than either the No. 2 or the No. 3 Canadian Northern hard spring wheat at Winnipeg. The same holds true for our No. 1 Northern hard spring wheat at Minneapolis.

WHEAT IMPORTS

The Wall Street Journal's editorial writer also challenges my statement that "The terrible slump in farm prices which overtook the farmer in 1920 and 1921 was due in large measure to the fact that these products were on the free list"; and my further statement that "Notwithstanding a surplus at home on a number of important farm products huge imports from abroad were dumped on our markets, creating complete demoralization"; and insists that I "overlooked the fact that the postwar deflation was not a domestic affair." He then goes on to state that "It began in Japan and swept over the whole civilized world. It included all businesses as well as farming." I, of course, did nothing of the sort. I said the slump in the price of farm products "was due in large measure" to the fact that the farmer's products were then on the free list.

The truth of this statement is unassailable by anything based upon fact. At that time America was the only country in the world where the people had the cash to buy, and foreign exporters rushed their goods upon our markets to avoid paying the duties which they knew would be levied just as soon as President Warren G. Harding was sworn in. Our importers followed suit for the same reason and filled their warehouses with foreign goods and farm products.

It is a fact too well recognized in economics to need sustaining argument that comparatively small imports dumped upon a market already well supplied with domestic products produces demoralization, with a resulting drastic fall in prices. Of course, other facts entered in, but the "huge imports," and I use the term advisedly, were a major factor in the rapid decline of farm commodities' prices in 1920–21.

The United States Tariff Commission has just supplied me with a table showing the imports of wheat and flour for consumption for the years 1919–1929, inclusive. I shall append it hereto for the information of the country and the Wall Street Journal in particular.

This table does not include wheat which was entered free of duty for milling-in-bond and for subsequent export as flour. The table shows the sharp decline in the imports of wheat which

came almost entirely from Canada as soon as the emergency tariff act of May 28, 1921, went into effect. In 1920, when wheat was on the free list, imports amounted to 35,700,000 bushels. In 1921, from January 1 to May 27, general imports of wheat amounted to 18,130,000 bushels. After a duty of 35 cents per bushel was imposed in the emergency tariff act of 1921 the imports declined sharply. This decline continued when the tariff act of 1922 went into effect carrying a rate of 30 cents per bushel on wheat. In 1923 imports amounted to 8,900,000 bushels. In 1924, effective April 7, by presidential proclamation under the flexible provisions, the duty was increased to 42 cents per bushel. During the period January 1 to April 5, 1924, 6,200,000 bushels of wheat were imported. Under the increased rate of duty imports of wheat have declined until in 1929 they amounted to only 36,000 bushels.

The imports of hard spring wheat have, it has been claimed, been relatively unimportant as compared to the total wheat production of the United States, of all types of about 800,000,000 bushels annually. This overlooks the fact that the imports of wheat compete directly with hard spring wheat and particularly with domestic No. 1 wheat. In 1920, for example, the production of hard spring wheat in the United States was 174,230,000 bushels of which 33.4 per cent was graded as No. 1. Approximately 60,000,000 bushels, therefore, were graded in that year as being comparable in quality to the imports of 35,700,000 bushels. In 1923, the year of largest imports since the removal of wheat from the free list, the domestic production of the United States is reported at 172,783,300 bushels, of which approximately 40 per cent or 68,000,000 bushels were graded as No. 1. Imports in that year were close to 9,000,000 bushels.

It is evident that prior to the proclamation by the President of the 42 cents per bushel duty on wheat the imports represented a very large proportion of the domestic consumption of hard spring wheat of quality graded as No. 1. Besides their direct competitive influence the imports of wheat have had an indirect effect on the marketing of all grades of hard spring wheat.

In addition to the imports of wheat which came in free of duty during 1919, 1920, and 1921 there were in those years considerable imports of flour from Canada free of duty. In 1920, for example, the imports of flour amounted to 800,000 bushels. In 1921, from January 1 to May 27, they amounted to 68,000 bushels. The emergency tariff act of 1921 made wheat flour dutiable at 20 per cent. However, because of the maladjustment of the rate of duty on flour to the rate on wheat flour was exported to the United States from Canada following the emergency act on more favorable terms than wheat. Thus in 1922, from January 1 to September 21, inclusive, the United States imported 484,000 barrels of flour from Canada. The act of 1922 made flour dutiable at 78 cents per 100 pounds or the equivalent of $1.53 per cent per barrel. Under this rate of duty a considerable volume of imports of flour continued. The presidential proclamation went into effect April 6, 1924, increasing the duty on wheat flour $1.04 per 100 pounds or the equivalent of $2.883 per barrel. This rate of duty which contained a full compensatory for the new duty on wheat of 42 cents per bushel has resulted in a very considerable decline in flour.

I respectfully commend the table following for study to the editorial writer of the Journal and hope he may not find it entirely unprofitable:

Wheat[1] and flour: United States imports for consumption, 1919–1929

	Wheat			Flour		
	Rates of duty	Quantity	Value	Rates of duty	Quantity	Value
		Bushels			*Barrels*	
1919	Free	7,913,589	$14,916,589	Free	16,774	$174,874
1920	do	35,712,035	75,170,509	do	800,348	8,663,721
1921 (Jan. 1–May 27).	do	18,132,677	29,774,372	do	767,799	6,628,656
1921 (May 28–Dec. 31).	35 cents per bushel.	3,574,164	4,248,283	20 per cent	198,142	1,096,705
1922 (Jan. 1–Sept. 21).	do	7,394,989	8,996,382	do	484,574	2,699,794
1922 (Sept. 22–Dec. 31).	30 cents per bushel.	3,165,026	3,393,207	$1.53 per barrel.	142,243	745,736
1923		8,929,749	8,887,124	do	264,019	1,366,051
1924 (Jan. 1–Apr. 5)		6,215,465	5,841,153	do	55,983	291,610
1924 (Apr. 6–Dec. 31).	42 cents per bushel.	679,160	736,178	$2.038 per barrel.	8,676	27,232
1925	do	1,308,399	1,701,851	do	11,086	71,417
1926	do	451,029	640,140	do	9,155	71,587
1927	do	21,299	27,443	do	3,579	30,158
1928	do	224,133	280,690	do	3,867	26,917
1929	do	36,263	29,208	do	1,945	13,367

[1] Does not include wheat entered free of duty for milling in bond and reexport.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this conference report marks the final act in the passage of the Hawley-Smoot, or "Grundy," Tariff Act, the most atrocious and iniquitous piece of legislation of its kind ever foisted on the American people.

The excessive rates carried in this bill adversely and seriously affect every man, woman, and child in the United States, and its evil consequences will be felt hardest by the workers in the large cities and their families.

It adds an enormous amount to the cost of living, estimated as high as a billion dollars a year. This bill is pushed through Congress over the protest of more than 30 foreign nations—those nations which give us the foreign markets to take the surplus of farms and factories—it is jammed through in spite of the protests of more than a thousand of the foremost economists of the country, who see in it the destruction of our foreign markets. In my opinion it will be of little or no service to industry but, on the contrary, it will add recruits to the already large army of unemployed.

Nowhere in the make-up of the bill does any attention seem to have been given to the average citizen—the too-often forgotten consumer. Everything that he or she needs to keep body and soul together is taxed, and for whose benefit? Food, such as sugar, fruits, vegetables, meats, and dairy products; wearing apparel of all kinds; boots, shoes, hats, woolens, cottons, silks, and rayons; house furnishings of every description and the materials used in building homes; jewelry, watches, and clocks; chinaware and glassware.

Even the bedside of the sick has not been overlooked in the taxing of surgical instruments and hospital appliances. In fact, nothing that in any possible way could add to the increased cost of living for the average person has been overlooked in the making up of this tariff bill for the favored few. It has been denounced by the press of the Nation and merchants throughout the country have protested its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the great mass of consumers who will feel the effect of the burdens that must naturally follow in the wake of the adoption of this bill, and as a friend of the many millions of people throughout the United States who go to make up this class, I can not in good conscience do anything else than vote against the adoption of this legislation. I know that there are sufficient votes to pass the bill, but the responsibility for all its iniquities and the results that are sure to follow rests upon the shoulders of those who vote in favor of it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have voted for this tariff bill.

I have not voted for it because it is perfect.

I do not think it is perfect.

It is far from perfect.

Its friends know this.

I cast my vote for it because it seemed to be the best thing to do.

Our Government is founded on checks and balances.

The slogan on the streamer in the eagle's beak in the coat of arms of the State of Illinois, "State sovereignty and national union," still holds good. And the provisions in the United States Constitution guaranteeing that the three functions—executive, legislative, and judicial—shall not be interfered with still holds good.

It follows inevitably that the resulting institution, the concept, the reaction, the grand total, the grand culmination—that is, our dual Government, with three agencies or departments—is a general, generous, wide-sweeping compromise, a give and take.

This being so, it is not to be wondered at that 96 Senators and 435 Representatives, each with diverse interests and burdens and needs and policies and triumphs and disasters, should each have had to subscribe to some things they did not want and to vote against some things they did want.

The tariff situation is no exception; it does not escape.

Consequently, when the Senate by a vote of 44 to 42 and the House by a great vote voted the present tariff bill nobody was entirely satisfied.

It was always so. Nobody was entirely satisfied with the Magna Charta or the Declaration of Independence in 1776 or the Constitution in 1789.

Nobody was entirely satisfied with the results of all our wars.

And there have always been numerous men, leaders, who have felt that our diplomatic efforts and achievements could have been better.

But somehow or other the world has "muddled along."

And neither triumph nor disaster has been able to check the onward march of civilization.

Kipling, the British writer, says:

If you can meet both Triumph and Disaster
And treat those two impostors just the same * * *.

He was right; they are both impostors, for neither is what it pretends to be. Triumph is not so satisfying as it might be and neither is disaster so appalling. We manage to survive both.

I attach as fairly reflecting my own feelings and hopes the following paragraphs from an editorial in the Washington Post:

THE NEW TARIFF LAW

As promptly as possible President Hoover announced that he would sign the tariff bill. His review of the bill sweeps aside much popular misunderstanding, most of it deliberately injected by opponents of protection. Among the worst offenders against truth in tariff matters have been the selfish interests that are trying to induce foreign governments to grant them special tariff favors. These interests would not hesitate to injure or destroy other American businesses if by so doing they could sell more goods abroad. Many of them have been built up by the protective tariff; and now, after having reached the state where they are not in need of protection, they are not willing that American labor, industry, or agriculture should have protection.

The new tariff law is strictly in line with the majority sentiment of the United States. It increases duties principally on agricultural products. It maintains duties in industries employing millions of men. It makes relatively few increases in industrial duties, and with all the political agitation against the bill no one has yet pointed out an increase that is unwarranted. The purpose of the bill is to stimulate production and to keep producers employed. Unless Americans can be employed productively they will not be heavy consumers of anything, however cheap. Employed at high wages, they are the greatest consumers in the world. Their purchases of foreign goods run into billions of dollars annually. No foreign country that can produce the raw materials required by America need fear the new tariff law.

Mr. Hoover takes pride in the fact that his insistence has brought about a great improvement in the mechanism which will make tariff readjustments flexible, by particular items and not by general revision. The turmoil attendant upon general tariff revisions is relished by nobody, and it is gratifying to see new legislation that will make general revision unnecessary for a long time to come.

The success of the flexible provision will depend largely upon the ability of the new Tariff Commission. Increased salaries will enable the President to obtain the services of capable men. He will select Democrats and Republicans in equal numbers. A recommendation by the Tariff Commission will necessarily be nonpartisan, and the spirit of the new law requires that the commission shall apply the protective principle. Improved methods of ascertaining the disparity between cost of production here and abroad will enable the commission to make prompt reports, upon which the President can readjust rates to meet changed conditions.

The Democratic Party seems to believe that it can make the tariff a leading issue in forthcoming campaigns. To this end the spokesmen of the party have been indefatigable in their criticism of the new law. Many of them have gone contrary to their own party platform in trying to defeat a system that insures employment of American workingmen in preference to foreign workers. The American industrial system, which is the envy of all other nations, is based upon protection. The people have repeatedly, by overwhelming majorities, approved of protective tariffs. The new tariff law enlarges the protection afforded to agriculture, but does not otherwise materially differ from former tariffs. Therefore it does not seem probable that a successful attack can be made upon the tariff as a political issue.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the tariff bill of 1930 is now economic history. Imports from foreign countries now are subject to the new rates set up and made a law by the passage of this act. The time has arrived when every loyal American citizen should display his faith in fundamental American principles—those principles which are the bedrock upon which this great country is founded. Faith in the United States of America and in the Government which guides our country is the need of the moment, for it breeds prosperity and well-being. The tariff bill is a law, and we should accept it and stop going about with long faces. As Shakespeare said:

Things without all remedy should be without regard; what's done is done.

The Washington merchant who quoted this line in a local paper a few days ago made a commendable display of faith in our Government; we need more of it from all sides. Calamity howlers go about talking of business depression and unemployment, spreading uneasiness. What we need is more good cheer leaders. The new tariff bill should go far to help herald the dawn of a new day of prosperity and progress, for it digs down toward the basic reasons of unemployment and depressions.

The United States have long been the dumping ground for cheap merchandise of every foreign country in the world. This new bill should help eradicate that. Foreign countries with their cheap, low-grade labor have exported goods to this country, where they have been sold on the open market in competition with goods made by high-grade, well-paid American labor. The result is that foreign-made goods have sold in preference to American-made goods. Factories can not continue to turn out products that are not selling. They must close down. Because of this foreign competition, American factories have been forced to close, others to curtail production. As a result, our workers have been forced into idleness. Idle workers have no money to spend. Thus, we have had both depression and unemployment. This new tariff bill creates schedules higher than ever before in tariff history. They are badly needed to eliminate this cut-throat competition. By forcing foreign imports to compete fairly with our own products, we give protection to our workers; we insure our industries of that honest competition to which they are entitled.

The State of Kentucky has fared fortunately in this tariff bill and my own district has been recognized very favorably. The blue-grass section of Kentucky, long famous for its blue grass and orchard-grass seeds, has secured a tariff on these seeds that will insure ample protection against the influx of the cheaper Canadian seeds. These two items, formerly taxed at 2 cents per pound, have been increased 3 cents and are now carrying an import duty of 5 cents for every pound imported into this country to compete with the seeds raised in Kentucky.

Tobacco, the principal agricultural product of Kentucky, whose Burley is world-famous, has also been recognized in the tariff bill. The tobacco-raisers, long stifled in the grip of an unjust and unwarranted high revenue tax on cigarettes, have been given some relief from competition with the cheaper tobacco from other countries. The rates on wrapper and filler tobacco have been increased 17½ cents over the rate of 1922. This will effect a great saving to the tobacco farmers of Kentucky and the South. I sincerely hope that in the next session Congress will see fit to act upon the bill which I introduced to cut in half the revenue tax on cigarettes, which will grant a more effective relief to tobacco raisers. This tax is now working a great hardship on Kentucky's Burley tobacco growers.

Butter, for which the Kentucky housewife and dairy farmer are justly famous, has received an increase from 12 cents to 14 cents. In reality, butter has been increased 6 cents over the rate of 1922. This product was given additional protection by an Executive order, the tariff of 8 cents having been increased to 12 cents.

Similarly, almost every other agricultural product has been accorded protection. The duty on eggs has been increased. The rate on eggs in the shell has been raised from 8 cents to 10 cents. Prepared eggs have had an increase from 6 cents to 11 cents per pound.

The rates on poultry have been increased to a degree where they afford real protection to the poultry farmer. The tariff on chickens, ducks, geese, turkeys, and guineas have been increased from 3 to 8 cents per pound. Dressed and undressed poultry receive an increase of 4 cents per pound.

Wheat, that great staff of life for which a friendly market is such an absolute necessity to many thousands of farmers, has been increased from 30 to 42 cents a bushel, which will go far toward granting American farmers protection against the unfair competition of Russian and Argentine wheat.

On every hand we may expect to see the reviving influence of this tariff law. It is not perfect—but Congress is not perfect; but it is a bill over which the labor of many months has been expended—a bill which honestly seeks to fill a vital need. It may not fill that need in every instance—the probabilities are that it will not. Yet it will go far toward granting that relief which American labor, industry, and agriculture have long needed. It may bring a squeal from those who would prefer to buy the cheap shoes of Czechoslovakia in preference to the American product. It may cause a howl by those who prefer to walk and ride on Belgium concrete roads and walks, rather than on roads made of paving produced in the United States. It may cause a feeling of bitterness in the breasts of those who prefer to eat the butter made in Denmark and Sweden rather than that made by the Kentucky housewife and dairy farmer. I contend that the people who raise these outcries are not deserving of consideration.

I would rather live in a house made of American concrete or American lumber; I would rather eat the bread made of American wheat, raised on an American farm by American farmers; I would rather wear a pair of shoes made in an American factory, than a pair made by cheap labor in Czechoslovakia, while American shoemakers go hungry. I would rather live in America and buy the products of American agriculture and labor, rather than live here and while pretending to be a patriotic citizen purchase the goods imported from foreign countries just because they cost a few cents less. I put my Americanism and my love for Americans above the miserly question off dollars and cents. If it is necessary to protect American agriculture, American labor, and American industry, I am willing to help erect a tariff wall a mile high, if need be, for they are our countrymen, our fellowmen, and they deserve and should have our consideration before the people of any other land.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the new tariff bill just signed by the President the tariff on sweet milk was changed from 2½ to 6½ cents per gallon; condensed milk from 7 to 12½ cents per pound; cream 40 per cent butterfat from 20 cents per gallon to 56 cents per gallon; butter from 8 cents per pound to 14 cents.

This is intended to give the American market to our dairymen, because we can produce all that the United States consumes at a reasonable price. The tariff on casein made from skim milk was increased from 2½ to 5½ cents per pound, opening up a market for skim by manufacturing casein, which is now being imported.

Milk is the largest source of revenue for the average American farmer, and the price of milk for a number of years has been fairly good as compared with other articles, and we have been receiving a direct benefit of the tariff on butter.

Last fall the situation began to change and by December the price of butter went down to a parity with Danish butter on the London market and has stayed there during the winter and spring, and milk producers lost the benefit of the tariff. During May and June very low prices obtained on the London market, and the tariff again protected the American producer to the extent of a few cents per pound; but butter remains at least 10 cents below the tariff wall and 10 cents at least below normal prices.

Milk prices are based upon the price of butter to a very large extent, and if conditions do not change, this year will show a decrease in the receipts of farmers for milk and its products of from $300,000,000 to $400,000,000 less than the previous year. The cause of this is generally ascribed to an increased number of cows, and the recommendation of the Government authorities has been to reduce the number of cows by selling the poor ones. However, there was another reason. We had an abundance of grass in July, August, and September last year on account of constant rain at a time when there is generally very much less rain and very much less grass growing, and this caused all dairies to produce an unusual amount of milk. The surplus was converted into butter, and this butter eventually went into cold storage and was carried through the winter.

Even now, in June, 1930, there are some 17,000,000 pounds of butter in storage more than there were a year ago and more than there were two years ago on the same date. That is, 17,000,000 pounds of butter have caused a drop in the price of butter from 10 cents to 12 cents per pound, and we produce in the United States 1,500,000,000 pounds of butter per year. The loss on this total production of butter amounts to at least $150,000,000 for the year on account of the reduction in price. The 17,000,000 pounds of butter now in storage in excess of previous years is worth on the market something less than $6,000,000, so we are enduring a loss of $150,000,000 in the price of butter on account of having a surplus worth, all told, about $6,000,000. This is not all of the story.

The milk used in butter represents only about one-third of the milk produced—the balance being used for fluid milk to be bottled for city use, also milk used to be evaporated or condensed, also milk used for cheese making.

If we have lost $150,000,000 on the milk used in butter, it is very probable that we have experienced an actual loss of more than $300,000,000, because the price of milk for all other purposes has declined materially, but it is quite impossible to get an actual estimate of the loss such as we can make on butter but it is clear that this $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 worth of surplus butter is responsible for a loss of not less than $300,000,000 to the dairymen of the United States.

If this small surplus is allowed to stay on the market it will continue to depress our market. If you are interested in agriculture and want the farmer to have a source of income and be able to live in some degree like other people live in the United States and do not wish agriculture to become absolutely bankrupt you will say: Why not destroy that $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 worth of butter? But that is an uneconomic proceeding and does not appeal to very many.

Then why not buy this butter and take it off the market and state when you buy that it will not be sold back into the American market but will be disposed of outside of this country when a favorable opportunity offers. Then it can not get back on the American market unless it pays the 14 cents per pound tariff duty on butter.

Of course, there would probably be some loss in this transaction. We might lose $1,000,000; but what if we did, if we brought the dairy business back to where it was a year ago? What if we did, if we restored the 10 cents per pound that has been lost by the American dairyman, which would amount to $150,000,000 per year to him? What if we did, if we restored the price of milk—and, by the way, the consumers over the United States have received no benefit from the reduced price of milk which the farmer is getting, because bottled milk has not changed in price in many cases.

Who would have the power and authority to put up $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 and buy this butter and sell it, perhaps, for less than it cost? The Farm Board is undoubtedly organized for that purpose whenever, in their judgment, such a proceeding is necessary. They were given by the Congress $500,000,000 as a revolving fund, to be used in stabilizing farm prices, and butter prices to-day are 10 cents below normal, and it is right to stabilize these prices at the normal level.

It is a fact that they could not do this themselves, but they are empowered to organize a stabilization corporation with full power to act and with power to take care of the loss which, as I have said before, might not amount to more than $1,000,000 on this transaction, and it might increase the value of American products at least $300,000,000.

I submit this proposition to the Federal Farm Board for their careful consideration, together with data confirming my statements, with a full realization that they have a great responsibility in adopting policies and with a firm conviction that the Federal Farm Board has a personnel of unusual ability and a chairman who has endeared himself to agriculture by making the farmer his client and defending his rights.

The Federal Farm Board has been organized less than a year and they are pursuing a course of organizing farm cooperatives to handle and sell the products of the farm. They are succeeding in this purpose, and the merchants who have formerly handled these various items are strenuously objecting, but the Farm Board has stood firm.

When these various agencies are well organized and functioning it is very clear that they will encounter the difficulties in marketing their crops at a fair price, and the country will have the advice and the experience of these organizations in pointing out the way to secure for the producers of food and material for clothing a fair return for their services.

Many are criticizing the Farm Board and saying that prices are the lowest ever endured by agriculture; but, if one will take a long-time view, I believe the Farm Board are getting at the fundamentals and are building a solid foundation. I believe, however, that they have gone far enough now for them to decide to immediately stabilize the butter market by handling our small surplus outside of the country.

We are passing this week a tariff bill intended to improve the situation of agriculture. This tariff bill is criticized mostly by city newspapers who may not be interested in improved agricultural conditions. A careful survey of this bill shows that 50 per cent of the increases are on agricultural raw materials, 18 per cent on processed or manufactured agricultural products, and 32 per cent on industrial products.

This country now has probably an industrial majority. At any rate, it has an industrial preeminence of influence in public affairs, and I feel that agriculture has been fortunate in carrying out its purpose in this bill, under the circumstances. The industrial part of the Nation has conceded to agriculture in this bill some degree of equality under the tariff, but, at the same time, it has demanded some advances and at the same time has been forced to accept 243 decreases in tariff duties, while I am not aware that agriculture has suffered one single decrease in duty. Many of these schedules are effective on

agricultural products and the effect will be direct and immediate, but on our surplus crops we still have a great problem because they are selling at world prices.

This is the problem before the Farm Board and before the Congress and faces agriculture. In my opinion, it can and must and will be solved.

I append the data supplied by the Department of Agriculture, which confirms my figures, and for the consideration of the Federal Farm Board.

Production of dairy products

[Million pounds, 000,000 omitted]

Products	1927	1928	1929
Creamery butter	1,496	1,487	1,514
Farm butter	600	590	580
Total butter	2,096	2,077	2,094
Total cheese	407	438	375
Condensed and evaporated milk	1,856	1,918	2,066

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Production of milk in the United States, 1926

Product	Whole milk used	Per cent of total milk
	Pounds	
Creamery butter	30,487,086,000	25.245
Farm butter	12,915,000,000	10.694
Cheese (all kinds)	4,274,160,000	3.539
Condensed and evaporated milk	4,333,760,000	3.589
Powdered milk	86,144,000	.071
Powdered cream	6,289,000	.005
Malted milk	45,481,000	.038
Sterilized milk (canned)	1,286,000	.001
Milk chocolate	171,543,000	.142
Ice cream (gallons)	4,464,144,000	3.698
Total whole milk used in manufacturing	56,784,893,000	47.020
Milk:		
For household purposes	56,417,000,000	46.716
Fed to calves	3,941,600,000	3.264
Wasted (estimated)	3,622,994,000	3.000
Grand total	120,766,487,000	100.000

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Dairy and Poultry Products.

Milk used in manufactured products in the United States, 1927 and 1928

	Milk used per unit of product	1927			1928		
		Quantity of product manufactured	Whole milk used	Per cent of milk manufactured	Quantity of product manufactured	Whole milk used	Per cent of milk manufactured
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		*Pounds*	*Pounds*	
Creamery butter	21	1,496,495,000	31,426,395,00	54.486	1,487,049,000	31,228,029,000	53.947
Farm butter	21	600,000,000	12,600,000,000	21.846	590,000,000	12,390,000,000	21.404
Cheese (all kinds)	10	403,686,000	4,066,860,000	7.051	437,519,000	4,375,190,000	7.558
Condensed and evaporated milk	2.5	1,855,722,000	4,639,305,000	8.044	1,918,427,000	4,796,068,000	8.285
Powdered milk	8	11,464,000	91,712,000	.159	9,605,000	76,840,000	.133
Powdered cream	19	338,000	6,422,000	.011	673,000	12,787,000	.022
Malted milk	2.2	22,116,000	48,655,000	.084	21,128,000	46,482,000	.080
Milk chocolate			183,538,000	.318		175,456,000	.303
Ice cream (gallons)	13.75	335,628,000	4,614,885,000	8.001	348,046,000	4,785,633,000	8.268
Total whole milk used in manufacturing			57,677,772,000	100.000		57,886,485,000	100.000

United States cold-storage holdings of creamery butter

[Figures given in millions of pounds; i. e., 000,000 omitted]

Month	1928	1929	1930
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
January	46	44	82
February	28	25	60
March	14	12	47
April	6	6	30
May	5	6	23
June	16	28	
July	70	92	
August	120	152	
September	136	169	
October	128	159	
November	106	138	
December	71	112	

Source: United States Cold Storage Reports, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Butter—Weekly quotations per pound on best Danish and New Zealand butter in London and 92-score butter in New York

	London		New York 92 score
	Danish	New Zealand	
1927	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Jan. 6	39.3	37.8	50.00
Feb. 3	40.8	37.6	50.50
Mar. 3	40.1	35.8	50.00
Apr. 7	38.9	33.0	50.00
May 5	35.0	33.2	44.50
June 2	36.3	36.7	43.00
July 7	35.1	34.9	41.50
Aug. 4	36.3	36.1	40.50
Sept. 1	39.8	38.2	44.50
Oct. 6	42.4	39.1	49.00
Nov. 3	41.3	36.7	48.00
Dec. 1	42.2	36.7	51.50

Butter—Weekly quotations per pound on best Danish and New Zealand butter in London and 92-score butter in New York—Continued

	London		New York 92 score
	Danish	New Zealand	
1928	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Jan. 5	39.8	35.2	52.00
Feb. 2	38.9	35.2	48.00
Mar. 1	43.0	37.6	49.00
Apr. 5	41.1	36.5	45.50
May 3	39.0	35.6	44.50
June 7	37.2	36.9	44.00
July 5	38.0	38.4	44.00
Aug. 2	39.5	39.5	45.25
Sept. 6	41.5	39.6	49.00
Oct. 4	42.7	39.3	48.50
Nov. 1	42.8	38.4	49.00
Dec. 6	44.3	38.9	52.00
1929			
Jan. 3	42.4	40.0	49.00
Feb. 7	42.4	39.3	50.50
Mar. 7	40.6	37.2	50.00
Apr. 4	35.4	35.1	45.00
May 2	35.8	35.8	45.50
June 6	37.6	37.0	43.00
July 4	38.4	37.4	42.00
Aug. 1	37.5	37.0	43.50
Sept. 5	40.1	38.4	45.00
Oct. 3	44.2	39.5	46.00
Nov. 7	40.8	37.6	43.50
Dec. 5	39.5	35.8	43.50
1930			
Jan. 2	38.4	34.1	38.00
Feb. 6	38.5	33.3	36.00
Mar. 6	35.8	30.4	34.70
Apr. 3	30.6	27.4	38.00
May 1	29.8	28.9	37.00
June 6	28.9	27.6	33.00

Prices for the first week in the month.

Foreign quotations as cabled weekly by Agricultural Commissioner E. A. Foley, and converted to United States equivalent at par of exchange.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Speaker, after a period of 17 months, during which time this bill has been under continuous consideration and discussion by either the House or the Senate, we have reached the final stages of action—the adoption of the conference report.

It is, perhaps, useless to have any further discussion on the merits of the bill to-day. I am sure that everyone has reached the conviction as to how he or she shall vote. As the "baby" conferee, I do want to say a few words about the members of the conference committee, both the Democrats and the Republicans. We have had a long and strenuous session in the passage of this legislation; part of the time in committee, some time in executive sessions of the committee, and considerable time here on the floor of the House, and in all that time I can safely say that there has been no very substantial difference between us excepting with respect of our personal, conscientious views.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], the distinguished chairman of our committee, deserves all of the fine things that have been said about him by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has himself been a very able assistant to the chairman. And for the benefit of the House I just want to say that while there have been many things said about the Republican members of the conference committee and their attitude in conference, I am gratified to say that without exception we voted as a unit on every item and paragraph of the bill that was before the conference for adjustment.

With respect to the Democratic members of the conference, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER], while their views were, and still are, entirely different from ours on the theory of a protective tariff and what constitutes protection, we got along with them very harmoniously, and there was never a time when the voice of a conferee was raised in anger.

All the items in dispute between the two Houses have now been adjusted, and while our Democratic colleagues offered a measure of resistance they always finally gave way with good grace, and I want to express to them my appreciation for their very courteous consideration and treatment of the many difficult problems which confronted us.

It is usually when we reach this stage of any piece of important legislation that the floodgates of abuse, vituperation, villification, and denunciation are turned loose by its opponents. This is especially true of tariff legislation; and so in the past few days the Halls of Congress have rung strident with the voices of our Democratic brethren, and some of our so-called progressive Republican brethren, denouncing the bill as the most monstrous and atrocious tariff law ever enacted, with the exception of the Fordney-McCumber law, the Payne-Aldrich law, the Dingley law, the McKinley law, and every other protective tariff law that has preceded the enactment of this act. They have said the same things about all, and we will continue to be regaled with these outbursts through the remaining days of the session, both here and through the publicity bureau of the Democratic National Committee.

But I am inclined to the opinion that much of the abuse that has been heaped upon this legislation has been uttered by its abusers with their "tongues in their cheeks," for there are very few Members of the House and Senate voting against the final passage of this act who are not believers in the "practice" of a protective tariff, although against it in "theory"; at least, they are believers to the extent that they have left no stone unturned to get into the bill increased rates for commodities of the farms and factories of their districts—and some have even gone so far as to brag about how they succeeded in getting these increased rates in the bill—only to abandon the cause when certain of enough Republican votes to pass the bill and vote against it on final passage.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about the protests of foreign nations against the passage of this bill and their threats of retaliation. These protests deter me not the slightest in my support of a protective tariff. It should not be forgotten that practically every one of these protesting foreign nations, perhaps profiting by the example set by the United States, have themselves adopted the policy of a protective tariff in the past 12 years, and in many instances their rates are higher than ours.

I have no objection to their doing this, but I do most strenuously object to their "butting" into our affairs and trying to tell us what is best for us in the way of tariff legislation. I am not an internationalist. I am an American. The policy of a protective tariff is an American policy, and for that American policy I stand foursquare against its opponents, be they within our shores or without our shores.

I want the American markets so protected that the industries and farms of my State and throughout the Nation shall be prosperous. I want the wages of the American workmen and the American farmers protected against the cheap wages of Europe and the Orient. I want our workers to have higher wages, not lower wages, so that they may own their homes and be able to give their children the advantages of higher education. I want them to be able to enjoy the pleasures of the automobile and the radio and to have their homes equipped with all those labor-saving appliances which make the work of the housekeeper easier and more enjoyable. In a word, I want to see the workers of this country enjoy the highest possible standard of living attainable, and in my opinion such conditions can only be attained and fostered under the beneficent influences of a protective tariff.

Our foreign customers should not lose sight of the fact that it is just as important for them, as it is for us, that the high standard of American living and the high scale of American wages shall be maintained, for without a high purchasing power we would be able to use little of the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of commodities which now come into the United States, no matter if we had a high tariff or a low tariff law in force.

The protest of foreign nations is no new thing. There were as many protests following the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Act and as many predictions of disaster to our foreign commerce, but what actually happened is an entirely different story. We are told by the Secretary of Commerce that—

> In the seven years under the 1922 tariff act, our total imports increased 41 per cent. Imports of manufactured goods from Europe rose from $340,000,000 in 1922 to $581,000,000 in 1929, or by 45 per cent. These gains were not due to increased prices of commodities.
>
> IMPORT INCREASE GENERAL
>
> Our imports from Germany and Czechoslovakia more than doubled; from Italy they increased 83 per cent; from Belgium, 37½ per cent; from Spain and Switzerland about 25 per cent each, and from France, 20 per cent. The United Kingdom is the only important European country from which we purchased less in 1929 than in 1922, and this falling off was not due to changes in our rates of duty.
>
> During the same period, our exports of finished manufactured goods, the class most affected by the tariff of foreign countries, increased practically 100 per cent. Every year following the enactment of the 1922 act showed a marked gain until the present year.
>
> It is obvious, of course, that the reductions in imports and exports which began in the latter part of last year are not to be attributed either to the discussion of our tariff or its enactment. There has been a recession in business and a reduction in prices throughout the world. Other countries, as well as ours, have seen their trade in both directions decline during recent months.

My idea of a protective tariff is that the rates of duty on imported articles which come into active competition with the products of our own farms and factories should be based not alone upon the actual difference in the cost of production at home and abroad but they should be so fixed as to equalize as nearly as possible the difference in competitive conditions between the United States and other countries.

When this measure was before the Ways and Means Committee for determination as to what rates in the various schedules should be increased, we endeavored to lay down the rule that very definite and real competition was established where imports of any commodity equaled 10 per cent of domestic production. Of course, not all of the items on which the rates have been increased could be measured by such a yardstick; there were other factors to be considered. For instance, there are many commodities shipped here in bulk, such as cement, brick, sand, iron pipe, pig iron, certain kinds of ores, and other heavy materials, which do not come into competition with domestic articles of the same kind outside of the seaport areas in which they are delivered. On some of these commodities we found that while the imports were less than 10 per cent of the domestic production the selling price of the imported article in the seaport town influenced the price of the domestic article throughout the country, and therefore not only did the foreign competition destroy the home industry in these seaport areas but it forced the domestic producers in all sections of the country to sell their goods at unprofitable prices. Conditions of this nature, of course, had to be considered in adjusting the rates on such commodities.

Then there is an entirely new element which confronts us today in the making of tariff legislation which did not so strongly present itself when our tariff law was last revised in 1922, and that is the element of mass production. In previous tariff revisions mass production in the United States, which was not then so far advanced as it is to-day, was used as an argument for keeping down tariff rates, the contention being that under

our system of mass production our American workers were able to turn out many times over in a day's work the quantity produced by foreign workers under the foreign methods then in effect, all of which permitted the paying of higher wages to the workers and resulted in higher profits for the manufacturers more than sufficient to make up the difference in cost of production and meet foreign competition in the home markets.

Mass production on the scale on which it is practiced to-day presents a very vital problem in our economic life in its relation to the employment or the lack of employment for our workers. The changes brought about by this so-called mass production, which simply means the substitution of machinery for our men and women workers, has resulted in throwing several millions of workers out of employment, with its attendant hardship and suffering, and has been a high price to pay for industrial progress.

Very largely our great industrialists and economists, with all the aid that our Government is able to give, are directing their energies to find some way to absorb this surplus of workers and put them to work in new fields of industry, but it is a stupendous job and must naturally take time. I think that much of the unemployment now existing is directly due to our inability to find new work for those who have been displaced by new machinery.

At the hearings before the House and Senate committees some startling information was given bearing upon the extent to which men and women who have spent their lives in developing skill and ability in their work now find themselves displaced by machinery. A few of these instances are worthy of the notice of the general public:

Cases in the steel industry were cited where 7 men now do the work which formerly required 60 to perform in casting pig iron.

Two men now do the work which formerly required 128 to perform in loading pig iron.

One man replaces 42 in operating open-hearth furnaces.

A brickmaking machine in Chicago makes 40,000 bricks per hour. It formerly took 1 man 8 hours to make 450.

In 25 and 40 watt electric bulbs the man-hour output of the automatic machine is more than thirty-one times that of the hand processes.

In New York from 1914 to 1925 the number of workers in the paper-box industry decreased 32 per cent while the output per wage earner increased 121 per cent.

Thousands of skilled musicians with a life's training behind them are being thrown out of employment by the advent of the talking moving pictures.

In the field of news transportation the simplex and the multiplex machines have eliminated the need for trained telegraphers, and to-day by the mere process of typing a message at the sending office the message is automatically printed at the receiving office. Many thousands of trained telegraphers have been made unnecessary during the past few years as a result of this new device.

In the printing trades new inventions in typesetting threaten to make possible the setting of type in innumerable offices scattered as many as 500 miles away by the manipulation of keys in a central plant.

Over 8,000,000 more railroad cars were unloaded last year than 1922 with 250,000 fewer railroad employees.

The General Motors' decrease in the number of its workers amounting to 7,987 was accompanied by an increase in production of 37,347 cars delivered to dealers in 1925 compared with 1923.

Between 1925 and 1927 the number of wage earners in the manufacture of motor vehicles, including bodies and parts, decreased 56,796.

In the men's clothing trade a power machine operated by not more than 2 persons displaces 200 skilled clothing cutters.

In the iron and steel industry, on a general average 1 man now does as much work as 45 men used to do.

On a trans-Atlantic liner we used to average 120 stokers to feed the boilers; now 3 men do this work, dressed immaculately in white, by merely turning a valve.

The New York Edison Co. installed automatic mechanism that is operating an electric distributing station which is supplying sufficient power to light 300,000 homes without one human being in the plant. An operator 3 miles away handling the switch has perfect control at all times.

Again, a mechanical device known as the business brain will do the work of nine-tenths of the office men employed in large institutions. A machine will simultaneously do the work of a cash register, doing bookkeeping and adding, and in another part of the building make a complete record of the sale. One bank that has used this machine estimates that it can accomplish its accounting and auditing with 7 employees instead of 67 formerly required.

Where it took 49 coal shovelers to feed one of the plants of the International Paper Co., 3 men now do the work by feeding crude oil to the boiler.

In 1915 a man in a razor factory honed 500 blades a day; now that same man hones 38,000.

Not less than 2,000,000 workers have been displaced permanently by modern machinery.

The thing which should concern us most in dealing with this problem is the fact that this process of mass production is not confined to United States alone, and what is being done here in this respect is being done all over Europe not only by some of our own captains of industry who have seen fit to build factories abroad for various and sundry reasons but their example is being followed by their foreign competitors, and the postwar reconstruction of Europe has witnessed its mechanization almost equal to that of our own country.

Therefore in the consideration of foreign competition in the making of new tariff laws we must now give added weight to the fact that we are confronted with the possibility of our domestic markets being flooded with a vast increase in importation of foreign commodities and at lower prices than ever, due to this system of mass production which heretofore was calculated to give an advantage to the domestic producer.

The general public, as a rule, has little or no conception of the vast quantity and the large value of the goods imported into the United States annually, which come in violent competition with our domestic products. And, strange as it may seem, this lack of knowledge and understanding applies, perhaps, more particularly to the very workers who are employed in the manufacture of these commodities. I dare say if the average worker was asked as to the quantity of the particular article which he produces that was imported into the United States in the past year, he would be absolutely ignorant of the facts and unable to answer the question; and yet his very livelihood, to a large extent, is affected by it.

For instance, I wonder how many of the shoe workers of the New England States know that in 1922 there were imported into the United States free of duty 871,074 pairs of boots and shoes, valued at $1,091,916; that in 1928 the total imports had increased to 3,249,939 pairs, valued at $9,273,406; that in 1929 we imported 7,158,418 pairs, valued at $18,459,311; and the indications for the year 1930 are that unless these imports are checked by the imposition of a duty they would reach the enormous total of 12,000,000 pairs.

How many of the workers in our hat factories know that in 1927 there were 2,814,196 men's straw hats, with a value of $1,055,780, imported into the United States, while for the year 1929 these imports increased to a total of 8,175,231 hats, with a value of $2,260,907?

How many of the workers in the watch industry know that more than 1,000,000 watch cases are imported annually; that the number of watch movements imported into the United States in 1923 was 2,091,747, with a value of $6,698,685; that for 1927 the imports amounted to 4,375,097, with a value of $10,864,242, while for the 11 months of 1929 the total of imports had jumped to 4,534,153, with a value of $10,455,690? One-sixth of the total watch production of Switzerland is sent to the markets of the United States. Added to this legitimate competition is the illegitimate competition which the domestic industry is forced to meet, in the practice of a certain class of importers and foreign manufacturers to undervalue goods in order to lessen the tariff duty; and some have gone so far as to bribe customs employees to smuggle in shipments of watch movements as dishes, and so forth, and thereby avoid payment of the correct duty. It is said that more than a million dollars' worth of watch parts were smuggled into the United States within the last year.

It might be said in passing that, anticipating an increase in the rates of duty on watches, the imports for the first quarter of 1930 have shown a tremendous increase over 1929, as a result of which the domestic market is so flooded with imported watches that it will probably be a year or more before the effects of the new tariff rates will be felt by the domestic industry.

It would take up much time and space to go on and enumerate the many other similar instances which I might cite, but I am including in my remarks a list of a very limited number of articles, as compared with the total number imported into the United States annually, all of which are highly competitive with American-made goods, as will be noted from the quantity imported.

This list is particularly representative of the industrial and farm life of the State of New Jersey, and it shows a comparison in the imports for the calendar year 1928 as compared with 1929. In some instances the increase is shown to be very considerable. However, it is not alone to the increase in these imports in the one year over the other that I wish to direct attention, but more especially to the actual quantity of the commodities selected that comes into the United States in the course of a year, and to the fact that every pound, ton, dozen, barrel, or whatever the quantity unit may be, displaces a like amount

of American-made goods, and keeps the dollars involved out of the pockets of the American worker. The list follows:

Imported articles in competition with American-made goods

Article	Unit of quantity	12 months ending December— 1928 Quantity	1928 Value	1929 Quantity	1929 Value
Animals and animal products, edible			$139,103,451		$143,790,991
Meat products	Lb	183,248,653	35,632,206	203,543,323	40,893,474
Dairy products			34,228,489		30,414,937
Fish	Lb	373,883,415	38,542,061	369,560,048	39,772,491
Eggs of poultry in the shell ... dut	Doz	285,864	82,795	307,912	90,602
Whole eggs, dried ... dut	Lb	1,835,060	1,017,127	1,642,426	892,193
Whole eggs, frozen, prepared, etc ... dut	Lb	11,124,402	1,750,305	9,180,137	1,585,393
Boots and shoes (all leather) ... free	Pair	2,616,884	8,254,224	6,182,641	17,025,931
Slippers, (all leather) ... free	Pair	633,998	1,019,435	975,522	1,432,705
Other footwear ... dut	Pair	1,171,923	316,633	1,199,990	314,289
Gloves	Pair	11,505,256	11,103,469	17,388,869	16,550,530
Beans, dried ... dut	Lb	138,016,308	6,223,744	120,098,037	6,790,096
Peas, dried ... dut	Lb	12,423,132	467,145	22,527,560	855,228
Peas, split ... dut	Lb	1,242,713	53,487	6,709,802	296,619
Chick peas or garbanzos ... free	Lb	56,705,649	3,352,681	52,538,785	3,262,744
Mushrooms ... dut	Lb	7,830,864	1,958,338	9,071,503	2,503,708
Potatoes, white or Irish ... dut	Lb	222,611,003	3,141,484	256,550,828	4,304,757
Garlic ... dut	Lb	6,179,499	286,583	4,502,253	266,180
Turnips ... dut	Lb	150,425,581	835,849	138,172,986	900,665
Tomatoes, in natural state ... dut	Lb	120,002,335	3,836,116	119,205,417	3,828,208
Onions ... dut	Lb	125,978,441	2,673,529	68,593,148	1,242,310
Other vegetables, fresh, n. e. s. ... free	Lb	226,481	11,788		
Vegetables, canned:					
Peas ... dut	Lb	1,188,803	139,145	1,686,744	130,866
Tomatoes ... dut	Lb	92,732,091	5,198,472	174,786,822	9,005,164
Other ... dut	Lb	8,562,401	861,233	8,716,360	902,553
Vegetables, prepared or preserved:					
Pickles ... dut	Lb	865,279	72,090	2,081,088	100,026
Sauces ... dut	Lb	12,382,624	929,895	13,487,757	974,328
Lentils ... dut	Lb	7,042,968	442,622	11,696,543	965,238
Tomato paste ... dut	Lb	9,817,456	1,054,029	13,857,362	1,612,305
Fruits			58,451,799		58,558,068
Handkerchiefs, other than cotton.	Doz	5,184,889	5,800,072	6,185,673	6,402,925

Imported articles in competition with American-made goods—Continued

Article	Unit of quantity	12 months ending December— 1928 Quantity	1928 Value	1929 Quantity	1929 Value
Laces, embroideries, etc			$6,766,078		$6,087,541
Woolens (for clothing)	Lb	8,636,797	15,856,546	8,371,969	15,799,361
Silk manufactures			41,388,361		38,851,019
Hats of straw, grass, etc	No	22,234,726	7,762,973	37,605,912	14,350,815
Stone, sand, cement, and lime			7,347,427		6,913,759
Glass and glass products			15,239,755		13,992,792
Pottery			17,947,401		18,803,223
Tiles ... dut	Sq. ft.	76,050	403,808	17,735	167,592
Bricks ... free	M				
Iron and steel semi-manufactures			10,690,752		11,003,466
Steel mill products, manufactures			17,483,858		18,173,099
Cutlery:					
Razors and parts ... dut	No	77,577,792	601,988	53,102,011	743,413
Scissors, shears, and clippers ... dut	No	1,209,548	269,309	1,292,877	272,543
Pen, pocket, and other folding-blade knives ... dut	No	4,305,332	207,242	3,857,990	194,338
Other cutlery ... dut	No	1,079,905	382,028	1,122,833	457,761
Table, kitchen, and other ware, glazed ... dut	Lb	766,680	196,642	1,058,390	240,886
Tools ... dut			950,044		1,219,912
Needles, hand, sewing, and darning ... free	M	728,475	854,882	781,623	815,290
Other needles ... dut			202,163		266,520
Dental and surgical instruments ... dut			638,616		853,608
Clocks, watches, etc			13,245,099		16,922,263

Now, let us get the other side of the picture and see how much the foreign workers are paid in comparison with what is paid in the United States. This is a most important matter in the consideration of tariff legislation, and I am therefore following with tables showing a comparison in the wage scale of the United States and Europe and the Orient. These tables are worthy of the closest attention, for they are very complete and brought up to the most recent date available. Would anyone want to see such a scale of wages in effect in this country?

Standard hourly wages of adult male workers in various countries of the world, January, 1930,[1] *by industry and occupation*

[All figures in cents, United States currency]

Industry and occupation	Australia, Melbourne	Austria, Vienna	Canada, Montreal	Czechoslovakia, Prague	Denmark, Copenhagen	Estonia, Tallinn	France, Paris	Germany, Berlin	Italy, Genoa	Netherlands, Amsterdam	Poland, Warsaw	Spain, Barcelona	Sweden, Stockholm	United States Chicago	United States New York	United States San Francisco
Building:																
Bricklayers and masons	70.12	23.06	118.67	28.42	60.46	12.06	23.58	36.78	17.00	40.63	21.39	19.65	77.33	163	175	138
Carpenters and joiners	66.56	21.65	79.11	23.38	49.22	12.06	23.11	37.01	18.31	36.61	17.25	19.65	68.74	150	150	113
Plumbers	67.07	18.28	84.06	22.50	46.81	13.40	22.60	40.60	15.17	35.40		16.38	52.89	163	150	125
Painters (general)	63.01	25.87	79.11	25.16	50.56	13.40	21.62	35.58	18.04	30.17	17.81	16.38	73.03	163	150	113
Structural iron workers		21.37	98.89	35.52			21.62	30.81				16.38	44.30	150	175	138
Concrete workers		21.37	39.56	22.20				36.78	14.64	36.21		16.38	48.60	150	150	113
Laborers (general)	55.40	17.72	39.56	20.72	46.55	8.04	16.31	30.33	13.08		10.98	13.10	48.60	90	120	69
Mechanical engineering:																
Fitters and turners	62.50	17.43	67.25	26.94	44.94	12.96	24.56	30.81	14.12	33.79	21.39	19.65	40.28			
Iron molders (sand)	57.43	16.87	69.22	27.68	51.36	12.33		30.81	18.31	33.79	28.45	19.65	45.65			
Patternmakers	67.58	20.39	79.11	26.20	48.95	13.94		30.81		33.79		19.65	44.30			
Unskilled laborers	48.25	12.37	44.50	13.32	35.31	7.50	16.31	20.06	11.51	*24.94	10.75	13.62	33.56			
Furniture making:																
Cabinet makers	56.41	18.98	64.28	26.64	40.66	10.99	26.53	31.04	18.31	30.98		19.65	40.28			
Upholsterers		18.98	84.06	23.68	43.07	14.20		32.00		30.98		16.38	42.96		129	
French polishers	56.41		69.22	19.83		13.40		31.04	18.31			14.80	40.28			
Printing and bookbinding:																
Hand compositors	63.01	20.67	84.06	23.38	48.15	15.28	24.56	29.13	21.81		26.88	16.38	42.96	123	127	116
Machine compositors	69.61	20.67	84.06	30.78	48.15	19.03		34.86	23.43		37.52	20.44	48.33	126	127	116
Machine minders	63.01	22.78	77.13		46.28	16.35		29.13	21.81			18.08	42.96	126	133	116
Bookbinders	63.01	19.26	72.19	20.72	47.88	14.47	20.04	27.22	21.81			14.80	37.59	107	102	114
Unskilled laborers		13.36		16.87	33.44	11.26	16.31	25.55	13.08		12.77	13.10	32.22			
Electrical installation (building):																
Electrical fitters (skilled)	57.94	19.68	74.17	26.64	40.39	12.06		35.82	18.83	32.18	19.60	16.38	48.33			
Electrical power distribution:																
Electrical fitters (skilled)	55.91			22.20		13.94		35.82	16.74	36.61		14.80	40.28			
Unskilled laborers				17.32		12.60	16.31	29.85	13.08			13.10				
Transport:																
Tram and bus drivers	49.31	24.75	50.43	27.38	36.38	11.79		33.43	14.38	36.61	19.71	12.31	46.18	71	80	78
Tram and bus conductors	49.31	24.89	50.43	27.38	36.38	9.11		30.09	13.55	33.39	19.71	11.53	46.18	71	60	78
Motor drivers (van and lorry)	50.83	20.53	43.51	20.72	33.17	12.60		33.43	11.45			16.38	40.28	59	82	72
Horse drivers (one horse)	45.72	14.06	37.58	17.76	27.29	7.77		27.22	10.72			16.38	36.25	52	70	63
Railway goods porters	47.75		49.45			8.04		23.16	16.21	18.10		16.38	40.81			
Railway permanent way laborers	49.31		44.50			7.24		23.88	11.92	24.54		12.31	42.96			
Food industry:																
Bakers	73.20			21.16	41.20	10.99		29.85			26.88	18.08		82	90	91
Local authorities:																
Unskilled laborers	42.16		39.56	12.28	39.86	8.31		25.55			14.34	13.10	48.33	69	69	82

[1] Except for Australia (June, 1928), Austria (December, 1929), France (October, 1929), and the United States (May, 1929).

Source: International Labor Review (published by the International Labor Office), April, 1930, table on pp. 562-566. Figures there given in foreign monetary units have been converted into cents of United States currency on the basis of foreign exchange rates from the United States Federal Reserve Bulletins, January, 1930, p. 28 and March, 1930, p. 130; as listed below: Australia, 1 shilling, 24.40 cents; 1 penny, 2.03 cents. Austria, 1 schilling, 14.06 cents. Canada, $1, 98.89 cents. Czechoslovakia, 1 crown, 2.96 cents. Denmark, 1 krone, 26.75 cents. Estonia, 1 kroon, 26.80 cents. (Encyclopædia Britannica, 14th ed., article on Currency, vol. 6, p. 880.) France, 1 franc, 3.93 cents. Germany, 1 reichsmark, 23.88 cents. Italy, 1 lira, 5.23 cents. Netherlands, 1 florin, 40.23 cents. Poland, 1 zloty, 11.20 cents. Spain, 1 peseta, 13.10 cents. Sweden, 1 krona, 26.85 cents.

(Information supplied by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce)

India:	
Common laborer, per day	$0.16
Semiskilled laborer, per day	$0.20– .28
Highly skilled laborer, per day	.85
Average wage, per month	11.25
China:	
Peasant laborer, per day	.20– .30
Factory laborer, male, per month	6.50–12.00
Factory laborer, female, per day	.15– .25
Japan:	
Latheman, per day	2.14
Finisher	2.02
Wood-pattern maker	2.36
Foundryman	2.08
Blacksmith	2.52
Carpenter	1.55
Plasterer	1.83
Bricklayer	1.78
Joiner	1.25
Laborer, unskilled	1.04
Stevedore	1.53
Philippine Islands:	
Carpenter, per day	1.16
Mason	1.10
Laborer	.75
Tinsmith	1.06
Electric installer	.50

Well may one inquire of the workers of New Jersey and of the United States, of what avail is it to you to be able to buy some foreign-made article at a few cents less in price, if you have not the money—which has gone to the foreign worker and the foreign manufacturer—with which to pay for it?

I have no complaint to make with those who insist upon buying foreign-made luxuries if they have the money to pay for them, and I assure you that in many instances they will have to pay from 200 to 300 per cent more than they would have to pay for the equally as good American-made article; but I do not want the workers of the United States to be fooled by the false doctrine of the opponents of protection that such a policy will add to the increased cost of living by depriving them of the opportunity to buy foreign-made goods.

Many of the opponents of high tariff legislation contend they are opposed to it because the policy of protection is not a sound policy. This applies particularly to our friends on the other—Democratic—side of the aisle. It seems to me rather strange that they should hold such an attitude in view of their oft-repeated declarations and assertions in other respects that the Democratic Party is the only party which has at heart the welfare of the working people and the protection of American industries.

I venture to say that perhaps from 80 to 90 per cent of the membership of Congress has at some time or other had legislative experience in their State legislatures before coming to Congress; and I daresay that there is not one who has so served who did not have an opportunity to vote in favor of measures looking to the protection of the workers in industry. Our State legislatures have enacted laws for the betterment of factory conditions; for protection against industrial diseases; for improved and protected machinery for the safeguarding of life and limb; for improved living conditions; for improved working conditions in the mines, and so forth. Many laws along these same humanitarian lines have been enacted by Congress covering industries that are subject to regulation by the Federal Government. Not only has legislation been enacted for the protection of the worker but likewise for the protection of the employer.

All of this legislation provided for the protection and betterment of the American workman has added to the cost of the things he produces. Along with these safeguards to his life and health has come a steady increase in wages and the gradual lowering of the hours of employment to the extent that the 5-day week as a universal proposition seems not in the far distant future.

Our Democratic friends will assure you in loudest terms that they are whole-heartedly for that kind of protection for our workers, yet when it comes to supporting by their votes the one paramount thing that makes it possible for the American workman to enjoy all of these things—a policy of tariff protection such as is embraced in this measure, an act which will insure to our workers and those dependent upon them an abundant prosperity with plenty of work, high wages, and short hours—they scuttle the ship, vote against the bill, and denounce it to the world as a monstrosity and a gold brick.

It is extremely difficult to understand the workings of the minds of some of our legislators on the question of protective tariff legislation. For instance, on the item of cement. Following the adoption of a rate of 6 cents per hundred pounds on imported cement, Senator BLEASE, of South Carolina, offered what is known as the Blease amendment, which would permit cement to come in free of duty when imported for the use of a State, county, or municipality, for public purposes. Now, if we are going to permit cement when used for such purposes to come in free of duty in order to save expense to the State or municipality in the building of roads or the erection of buildings, why not pursue this line of thought to its logical conclusion and import the labor with which to build the roads and erect the buildings to be constructed of duty-free cement. The one proposition is as logical as the other, but to my mind both are ridiculous; and yet practically all of the Democrats and quite a few of the low-tariff Republicans supported the amendment.

It was my privilege to serve as a member of the conference committee, which was composed of 10 members, 5 from the Senate and 5 from the House. It so happens that geographically the South and Southwest had 4 members on the committee, 1 from North Carolina, 1 from Texas, and 2 from Mississippi, all Democrats. The West and Central West had 4, all Republicans, leaving the great industrial section of the East with only 2 representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and myself, both good Republicans. It was also my privilege to serve as chairman of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee in charge of the metals schedule, and as a member of the subcommittee on the earth and earthenware schedule.

Under these two schedules come many of the industries of my own district and the State of New Jersey—one of the greatest industrial States in the Union, and equally as great as an agricultural State in comparison with its area. The passage of this new tariff bill therefore means much to our welfare and prosperity. Our workers in our industries are the greatest customers for our workers in agriculture; without steady employment at high wages for our factory workers, there can be no outlet for the products of the farm. Each class is dependent upon the other for its means of existence, and both are dependent upon the protection afforded them in this bill against the inroads of foreign competition, which, if not checked, destroys the home market and eventually leads to suffering and want.

Mr. Speaker, much misinformation has been handed to the people as to the effects of this bill on the general public, and we have heard it branded time after time as the "billion dollar tariff bill" by which the users of the term mean to convey the idea that a billion-dollar burden is being placed upon the American people by reason of the rate changes that have been made.

That a better understanding may be had of what this bill provides in the way of increases and decreases as compared with the present law, I give a brief summary based upon data prepared by experts of the Tariff Commission.

No rate changes were made in 68 per cent of the total items in the present law. Increases were made in 888 items and decreases in 235 items. Seventy-five items were transferred from the dutiable list to the free list and 48 items were transferred from the free list to the dutiable list.

Based on the imports during 1928, the computed ad valorem equivalent of the duties under the present law is 33.22 per cent. Under the pending bill the equivalent ad valorem is 40.08, showing a general increase for all items, agricultural and industrial, of 6.86 per cent, divided as follows:

An increase of 2.37 per cent on industrials; and

An increase of 10.82 per cent on agricultural products.

The actual duties collected under the tariff act of 1922 on comparable items amounted to $522,649,383; under the pending bill on the basis of 1928 importations the total duties collected would amount to approximately $630,456,280, a total increase of $107,806,897.

This increase is divided 68 per cent on agricultural products and 32 per cent on industrials, or an increase of $72,181,314 on agricultural products, and an increase of $36,402,057 on industrials.

A comparison of the average ad valorem rates or their equivalents under various tariff laws, including the pending bill, follows:

The McKinley law of 1890: Equivalent ad valorem	48.39
The Wilson law of 1894–1987: Equivalent ad valorem	41.29
The Dingley law of 1897–1899: Equivalent ad valorem	46.49
The Payne-Aldrich law of 1909–1913: Equivalent ad valorem	40.73
The Underwood law of 1913–1921: Equivalent ad valorem	26.97
The Fordney-McCumber law of 1922–1930: Equivalent ad valorem	38.22
The present bill, based on 1928 importations: Equivalent ad valorem	41.64

Mr. Speaker, no tariff bill was ever enacted that was perfect or satisfactory to everybody. No legislative body could produce such a bill. There are, no doubt, some inequalities in this bill as there have been in every other tariff bill, whether written and adopted by a Republican Congress or a Democratic Congress. In this act there may be some rates that are too high or some that are too low; in my opinion, there are some items in both classes.

We took legislative notice of the possibility of some inequalities slipping into a tariff bill in the act of 1922 when, for the first time in the history of the country, we adopted the so-called "flexible" provision, giving authority to the President, in association with the Tariff Commission, to raise or lower any rate on the dutiable list by 50 per cent.

In this act we have amended and amplified that provision so as to make it more effective and workable and more promptly responsive to the wishes of interested parties. Under the new provision any interested party has the right to apply to the President for an increase or decrease to the limit of 50 per cent of the rate named in the bill. Even those foreign nations who are so bitterly complaining about the passage of this act, have the right to apply for a reduction in rates, a privilege which none of them extends to us in the matter of tariff rates. Whatever errors we may have made in fixing the rates in this bill, either by making them too high or too low may well be adjusted in the proper direction under the 50 per cent limitation provided in the "flexible" paragraph, for I do not think that we have erred one way or the other beyond that limit in the rates named in the act.

In spite of the adverse reaction of the stock market to the final passage of this bill, which its chief opponents ascribe to it but which easily may be the result of punitive methods on the part of some influential international traders who have been so outspoken against the adoption of this legislation, if there is any connection at all between the two events, I have every reason to believe that there will be an early recovery, and there will be renewed and increased business activity as soon as the world adjusts itself to the provisions of the new law, and our foreign commerce will again assume vast proportions even beyond anything ever dreamed of.

It usually takes at least a year following the adoption of a new tariff law before its real benefits to the country are manifested. Taken as a whole, I believe this is the best protective tariff bill that has ever been enacted. Especially is this true of its administrative features, and if these provisions are properly applied, as I feel sure they will be under the guiding influences of the present administration, it should be many years hence before we should again be obliged to make a general revision of our tariff law with its consequent disruption to business.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is the worst tariff bill ever presented to an American Congress. It might be interesting to consider the history of this long-drawn-out legislation. The House Ways and Means Committee began public hearings on this bill on the 7th day of January, 1929, and they concluded their hearings on the 27th day of the following month. Many witnesses testified, some wise, some otherwise. More than 1,100 witnesses testified and many filed briefs. Congress was convened in extra session on April 15, 1929, and the President in his message to Congress recommended a limited revision of the tariff.

The idea, of course, was ostensibly to put agriculture on a parity with industry, but in reality it was to let the interests which had contributed to the Republican campaign fund collect "their's," as was stated in substance by JOE GRUNDY before he was appointed Senator. When the hearings had been concluded the 10 Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee were excluded from participation in framing the bill and the 15 Republican members on said committee proceeded to hold secret hearings and to secretly draft the bill, reporting the same after they had spent approximately 70 days in secret drafting of the bill. The bill was reported to the House on the 7th of May, 1929, and the House passed the bill, under a gag rule, on the 28th day of the same month. The next day, May 29, 1929, it was referred to the Senate Finance Committee, and on the 13th of June following that committee began hearings and ended its hearings on the 18th day of July. On September 4, 1929, a redrafted bill was reported to the Senate. The Senate commenced the debate on the bill on September 12, being in special session, and adjourned on the 22d day of November. The regular session of Congress convened on the 2d day of December, 1929, and consideration of the bill was resumed in the Senate. On March 24, 1930, the Senate passed the bill and sent it to conference and the conference report reached the House on April 28. The House adopted the conference report on agreed items on May 5, and on May 7 the Senate sent the controversial items back to conference, and on May 20 releases of the pledges made on the debenture and flexible provision were made in the Senate.

On May 27 the conference report on controversial items was made to the Senate and returned to conference on points of order, and this report was made to the Senate on May 29. Conference report on agreed items was returned to conference on points of order on June 5 and on the 13th of June the Senate adopted both conference reports and these conference reports are being considered to-day (June 14) under the following special rule:

Resolved, That for the purpose of vote and debate the two conference reports on the bill H. R. 2667 shall be considered as one report. The reading of the two reports shall be waived, and the statement of the managers on the part of the House shall be read in lieu thereof. There shall be three hours of debate, which shall be confined to the reports, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. In the consideration of the reports all points of order shall be waived. At the conclusion of debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the adoption of the reports.

This shows the method of hog tying the House without opportunity for fair discussion, and this method has been pursued every time anything pertaining to the bill has been before the House or committee. This rule even prohibits a separate vote on the two separate and distinct reports. We have to either vote it up or down. The rule also waives all points of order. The American people love fair play and will not approve of this procedure, which harks back to the days of Cannonism.

This marks the history of the bill which has continuously been before the Senate and the House committees and in both bodies for 1 year, 5 months, and 7 days, receiving attention in 3 sessions of Congress. The measure carries 887 increases in rates, and is in no wise a compliance with the President's request for a limited revision. The adoption of the flexible provision is a cowardly surrender by Congress of its constitutional rights and duties, for the Constitution places the power "to levy duties, imposts, and excises" in Congress, and not in the President or Tariff Commission. That is too much power to be placed in the hands of any one man, and our forefathers wisely provided against it. This bill is widely known and characterized as the Grundy billion dollar tariff bill, although, technically, it is the Hawley-Smoot bill. There are at this time approximately 5,000,000 people out of employment in the United States, and, according to the independent press of the country, to say nothing of the partisan press, unempoyment will be increased under its bill. In fact, its contemplated passage has already increased unemployment, has affected the stock market, has caused export trade to decline 21 per cent in the last 4 month, has caused 30 foreign nations to protest against it, and has caused more than 1,000 leading expert economists to warn against it and denounce it and predict disaster to the country on its passage. Some of the largest manufacturing establishments in this country have protested against it. It has been declared by the American Bankers' Association to be a blow at business. Practically all farm organizations have denounced it as contributing to the burdens of agriculture. It is not in conformity with the platform pledges of either party. It does not represent the desire of the American people, and this will be shown in the general elections this fall.

As a result of it the Nation will witness a greater economic depression. It has already started an international war of tariff reprisals. It will make the poor poorer and the rich richer. It widens the gulf between them to the hurt and injury of our country. It is the highest tariff ever written, is a burden to agriculture, is extortionate, is grand larceny. It will be generally condemned by the country. The Payne-Aldrich tariff bill made a one-termer out of Mr. Taft, and Mr. Hoover might well profit by his example. Fifty-seven seats in the House of Representatives was another cost to the Republican Party of the Payne-Aldrich bill. In this bill the source of Republican campaign expenditures has been more liberally rewarded than under the Payne-Aldrich bill, a confirmation of the Bible doctrine "that the ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib." The Connecticut Manufacturers' Association had a representative not a member of either body sitting in at the secret sessions of the Republican Finance Committee, according to the lobby investigation—a new and strange practice—"Herod out-Heroded." Even the high-tariff-ridden State of Pennsylvania, where they mine iron and steel for a living, repudiated the action of Dr. JOE GRUNDY, who lost to Secretary of Labor Davis by a plurality of 366,000. Under the flexible provision, for which the President stood, and the deciding vote for which was cast by the Vice President, the President can jack up a rate for some friendly interest, or he can pigeonhole it, as Coolidge did with the sugar recommendation of the Tariff Commission for the benefit of the Sugar Trust. Let it be remembered that while a tariff tax of $1 was levied on every 1,000 feet of soft lumber, which every man who builds a house will have to pay, telegraph poles and railroad ties were put on the free list. It will be difficult for the farmer to see where he has been benefited by such iniquitous double dealing.

The amendment which would have admitted cement free for public works was eliminated for the benefit of the cement trust

and 6 cents a hundredweight upon cement will add heavily to the cost of every mile of street or public roads in the United States and to every house in which cement is used. The bill as a whole will reduce employment because it restricts trade. It will contribute to unemployment and business stagnation, and for every dollar it puts in the farmer's pocket, it will take out 10. Every man who labors will have to pay more in order to live. The public pocketbook has suffered a raid.

The bill carries a tariff on long staple or sea-island cotton. Very little of that kind is raised in this country. It does not carry a tariff on ordinary staple cotton and would not help the cotton farmer if it did because we produce an exportable surplus. The rate of 25 cents per bushel on corn is a joke sought to be perpetrated on the corn farmer. Only 407,085 bushels of corn were imported into this country last year while we produced last year 2,622,189,000 bushels. The comparison would possibly be about one ear to a wagonload, or one grain to a barrel. The debenture plan, rejected by the Republicans from the bill, would have resulted for the cotton farmer in an increase of $10 per bale on his cotton. It is the only way to make the tariff effective on agricultural products and this country will finally come to it.

The flexible provision, placed in the tariff act of 1922 as an emergency matter, was apologized for at the time by many standpat Republicans who sought to justify their votes for it on the grounds that we were just out of the war and that an emergency existed. During the life of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill it was invoked only four times—on milk-feed bran, long-handle paint brushes, phenol, and bobwhite quail. I predict that the flexible provision in this bill will be used to depress and not to help the masses. Our farm products can not be sold to foreign countries unless we buy from them. Commerce is not a one-sided game. I was born and reared on a farm. I have done all kinds of work incident to farm life. I own a farm now. I live in an agricultural district. I know something about the problems of the farmers. I know they are in hard shape. I know they are depressed. I know many of them are in debt and that a great many have lost their farms. They are already overburdened. This bill will add to their burdens. It will add approximately a billion dollars to the consumers. It does not place agriculture on a parity with industry. There was no demand by the country for a bill of this kind. The idea was to revise it only in a limited way so as far as possible to place agriculture on a parity with industry. The President said so much in his message to Congress. Under the flexible provision in the Fordney-McCumber Act the President, on recommendation of the Tariff Commission, was empowered to raise or lower existing rates 50 per cent. Had there been any demand for higher rates the President could have acted.

The bill was brought to the floor of the House under a gag rule from the Committee on Rules, which committee is composed of eight Republicans and four Democrats, but the Democrats on the committee were shunted aside, and the rule for the consideration of the bill was formulated by the Republicans of the committee. Under the rule adopted for the consideration of the bill no amendments could be offered except such amendments as had been agreed upon by a majority of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee. The Republicans claimed that they were framing a bill for the whole country, and yet the high-handed tactics which I have just mentioned and which they adopted demonstrates that nothing was farther from their minds. They partisanly selected whom they would favor, just as Frank and Jesse James did whom they would rob. I submit that in free America, in the "greatest law-making body in the world," a body supposed to be democratic in theory and practice, the public will condemn the gag rule and the gag methods which have closed the mouths and rendered futile the efforts of their Representatives on the floor of this House. There are 435 Representatives in the House, and yet, under the gag rule, only 8 Members of the House were privileged to offer amendments, 427 Members being denied that privilege. If that is fair dealing, then all of our teaching has been in vain and our faith is vain. Did Mussolini ever usurp and exercise more authority? Talk about "the greatest deliberative body in the world" when 8 Members of the House are given certain privileges denied to 427 Members who are here to represent their constituents and who have taken the same oath. Whither are we drifting, anyway? I voted against the gag rule, and all who voted for it will have a hard time in justifying their votes before their constituents, depriving them of having any voice in the matter.

I would not vote to delegate my rights and the rights of my constituents to the "annointed eight" for the House to "hog tie" itself in order to give the privileged few the right to collect their campaign expenditures, as was expressed by JOE GRUNDY before he became a Senator and while testifying before the lobby committee. GRUNDY was then frank, to say the least, and admitted the fact, which the public has long known, that campaign contributions to the Republican campaign fund are returned with compound interest as soon after the election as possible. This rule was adopted by a practically party vote, and upon it the Democrats can safely go to the country. Had this bill been fairly considered in the House, when each and every Member had an equal opportunity to offer amendments, quite a different bill would have been the result. But the country is to be pilfered and plundered by the special interests and special rules of iniquity must prevail. Under this procedure we had to either vote for the bill as a whole or vote against it as a whole. Only a small part of the bill was read in the House. The bill contained 727 paragraphs, and only 6 of them were read. Is it any wonder that people are losing faith in Congress? Is it any wonder that the bill does not do justice to the farmers, the laborers, and consumers, and that trade relations with other nations are seriously impaired? The Democratic Party stands for a tariff for revenue—a tariff so framed as to give equal protection to labor and capital, to the public generally, and which will not unduly tax the great masses, for after all a tariff is an indirect tax, and the indirect tax levied under this bill will bring about industrial conditions which will bring more distress to the farmers and the consumers generally than the World War brought to the farmers of England and France.

During the past few years farm property in the United States has decreased more than $17,000,000,000 and during the same period of time farm values have decreased more than $13,000,000,000, and during the same time the taxes of the farmers in the United States have been raised from $350,000,000 per annum to $900,000,000 per annum. Under this bill, export trade will be practically destroyed. The cost of living is already too high and the public ought not to be further plundered. There is ample provision under the act of 1922 to secure a tariff based on the cost of production in this country and abroad, without further legislation, but the Grundy crowd had to be compensated—the forward States advance more to the rear. This country can not be prosperous unless we sell our products abroad and when we erect a tariff wall so high that the products of other nations can not come in, then we are committing economic suicide. We can not make our farmers prosperous by further increasing their taxes in an indirect way without giving to them corresponding benefits. This bill adds to their burden and it is no wonder that the present census shows a drift from the farms to the cities. Shoes which now cost $10 will hereafter cost $12. Gloves for men, women, and children are increased from 50 cents to $1. Leather gloves, which now cost $2, will hereafter cost $3. A $3 hat will now cost $4.66. Woolen underwear is increased from 50 cents to $1 per suit. The increase on felt hats will be from $1 to $1.50. Automobiles and trucks will cost more. The tariff on glass, lumber, and paint, in fact all of the material used in the erection of an humble home, will cost at least $100. The sugar in your coffee will cost you more. In fact the sugar increase will be about $7.50 per family; the total cost to the consumer will be $350,000,000 per annum. Knives, forks, chinaware, linens, quilts, and blankets, and so forth, will all cost more.

In fact, everything used is taxed. Eight hundred and twenty-five specific increases have been made, and the farmer is harder hit than anyone else. A tariff ought to place the producers of this country on an equal or better basis than our foreign competitors, and then it ought to stop—a tariff that gives adequate protection to all and not a few, a tariff that will promote commerce instead of destroying it. Farm organizations have condemned it as not placing agriculture on a parity with industry; as increasing their burdens. The future historian will look in vain for any legislation which has been so marked with greed. It gives a stone when bread was requested. I have heretofore mentioned the fate of the Republican Party on the Payne-Aldrich bill. Let us go a little farther back and recall the fact that in 1890 the Harrison administration went to wreck on the McKinley tariff bill, which was passed in June. It then required six years to get a Republican Congress back in Washington. June is, indeed, a bad month for the Republicans when they have as their chief object a tariff steal. William Philip Simms, a prominent newspaper writer, is already predicting that as a result of the tariff the war debts may have to be canceled. To the shame of this country, they have already been canceled to the extent of over $11,000,000,000. The Italian debt settlement cost Texas alone over $44,000,000. Exclusive of war debts, America has invested in foreign countries now nearly $17,000,000,000, and America is adding to this more than two billion annually, and by the time the present year ends foreigners will owe us approximately $19,000,000,000. If we add to this the war debts they owe us it will amount to the staggering sum

of $39,000,000,000. There should be a tariff for all or for none. There should be no discrimination.

Until we can get a new deal at the ballot box, about all the poor, tax-burdened people of this country can do is to pray the prayer of the Norwegian sailor:

O God, save us by your strong right arm;
Your seas are so great, and my bark is not strong.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, in the Book of Proverbs we are told that "Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein." This fate is sure to overtake those responsible for the enactment of the abominable Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. It had only a few friends when it was framed, but its provisions are so vicious that it now has no defenders except those who are its beneficiaries.

The Hawley-Smoot tariff bill is the last word in governmental favoritism.

It filches the pockets of the many to enrich the favored few.

For every dime it drops into the farmer's pocket it extracts a dollar.

It increases the almost unbearable burdens under which the so-called common people are staggering.

It is un-Democratic, un-Republican, and un-American.

It will tremendously increase the cost of living.

It unjustly enlarges the undeserved bounties and unearned profits of the industrial classes.

It substantially increases the spread between what the farmer gets for his commodities and what he pays for his supplies.

It increases the cost of practically everything the ordinary citizen buys.

It will bring prosperity only to those who, by its discriminatory provisions, are licensed to plunder the public.

It does not fulfill the promises made in either the Democratic or Republican platforms or President Hoover's campaign pledges.

It brings to the agricultural classes no worth-while relief, but, on the contrary, subjects them to greater burdens, drives them closer to the pit of insolvency, and leaves them helpless and mangled, like the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho.

It does not place agriculture on an equality with industry.

It has been unequivocally condemned by over 1,000 economists, representing every first-class university in the United States, men of great learning and experience, students of public and economic problems, of all political schools of thought, who denounce it as unconscionable, indefensible, and a base sacrifice of our national interests.

It slaps in the face foreign nations who are our best customers, and will close foreign markets to our products.

It will cause other nations to enact retaliatory legislation, build high tariff walls against the importation of our agricultural and industrial products, and ultimately drive Europe into an economic league against us.

It will play havoc with our foreign trade and create ill will against us among the people to whom we want to sell our surplus products.

It will impair the purchasing power of the masses and reduce the domestic demand for the products of our mills and factories, thereby slowing down production and increasing unemployment.

It represents a big victory won by the troops of special privilege. The buccaneers of big business from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the New England States were marshaled in battle array behind this bill, which they dressed in the tattered livery of agriculture in order to deceive the American farmer while enriching the industrial freebooters.

It does not accomplish the purpose for which Congress was called in extra session. President Hoover and the Republican Party promised a tariff bill that would place agriculture on an equality with industry. The Hawley-Smoot bill signally fails to redeem this pledge. To paraphrase the language of Dante, President Hoover and his party gave us "an abundant promise and a meager fulfillment."

It will lead the masses or so-called common people of America through a labyrinth of error to economic disaster. "God outshoots Satan, sometimes with his own bow." An exploited and outraged public will find in the vicious provision of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill a brood of evils and many weapons with which to destroy those who enacted it.

On a medal commemorating the destruction of the Spanish Armada, appears this inscription: "The breath of God has gone forth and they are dispersed." In like manner the wrath and condemnation of the masses of the American people will smite, hip and thigh, those responsible for this pernicious legislation.

It tremendously impairs the purchasing power of the masses and imposes an unnecessary burden on all vocational groups except those engaged in manufacturing. It picks the pockets of the people. Those who voted for its enactment were consciously or unconsciously influenced by a policy as fatal and unwise as that of "the Indian who fells the tree that he may gather the fruit, and the Arab who plunders the caravans of commerce, who are actuated by the same impulse of savage nature, and relinquish for momentary rapine the long and secure procession of the most important blessings."

It embodies the dull, callous, harsh, and unethical New England school of political thought and reflects the unconcealed impudence and contempt with which the manufacturing classes have always looked upon the demands of agriculture for equality of opportunity.

It pretends to do something for agriculture which it does not do and is ingeniously framed to divert attention from the graft that lurks in every schedule of the bill so the plundered public will leave the beneficiaries of this special-privilege legislation undisturbed and uninterrupted in the enjoyment of their unearned bounties.

It pours the milk of special privilege into the mouths of industrial giants and big business behemoths.

Its effects will be as mischievous as its provisions are unsound and uneconomic.

In enacting the flexible provision of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill you are not doing very much, just tearing a few pages out of the Constitution of the United States.

In ancient France men sold themselves into slavery in order to escape taxation. The Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, by increasing the burdens of tariff taxation, will tremendously stimulate the drift of the agriculture classes toward economic vassalage.

It will unconscionably increase the unearned bounties of big business, which caparisoned, pampered and petted, stands haltered in the gilded stall of privilege like an ox lowing only for provender.

Its provisions are indefensible. It is like a villain with a smiling cheek, or a red apple rotten at the heart. As all the perfume of Arabia could not sweeten or remove the smell of blood from Lady Macbeth's little hand, so all the explanations of the outrageously high schedules of this measure will deceive no one or purge it of its stench.

According to tradition, Dionysius, or St. Denis, who was beheaded by the emperor, picked his severed head in his hand and walked with it 2 miles to the Parisian hill of Montmartre, where he was buried. It seems that the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, after being decapitated by the coalition in the Senate, picked up its severed head, replaced it on its bloody shoulders, and romped up Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House, where it received the blessings of Father Herbert.

If the American people stand mute and accept the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill without emphatic protest, then they will swallow anything, and submit to any burden the special-privilege classes see fit to impose.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, during the period of my membership in this body I have rendered to the people of my district a report of my services every two years. Ordinarily I make such report to them in person in public meetings in every county in the district. At such meetings I advise and consult with the people and obtain their views and judgment on the questions affecting the public interest. I believe what Lincoln said was true—that the common judgment of the people is sound and that judgment should be represented.

This is the first exception to the making of such report at such meetings, made necessary by the continued sessions of Congress where I believed it was my duty to remain until adjournment.

From time to time I have published my views upon all public questions as they have presented themselves for legislation by Congress. But I propose to supplement such views by reporting my position on the major questions as they appeared from time to time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Seniority through continued service and experience is essential to influence and accomplishment in Congress. Membership on the most powerful committees is only obtained in that way. My membership on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is the first representation Oklahoma has had on that powerful committee having exclusive legislative jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to transportation. Equitable freight and export rates affect the price of everything the farmer buys and sells.

If you believe I have faithfully represented your interests and my services meet with your approval, the only opportunity you will have to effectively express that approval will be at the coming primaries. You will then nominate the one to represent you—hence the importance of attending the primary and contributing your best judgment in making that selection. I will appreciate your support now as always, and when nominated and elected will continue to give in return the best services at my command.

During this Congress a multitude of problems presented themselves for consideration and much important legislation was enacted, which will receive our consideration from time to time in future reports. Among the many important propositions which have had my support are the following: The agricultural marketing act; an amendment to the oleomargarine act, imposing a tax on the yellow cooking compounds selling as substitutes for butter; the warehouse act; expansion of the foreign field service with agencies abroad to search for markets for farm products; the bill to suppress unfair and fraudulent practice in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce; relief for the storm-flooded States, including Oklahoma, which bill authorized an appropriation of $7,000,000 for loans to farmers in the flood, storm, and drought-stricken district; an act preventing the manufacture, sale, and transportation of misbranded or deleterious foods; revision of the tariff; veterans' legislation; expansion of the Federal aid road program; Federal bus regulation; expansion of the public-building program; flood relief through the reservoir system; channelization of harbors and rivers, including the Mississippi to St. Paul and the Missouri to Omaha; reorganization of the Federal Power Commission; and the act establishing a national health institute to give the general public the benefit of the latest experiments by noted specialists in the treatment and cure of malignant diseases as cancer, tuberculosis, and others.

Among the bills which I introduced during this Congress were the following: A bill authorizing an appropriation of $50,000 for use in investigation, experimental, and demonstration work at the Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College at Goodwell, Okla.; a bill granting benefits to the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College at Stillwater, Okla., as provided for in the acts of July 2, 1862, and July 23, 1866; a bill which passed the House during the last session providing for an additional Federal judge for the western district of Oklahoma embracing all 12 counties in the eighth congressional district. A public building at Ponca City, Okla., and the selection of Alva and Tonkawa as sites for public buildings, to be included in appropriations already authorized, were secured.

At this time we propose to present the facts in relation to the two questions which attracted nation-wide interest and incurred more controversies during the closing days of the session just ended than any others, namely, the revision of the tariff and veterans' legislation.

THE TARIFF REVISION

For more than a year of almost continuous session Congress grappled with the complex and difficult problems of tariff revision. During this time every Member of Congress was literally deluged with propaganda from every selfish interest in the country, eager to take advantage of an opening up of the question of the tariff to secure protection and increased protection, even at the expense of the industry in whose behalf the revision was undertaken.

Big business fought the tariff bill, resorting to misinformation and misrepresentation in its campaign of opposition. Alarmed at the increased rates levied in the bill on industrial products, it vociferously proclaimed that they more than counteracted any possible advantage that might accrue to agriculture from increased rates on farm products, attempting by their insidious propaganda to induce agriculture to join in a campaign to defeat a bill carrying more substantial relief for the farmers than any in our entire tariff history.

AMERICAN-OWNED FACTORIES ABROAD WANT FREE TRADE WITH US

Why did big business oppose the tariff bill? American industries have invested in factory plants in Germany, Great Britain, the Irish Free State, Cuba, France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and Italy nearly three thousand million dollars. General Motors owns and operates large factories in Germany; Henry Ford manufactures all his tractors and many of his automobiles at Cork, Irish Free State; General Electric has huge investments abroad.

There are large American owned and operated shoe factories in Czechoslovakia, unconcerned in the fact that many shoe factories in New England are closed, with thousands of workers—American citizens—out of employment.

There are big American owned and operated packing plants in Argentina protesting against any proposed increase of duty on cattle and poultry products. Their stand for internationalism and free trade is not predicated on the sound policy of protecting our home market to give our home people employment but of protecting their profits on cheap foreign labor, the products of which they insist on selling in our home market in competition with our own. For increased profits they would sacrifice American labor and American agriculture. It is a cold-blooded policy, this increase of profits through decreased production costs and importation into the home market that gave them their start. They want the duties as low as possible. It is a brutal policy of giving the jobs that belong to our own laboring people and farmers to the cheap labor of foreign countries.

THE INCREASED RATES ON FARM PRODUCTS FULLY JUSTIFIED

The issue in this controversy is clear-cut. It is the captains of mass production and international bankers on the one side demanding greater markets abroad at the expense of the markets at home, and on the other side are the farmers of the country demanding protection of the home market by the exclusion of competitive farm products from abroad. This is the issue in this controversy now raging over this country: Shall the capital invested in foreign countries control our domestic policy at the expense of our home market? Competitive foreign farm products are flooding our markets, depressing the price, and their importations are rapidly increasing each year, congesting our markets and every avenue and channel of trade.

A brief consideration of some of our importations of agricultural products for the calendar year 1929 presents a striking picture of the swollen tides of foreign commerce inundating our markets and, in a veritable whirlpool of competition, absorbing a large per cent of the profits which should rightfully accrue to our home producers.

In that year $21,531,710 worth of cattle was imported into our markets, an increase of nearly 400 per cent since 1923; $54,698 worth of hogs; $241,624 worth of sheep; $355,856 worth of live poultry, compared with $276,328 worth in 1923; 61,853,266 pounds of fresh meats, valued at $8,800,748, compared with 28,783,241 pounds, valued at $3,675,237 in 1923; 118,583,850 pounds of prepared and preserved meats with a valuation of $16,673,205, representing in quantity of imports nearly nine times as much as came into our markets from foreign sources in 1923; 307,912 dozen eggs, valued at $90,602, and 26,030,059 pounds of dried, frozen, and prepared eggs, yolks, and albumen, with a valuation of $8,493,358; 7,215,722 gallons of milk and cream, valued at $5,989,473; 7,867,493 pounds of condensed and evaporated milk, milk and cream powder, valued at $1,106,886; 2,772,746 pounds of butter, with a valuation of $1,036,378; 76,381,795 pounds of cheese, valued at $22,282,200; 515,658,541 pounds of hides and skins, valued at $137,281,386; 35,982,373 pounds of rice (uncleaned, cleaned—except patna flour, meal, etc.), valued at $1,618,247; $17,454,398 worth of fodders and feeds, compared with $8,857,399 in 1923; 334,171,862 pounds of oil cake and oil-cake meal, valued at $6,714,772, compared with 124,124,000 pounds in 1923, valued at $1,764,479; vegetables and vegetable preparations, valued at $47,796,874, an increase of more than $22,000,000 over the 1923 valuation; 174,786,822 pounds of canned tomatoes, nearly six times the 1923 figure and with a valuation of $9,005,164, compared to a valuation of $1,715,739 in 1923; $58,558,068 worth of fruits, compared with $44,415,413 worth in 1923; 31,239,832 pounds of peanuts, valued at $1,465,836; $79,335,487 worth of oilseeds, an increase of nearly $11,000,000 since 1923; $84,243,416 worth of vegetable oils, expressed, and fats, an increase of more than 41 per cent since 1923; $53,821,354 worth of unmanufactured tobacco; $3,276,784 worth of unmanufactured flax; 223,275,455 pounds of cotton, valued at $53,333,212; and 280,360,678 pounds of wool (including mohair, etc., unmanufactured), with a valuation of $87,344,471.

PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURE

Adequate protection against the importation of these items which are glutting our markets and forcing our home farmers to ruthless competition with the products of foreign lands and labor would make possible a more orderly production, a more profitable diversification, and a better balance in agriculture than has heretofore existed. For instance, according to statement of Hon. Arthur M. Hyde, Secretary of Agriculture, our importations of vegetables require 388,000 acres to produce; of soybean oil, 160,000 acres; of corn, 84,000 acres; of peanuts, 67,000 acres; of figs, 62,000 acres; of meats and meat products, 341,000 acres; of dairy products and by-products, 450,000 acres; of cattle, hogs, and sheep, 818,000 acres. On a basis of recent volume of domestic flax consumption and production the increased rates on flax, flaxseed, and linseed oil which the new law imposes make possible a substitution of 2,300,000 acres of flax for hard red spring wheat. The total shift in acreage from crops of which we now produce too great a surplus to crops to which increased tariff protection now offers a better market could run as high as 10,000,000 acres.

Important agricultural products upon which the rate of duty has been raised are cattle, meats and meat products, hides, wool, long-staple cotton, flaxseed, soybeans, butter and cheese, milk and cream, casein, eggs and egg products, and a large variety of fresh fruits and fresh vegetables.

In his analysis of the act, Arthur M. Hyde, Secretary of Agriculture, in substance said:

The average farm family's annual budget is $1,159. What is the effect of the tariff upon this budget? We find by applying the new rates to it, weighting the rate on each item by the expenditure for that item to get a tariff rate, that the weighted average tariff rate on commodities purchased by farmers was 16 per cent by the tariff act of 1922 and is 20.2 per cent by the tariff act of 1930. This would indicate, then, that the maximum possible increase in the farmer's budget on account of the increased rates would be about 4 per cent, or about $48 a year.

But this does not complete the analysis. A large part of the increase is on commodities which the American farm produces, or which are manufactured from raw materials produced by American agriculture. These articles comprise 50 per cent of the farmers' purchases, and it is on them that the rates are highest and the increases greatest. Eliminating these items, the tariff rates on the remaining dutiable items average 34 per cent by the act of 1922 and 38 per cent under the present act. We see, then, that the alarming sum of $6 a year may be added to the average American farm family's budget as a result of the rates on items in which the farmer is not interested as a producer.

Moreover, the term "high agricultural rates" has been bandied about so promiscuously and so generally that it has come to be considered as a general term embracing rates on all agricultural items. Such is not the case. The average farm family spends $16.54 per year on coffee, $4.96 on tea, $4.36 on bananas; and these commodities, not grown in the United States, as well as many spices and crude rubber which are included in the items of the family budget, bear no duty whatever.

There is, in addition, a large free list, including many of the commodities purchased by farmers. There is no duty on fuels, gasoline, and lubricating oils, for which the average farmer pays $95.32 annually, and fertilizer and materials used for fertilizers likewise come in duty free. More than 87 per cent of the farmer's expenditures for tools and machinery is for items on the free list, and a considerable part of the remaining expenditures is for items such as automobiles, on which the tariff is ineffective. More than 60 per cent of the farmers' expenditures for building materials, and more than 22 per cent of their expenditures for equipment and miscellaneous supplies are for items on the free list. Summarizing, about 39 per cent of the farmers' expenditures goes for items on which the tariff act of 1930 levies no duty.

Consider then—50 per cent of the American farmer's purchases for commodities produced by American agriculture and 39 per cent for commodities on the free list—and we have only 11 per cent of his expenditure for commodities bearing a tariff and in which he has no interest as a producer.

Assuming that the rate increases on agricultural commodities were entirely effective, the average income per farm on the basis of 1928 production and prices would be increased by about $150 while the average expenditures per farm would be increased about $48 by increases in duties on commodities purchased, leaving a net balance in change of duties of about $102 per farm in favor of the farmer.

INCREASE IN RATES ON FARM PRODUCTS MORE THAN DOUBLE THE INCREASE ON ALL OTHERS

On an equivalent ad valorem basis the percentage of increase on farm products in the new law is 54.43, more than twice the increase in rates on the other products in the bill. The significance of this increase is emphasized by its comparison with the rate of increase on all items covered in the bill, which is only 6.17 per cent.

The opposition to a protective tariff claimed that the rates on farm products are ineffective. With the exception of wheat and cotton such rates are effective, as we have shown by the importation of farm products in our home market. While they may not be fully effective at all times on the basic crops mentioned, because we have an exportable surplus, yet even they who oppose such rates would not for one moment contend for their removal even on wheat and cotton. Remove the rates on those products and you immediately expose our seaboard cities, our consuming centers, to a flood of Canadian, Australian, Argentine, and Venezuelan wheat produced upon cheap lands with cheap labor, with transportation costs to such markets lower than the costs to the mid-West farmer in our own country, so that those rates are a necessary barrier for protection against such contingencies, and the same is true of long-staple cotton.

COMPARE THESE RATES

The following table, comparing the rates under the 1922 act with those imposed by the recently enacted law on certain items of outstanding importance to agriculture, are illustrative of the degree of increased protection afforded its products under the 1930 act:

Comparison of rates in acts of 1922 and 1930

Commodity	Rate of duty	
	Act of 1922	Act of 1930
Live cattle, weighing less than 700 pounds.	1½ cents per pound	2½ cents per pound.
Live cattle, weighing more tha 700 pounds.	2 cents per pound	3 cents per pound.
Hogs	½ cent per pound	2 cents per pound.
Beef and veal	3 cents per pound	6 cents per pound.
Mutton	2½ cents per pound	5 cents per pound.
Lamb	4 cents per pound	7 cents per pound.
Fresh pork	¾ cent per pound	2½ cents per pound.
Live poultry	3 cents per pound	8 cents per pound.
Eggs in the shell	8 cents per dozen	10 cents per dozen.
Frozen eggs	6 cents per pound	11 cents per pound.
Fresh milk	2½ cents per gallon	6½ cents per gallon.
Cream	20 cents per gallon	56.6 cents per gallon.
Condensed milk, unsweetened	1 cent per pound	1.8 cents per pound.
Condensed milk, sweetened	1½ cents per pound	2¾ cents per pound.
Cheese	5 cents per pound	7 cents per pound but not less than 35 per cent ad valorem.
Casein	2½ cents per pound	5½ cents per pound.
Butter	12 cents per pound	14 cents per pound.
Corn	15 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel.
Buckwheat	10 cents per 100 pounds.	25 cents per 100 pounds.
Oil cake and oil-cake meal	Free	3/10 of 1 cent per pound.
Flaxseed	40 cents per bushel	65 cents per bushel.
Linseed oil	3.3 cents per pound	4½ cents per pound.
Peanuts, not shelled	3 cents per pound	4¼ cents per pound.
Peanuts, shelled	4 cents per pound	7 cents per pound.
Figs, fresh, dried, or in brine	2 cents per pound	5 cents per pound.
Onions	1 cent per pound	2½ cents per pound.
Dried beans	1¾ cents per pound	3 cents per pound.
Scoured wool, not finer than 44's (on wool finer than 44's increased to 37 cents per pound and on unscoured wool to 25 cents per pound).	31 cents per pound	32 cents per pound.
Wrapper tobacco, stemmed	2.75 cents per pound	2.92 cents per pound.

EAST CLAIMS HIGH RATES IN FARM PRODUCTS WILL INCREASE COST OF LIVING

It is conceded on all sides by all parties that the outstanding feature of this bill is the protection assured farm products, the rates on competitive foreign farm products being higher than in any preceding tariff bill in all our history. In all the poisonous propaganda of misrepresentation and denunciation concerning this bill you have not heard from any responsible source that the rates on agricultural products were too low. No one has had the temerity to make any such claim. On the other hand, the greatest opposition to this bill comes from those who are denouncing the rates as too high. The captains of industry are opposing this bill upon that ground. They claim that the rates will be largely effective, that they will increase the cost of food products to labor, and that labor, in turn, will demand increased wages and the increased cost of production in this country will further handicap them and lessen their profits in disposing of the products of their mass production in competition with cheap labor in foreign countries.

Even supposing their claim was true, are we to sacrifice the welfare of our people at home for the profits of the products of mass production which must be sold abroad in competition with cheap labor? Our first concern should be to see that our necessary production at home, especially that which is primary and essential to life, should return at least a reasonable profit to the producers. But there is more hot air than there are hot facts in this howling and yowling about the increased cost of production.

The immediate effect of the high rates on farm products may be to temporarily increase the cost of living, but this will be more than offset in the increased capacity of the farmers to buy the products of industry which represents steady employment at good wages to labor.

The president of the organized labor unions of the country came forward in support of farm legislation with the statement:

We want the farmers to get better prices for their products. As long as union labor has steady employment it is willing to pay more for its food products and thus share its prosperity with the farmer.

How different is the unselfish position of organized labor thus stated from the position of the so-called captains of industry and internationalists who attempted to assassinate the bill on the ground that it would curtail our foreign trade and thereby diminish their profits on transactions in foreign countries.

But while, as we have said, the immediate effect of the high rates on farm products may be to temporarily increase the cost of living, the marketing agency for farm products is being reorganized and there is substantial hope that ultimately there will be an elimination of at least a major portion of

the enormous overhead and waste now existing between the producer and consumer, so that while the farmers will receive higher prices for their products the consumers will be able to purchase them at prices lower than they are now paying. A brief statement from my speech on the floor of the House during consideration of the agricultural marketing bill emphasizes the importance of this phase of the problem:

THE ENORMOUS COST OF SELLING FARM PRODUCTS TO CONSUMER

Here at home is the biggest field for improvement in farm conditions. For the $9,779,000,000 which the farmer received for his farm products the consumers paid $21,730,000,000, the cost of the distribution being $11,951,000,000; or, in other words, here is the field where the farmer has to pay 55 cents to distribute every dollar's worth of products he sells. Here is a field wherein it costs the farmer $100.80 to distribute a thousand pounds of beef for which the farmer receives $72.40. The consumers of the United States consume 6,884,000,000 pounds of beef annually and the farmer pays, in his lesser price for its distribution, $693,970,200. For the distribution of a bushel of wheat in the State of Oklahoma, selling for $1.48, in the process of transportation, selling, storage, and milling and baking, it costs $4.28, so that the bushel of wheat in its ultimate loaves costs the consumers of New York $5.76. The cost of the distribution of bread alone amounts to $2,086,928,000 annually, and we could go on indefinitely, but from the above it will be seen that herein lies the big field of reclamation, and the bill provides for this work. It will stop the waste and cut out the overhead and put the producer, through his cooperative organizations, in direct contact with producer-controlled clearing houses to distribute direct to the consumer. It will thus increase the price the farmer gets for his product just to the extent of the reclamation and that should result in giving him not less than 60 cents out of the consumer's dollar instead of 45 cents, or $3,259,000,000 more than he now receives for his crops.

Here at home is the big field for the reclamation of waste in the economic system between the producer and consumer, and it must be clearly apparent that economies can be effected that will materially increase the farmer's share in the consumer's dollar and at the same time not increase the price of the product to the consumer.

THE MILLING-IN-BOND LOOPHOLE

While we had a tariff of 42 cents per bushel on wheat, yet Canadian wheat for milling and bonding purposes was admitted free of duty. The Buffalo mills close to the Canadian border with cheap water transportation, purchased Canadian wheat for milling-in-bond purposes. The wheat, being admitted free of all duty, when ground into flour was sold in the Cuban market as American flour, getting the advantage of our 30 per cent preferential from the Cuban tariff.

Through this loophole, wheat grown by Canadian farmers, when ground into flour, displaced in the Cuban market the wheat grown by American farmers. It was never intended that Canadian wheat should have the benefit of our 30 per cent reduction from the Cuban tariff rates, a reduction we secured in consideration of giving a 20 per cent reduction in our tariff rates.

The Garber amendment was incorporated in the tariff bill passed by the House and Senate, and is now the law. It stopped up the loophole through which Canadian wheat for milling-in-bond purposes was steadily flowing into our market free of duty. It requires all milling-in-bond wheat to pay a duty equivalent to our preferential rate with any country in which the flour from said wheat is sold, and thus protects the American wheat grower and our home mills in the advantage they have in the Cuban market. The Garber amendment was supported by all the farm organizations and the milling organizations with the exception of the group located at Buffalo. Under its provisions, wheat grown by American farmers and ground into flour by the American millers will supply the Cuban market.

THE PHILIPPINES AND THE TARIFF

A great many people inquire why we do not protect our dairy industry against the oils and fats from the Philippine Islands by adequate tariff rates. Being a part of our Territorial possessions, we can not tax her imports. While free trade among ourselves is essential to our progress and prosperity, yet in this instance, because of the retention of the Philippine Islands as a part of our Territorial possessions, free trade with them is at a great sacrifice to agriculture and especially to the dairy industry of our country. Thus we see the independence of the Philippines is closely allied with the tariff issue. Their representatives have continually insisted upon their independence. I believe the time has come when we should yield to their demands. They claim they are qualified for self-government. We have extended every possible aid to educate them to that end. Our obligations in that respect have been fully discharged. We should not retain them against their own will. Responsibility, alone, is the finishing touch to qualify them to work out their own salvation and destiny. Their continued retention against their own will but engenders resentment and a lack of appreciation on their part and, in addition, creates a continuous hazard to our international peace.

That you may be informed as to the extent of the competition of their products with those of our dairy industry, I quote you the imports for the year 1929, during which 252,059 pounds of edible animal oils and fats, valued at $23,694, were admitted free of duty; 411,936,213 pounds of coconut oil, valued at $29,552,206, and 310,194,463 pounds of copra, valued at $13,154,189, all produced on cheap lands with cheap labor, not exceeding 25 per cent of the value of the land and labor cost in this country. These oils from the Philippines are used by the packers and manufacturers of oleomargarine to displace the use of the pure butter of the American farmers to the extent of more than 250,000,000 pounds annually.

Already these free importations of oils and fats diverted into products competing with our dairy industry have depressed the price of its products below the cost of production. The dairy industry is one of the most important, valuable, and widely distributed of all the industries of agriculture. Continued free importations thus diverted into the packers' products will finally result in completely closing up the streams of revenue flowing into the households of our farms, revenue which in turn is expended for the necessaries of life in our home markets.

OLEOMARGARINE DISPLACING OUR BUTTER

Of the 255,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine consumed annually, nearly 95 per cent, or 240,000,000 pounds, was uncolored and taxed at the rate of only one-fourth of a cent per pound, compared to 10 cents per pound levied on the colored product. We favor a tax of 10 cents per pound on the uncolored product as well as the colored, since it must be apparent that the existing tax of one-fourth of a cent a pound on the uncolored commodity is entirely inadequate to afford even the semblance of protection.

Two hundred and fifty-five million pounds of oleomargarine, displacing an equal number of pounds of butter in our home market annually, is the competition to which we are subjecting our dairy farmers. But this is not all! During the last five years additional competitive products in the form of cooking compounds with alluring names, colored like butter and advertised as a substitute for it, have been adding to the depression. To protect against this additional competition of foreign raw products admitted free, I supported an amendment to the oleomargarine act bringing such cooking compounds within the provisions of the law, subject to taxation and regulation.

By the enactment of such legislation a measure of protection would be afforded the farmers of this country but the protection they must have will come only from the independence of the Philippines and the subsequent taxation of their exports to this country. Our continued refusal to grant them their independence is at a sacrifice of the home market for the American farmers, in which millions of dollars' worth of our home products are displaced annually by these products of the cheap land and cheap labor of the Philippines.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Throughout my service as Representative of the eighth congressional district, I have consistently worked and voted in the interests of our veterans and their dependents. In my efforts in their behalf, I have cooperated to the fullest possible extent with the American Legion, the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Spanish-American War veterans, and other organizations directly interested in relief legislation.

In addition to working in their best interests in securing the enactment of needed relief legislation, I have assisted in securing pension and compensation benefits in hundreds of individual cases and always consider it a privilege to be afforded such opportunities for service. These men and their dependents are entitled to every consideration at the hands of a grateful Government, and in exerting my best efforts in their behalf I have always felt that I was expressing the wishes of the people of the eighth congressional district.

MERIT OF GARBER AMENDMENT RECOGNIZED

During the present session of Congress I introduced a bill to amend section 200 of the World War veterans' act providing for presumptive service connection in tubercular cases, whether arrested or active, if developed to a degree of 10 per cent or more during the presumptive-service period. Experience had demonstrated the necessity for such an amendment since the Comptroller General of the United States ruled that active tubercular condition must be shown within the presumptive-service period in order to secure the benefits of the provision. The application of such a ruling constituted gave injustice in many cases and the merit of the proposition was recognized by the Committee on World War Veterans' legislation which incorporated it, in substance, in the bill passed by the House,

known as the Johnson bill, a composite of a number of needed relief propositions.

PENSION ON BASIS OF DISABILITY SERVICE AND NEED

But this bill, while it would have provided additional benefits on a basis of service connection and corrected many existing injustices and discriminations, entirely overlooked the thousands of worthy veterans whose need is outstanding, whose service was honorable, but who are suffering from disabilities which they have been unable to connect with their service. In my speech before the House on April 24, 1930, I emphasized the imperative necessity of meeting our obligations to these boys, who unquestioningly offered their all in the hour of the Nation's need and who now need our assistance. A brief quotation from my remarks will explain my position:

Our primary concern should not be how or when these men incurred their disabilities. The fact that we accepted their sacrifices, that in their country's service they were liable to the exaction of the supreme sacrifice, constitutes a distinct obligation on our part for their welfare now. If one of them is ill, in need of assistance, why should we demand that he show that disability to have been a direct result of his service before we extend to him the aid of a grateful Government? He accepted his obligation to his Nation. Let us accept ours to him, to every man like him who may now be suffering from disease or disability and in need, whether or not it is a result of his service.

* * * * * * *

In my judgment, the people of this country desire to extend relief to every needy disabled veteran, whether his disability is service connected or not. They want that relief so apportioned as to help the veteran who served in the ranks in equal degree with the veteran who served in command. The equitable apportionment so as to include all the disabled veterans in need is their first concern, and their second is the efficient and economic administration of the law so as to give the maximum degree of relief for the moneys expended.

* * * * * * *

The imperative need of a thorough revision of existing laws and the embodiment of a broad national policy in a comprehensive act to include all the needy disabled veterans upon an equality, one with the other, is too apparent to even suggest argument in its support. It is admitted upon all sides and by all who have made a study of the questions involved.

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION ENACTED

The relief legislation finally enacted includes provision for pension relief on the basis of disability, service, and need, as I advocated in my speech before the House. In this connection it provides as follows:

On and after the date of the approval of this amendatory act any honorably discharged ex-service man who entered the service prior to November 11, 1918, and served 90 days or more during the World War, and who is or may hereafter be suffering from a 25 per cent or more permanent disability, as defined by the director, not the result of his own willful misconduct, which was not acquired in the service during the World War, or for which compensation is not payable, shall be entitled to receive a disability allowance at the following rates: Twenty-five per cent permanent disability, $12 per month; 50 per cent permanent disability, $18 per month; 75 per cent permanent disability, $24 per month; total permanent disability, $40 per month. No disability allowance payable under this paragraph shall commence prior to the date of the passage of this amendatory act or the date of application therefor, and such application shall be in such form as the director may prescribe.

Though the rates are not as high as we would liked to have enacted, they represent benefits this year to about 156,056 disabled veterans unable to trace their disabilities to service origin. That number will be increased annually until it is estimated a maximum of 380,622 beneficiaries under the pension provision will be reached in 1935. Veterans suffering from illness of service origin, of course, are still entitled to the higher rates provided by the original World War act.

The new law has 25 sections. Among other things, it provides that due consideration be given to lay and other evidence not of a medical nature; extends the time for one year for the commencement of actions under the war risk act; provides in addition to any other compensation received, an allowance of $25 monthly to any veteran who lost one or more feet or hands in the active service in line of duty between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918; and grants to veterans with arrested or apparently cured tuberculosis a minimum rating of not less than 25 per cent disability. This latter provision will not be of particular effect where the only service-connected disability is that of active tuberculosis and the veteran is entitled to the statutory award of $50 per month, since that award is in excess of the 25 per cent rating established by this amendment. If, however, the veteran has in addition to a service-connected tubercular disability another disability of service origin, he will receive a combined rating, and in such rating the disability resulting from the service-connected tubercular condition will be evaluated at not less than 25 per cent. The combined total disability rating may thus entitle the veteran to an amount in excess of $50 monthly.

The enactment of this measure was advocated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its commander, Hezekiah N. Duff, a Spanish and World War veteran, and in its final stages it had the indorsement of the American Legion by its commander, O. L. Bodenhamer, who recognized the fact that it is impartial and grants substantial benefits to all seriously disabled service men.

"EQUAL SERVICE OF ALL; SPECIAL PROFITS FOR NONE"

In three successive Congresses I have introduced a resolution in the House to amend the Constitution to authorize Congress, in the event of war, to conscript not only the persons of its citizens but money, industry, and property as well. It would further authorize Congress "to take such steps as may be deemed necessary to stabilize prices of service and of all commodities declared to be essential, whether such services and commodities are required by the Government or by the civilian population."

Our experience in the World War, during which 20,000 millionaires were created out of war profits while our boys were serving in the trenches at $1.10 a day, emphasized the imperative need for the enactment of such legislation.

In 1924, and again in 1928, the Republican Party platform included the following:

We believe that in time of war the Nation should draft for its defense not only its citizens but also every resource which may contribute to success. The country demands that, should the United States ever again be called upon to defend itself by arms, the President be empowered to draft such material resources and such services as may be required, and to stabilize the prices of services and essential commodities, whether utilized in actual warfare or private activity.

The Democratic Party also declared itself in favor of such legislation in its 1924 platform, stating:

War is a relic of barbarism, and it is justifiable only as a measure of defense.

In the event of war in which the man power of the Nation is drafted all other resources should likewise be drafted. This will tend to discourage war by depriving it of its profits.

The American Legion, with its motto of "Equal service of all, special profits for none," has stood squarely for the enactment of such legislation since 1921. But in spite of concerted effort of those of us in Congress who recognize the undeniable merit of such an amendment and the active support and organized cooperation of the American Legion no such bill has ever been reported from committee to either House of Congress for its consideration and disposition.

Now, after a campaign of nearly 10 years' duration, a universal draft commission has been authorized by Congress to study and report back to Congress by December, 1931, the advisability of a constitutional amendment under which the Nation's wealth resources may be drafted in war time with a view to equalizing the burdens of war and promoting peace. The commission includes four Senators, four House Members, and the following members of the Cabinet: The Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, and the Attorney General.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, ask people, "What makes business bad?" Most of them will reply, "The new tariff bill."

In many public addresses I have asserted that the greatest contributing factor to the present decline in trade has been the protracted delay in the passage of the tariff bill. Business can not proceed with uncertainty ahead. Future plans can not be formulated; stagnation sets in resulting in slow turnover of stocks and produce and idle workmen.

Jobless workmen eat but little of Iowa's food products. A well-paid American workman is the best customer we have for our products. In my recent campaign in Iowa I affirmed my stand that the American market, the best market in the world, should be preserved for American products and the American job for the American workmen.

Matthew Woll, of the American Wage Earner, recently said:

The protest of Henry Ford against the passage of the pending tariff bill can not go unchallenged.

Ford's protest is but another sign of the desperate plight which American capitalists who, with millions of American dollars invested in foreign countries in order to curry favor with those in control, find it convenient to embarrass their own countrymen in order to safeguard their foreign investments.

If the wages and living conditions of American workers are to be preserved, let alone improved, Congress can well afford to look to those Americans who have indicated their sincere interest in the welfare of their country by investing their moneys in America rather than those who have taken their profits received from the American purchasing public and used them to destroy American industries.

Some of our severest critics of the tariff bill howl the loudest about depressed times. In all probability their criticism has only added to the severity of the depression.

Recently farmers in my State wrote as follows:

If we had statesmen who would find some means of getting every man a job, instead of fooling away their time wrangling about the tariff, the surplus question would settle itself.

Another said:

What this country needs more than anything else is to find employment for the millions of idle workers. When this is accomplished you'll need no acreage reduction.

The Washington Post editorially declared:

For many months this unscrupulous coalition embroiled Congress in controversies that worked injury to the public. An attempt was made to strike down American industry and labor under the pretense that agriculture could not otherwise obtain its rights. The welfare of all Americans was jeopardized by this wanton attack. Business recovery has been delayed by it, and hundreds of thousands of families are hungry because of it.

The Republican Party, thanks to the House of Representatives and the skillful leadership of Senator WATSON in the Senate, finally passed the tariff bill, with the flexible provision in the form desired by President Hoover. The foundation of American prosperity is, therefore, solid, and the work of recovery can now go on without further interference.

Americans are guaranteed possession of their own market. The greatest consuming market in the world belongs to them. Upon that asset they can proceed to conquer foreign markets by producing better goods by cheaper mass production methods than any competitors can command.

Foreign nations can continue to sell enormous quantities of goods to the United States. This is their best market. But they can not send here cheap-labor goods to destroy American industries.

There is a world-wide depression, which is presumed to be an aftermath of the cremation of lives and wealth during the late war. The United States is feeling this depression in decreased exports, but only to a mild degree. Within the United States recovery from the stock-market crash would have been accomplished by this time if the would-be wreckers of prosperity had not delayed enactment of the protective tariff law.

The first country that will recover from the world-wide depression is the United States. It has no war losses to be wiped out by extreme toil on starvation rations. Its industries are not kept going by robbing workers of rightful wages.

Twenty billions of American dollars are at work in foreign countries, helping to restore world prosperity. When American manufacturers establish branches in foreign countries and pay high wages they contribute powerfully to world welfare. When they attempt to exploit foreign workers in order to send cheap-labor goods back to the United States they are stopped at the customhouse.

The way is now open for the United States to forge ahead under the constructive administration of a President whose instinct is to build up and not tear down.

Complaint has been made that the farming population will be charged more for their purchases than they will receive benefit in their sales. Chester H. Gray, in his report of June 24, 1930, says:

The objective of the American Farm Bureau Federation in tariff adjustment matters has not been to destroy protection but to secure it for farm crops so that farmers might profitably enjoy supplying the domestic market.

The tariff policies of the American Farm Bureau Federation seems to accent the idea that farmers may sell themselves rich in the domestic market. Much less thought is given in the Farm Bureau to the idea of so adjusting tariff rates that farmers can buy themselves rich. The average American farmer seems to think that if he can be protected against his foreign competitors he need not be so much concerned about the buying end of the farm game.

It should be remembered that the Members of Congress in voting for the 1930 bill voted for the new schedules as against the old 1922 schedules. A vote against the present tariff bill was a vote to continue the old schedules and not to substitute something else therefor.

The following table shows that $3,429,400,000 of our imports, or 77.9 per cent, came to our shores in 1929, and that most of them will not be affected by the new act:

Imports of chief commodities into the United States in 1929

(In millions of dollars)

Items	Tariff status	Value	Per cent of total imports
Silk, raw	Free	427.1	9.7
Coffee	do	302.4	6.9
Rubber	do	241.0	5.5
Sugar, cane	do	209.3	4.8
Copper, unmanufactured	do	153.4	3.5
Newsprint	do	144.5	3.3
Petroleum, crude and refined	do	143.5	3.2
Hides and skins	do	137.3	3.1
Paper base stocks	do	118.1	2.7
Furs, undressed	do	108.1	2.5
Vegetable oils	Partly free	100.7	2.3
Tin	Free	91.8	2.1
Wool and mohair	Duty	87.3	2.0
Fruits and nuts	Partly free	86.6	1.9
Art works	Free	82.1	1.8
Oilseeds	Partly free	79.3	1.8
Wool manufactures	Duty	78.5	1.8
Burlaps	do	77.4	1.7
Precious stones, pearls, and imitations	Partly free	78.8	1.8
Fertilizers and material	Free	71.6	1.6
Cotton manufactures	Partly free	61.2	1.4
Tobacco, unmanufactured	Duty	57.1	1.3
Wood, semimanufactures—sawmill manufactures.	Partly dutiable	54.2	1.2
Cotton, unmanufactured	Free	53.3	1.2
Cocoa or cocoa beans	do	49.5	1.1
Flax, hemp, and ramie, and manufactures	Partly free	51.2	1.2
Vegetables and preparations	do	44.8	1.0
Leather	Partly dutiable	44.4	1.0
Meat products	Partly free	39.7	.9
Fish	do	38.7	.9
Silk manufactures	do	37.9	.9
Industrial chemicals	do	30.5	.7
Tea	Free	25.9	.6
Coal-tar products	Partly dutiable	22.2	.5
Total above		3,429.4	77.9
Total, all		4,400.0	100.0

Exports of meat products—1929

Meat products	Value	Per cent of total meat products
	Millions of dollars	
Beef and veal, fresh	2.0	0.04
Pork, fresh	2.2	.04
Cured meats	55.6	1.07
Lard	108.0	2.08
Oleo oil, tallow, stearin, etc	9.3	.18
Other meat products	25.7	.49
Total	202.8	3.90

It is evident that the injury which the new tariff law will do to the total volume of the import trade of the United States has been considerably exaggerated. The prospect is that the volume of imports will continue to show a substantial expansion. The business recession which the United States is now experiencing is only a temporary matter. The long-term upward trend which the United States has experienced in the past will continue. With the growth in population and the increase in wealth, the United States will have to purchase from foreign countries larger quantities of such commodities as silk, coffee, and rubber, which are not produced in the United States.

From the foregoing report, it would seem that the hog producer is mostly interested in the export of lard. Recently on the open market in Berlin, lard was selling at a lower price than the market price of live hogs in America; which indicates that the hog producer in this country is going to be compelled to change his production from a lard hog to the bacon type. This transformation is gradually taking place at the present time. The change in the demand of the production is requiring the adjustment of the producer in his products.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, the tariff law just enacted has already served one good purpose in that it has reassured industry and restored confidence in business. The period of uncertainty through which the country has passed during the present year on account of the delay in disposing of the tariff measure, has of itself done much to prevent an upward turn of business conditions. Not until at least a year has elapsed under the new law will it be possible to make a reliable estimate of its permanent effect upon industry, but the mere termination of the period of uncertainty should, and I believe will, cause an immediate improvement in business, especially

in many manufacturing industries that had been disturbed by the long delay.

While it is true that for at least a year there will be no reliable information upon which to base an opinion as to the permanent effect of this law, I am convinced that it will be highly beneficial to business and to the people, because it distributes the benefits of protection better than any previous tariff law in our history.

There have been comparatively few substantial changes in the rate structure of the tariff law, and the new law is substantially a reenactment of the one it supersedes, which operated with such notable success from 1922 to 1930. If the 1922 law aided in producing prosperity, and no one can deny, of course, that there was unusual prosperity from 1922 to 1930, it seems certain that the present law which is so slightly different from its predecessor, will have the same general effect.

The only consistent basis of opposition to the new law it would seem, therefore, is opposition to a protective tariff as a governmental policy.

In the new law the most important changes, and those which are causing criticism from foreign countries, are the increases in rates on agricultural items. A general willingness has manifested itself to give agriculture every help possible. The industrial rates, aside from agriculture, have not been materially increased, except in such instances as could be clearly demonstrated where changed conditions made increases necessary if the industry was to be allowed to continue in this country. Nowhere throughout the bill are changes sufficiently great to seriously disturb any line of industry, but every industry has been in a state of uncertainty for more than a year as to whether there would be a change of rates, and if so, to what extent. Business simply could not go ahead under such conditions.

REMOVES UNCERTAINTY

The final passage of the bill removes this uncertainty. Business can and will soon adjust itself to the new law, and with its workable flexible provision to take care of necessary changes brought about by changed conditions, I predict for the present law a long period of successful operation and usefulness.

Friends of agriculture have been contending for several years that this industry has not shared in our national prosperity to the same extent as other industries and in response to this appeal substantial increases have been granted in duties to practically every agricultural product affected by foreign competition. I can not understand how anyone who wishes to aid agriculture can be opposed to the measure.

On the other hand, in the face of an insidious propaganda from those who seek to undermine the policy of protection, the 1922 rates on manufactured products have been on the whole maintained, and increases have been granted where it has been shown that foreign competition has caused serious unemployment.

LABOR APPEALS GRANTED

Most of the important increases in duty on manufactured articles were made on the request of interested labor groups. The articles in which organized labor was particularly interested were boots and shoes, leather, bricks, marble, granite, patterns, bottles, antique furniture, straw and felt hats, print rollers, wall paper, pottery, flint and window glass, woven wire cloth, and printed matter. The labor organizations which urged and obtained either new duties or increased duties on these items included the Boot and Shoe Workers Union, the Brick and Clay Workers Union, the Glass Bottle Blowers Union, the Potters Union, the United Hatters of North America, the American Flint Glass Workers Union, the Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union, Brotherhood of Painters, Paper Hangers and Decorators, Pattern Makers League, Upholstery Workers Union, Lithographers Union, the United Wall Paper Crafts, and the American Wire Weavers Association.

The new law also carries in it a provision to eliminate within a period of 18 months competition with products made by convict, forced, and indenture labor in Europe and the Orient, which was proposed and indorsed by labor groups.

PLEAS FOR HELP MET

For the first time in tariff legislation organized labor and organized agriculture have taken an active part in framing a tariff law, and in an overwhelming number of cases have obtained the help they asked. It is too much to expect any single group should be entirely satisfied with the law as a whole. It is impossible for 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate to agree on a law which entirely meets the views of any one person or any one group, but on the whole the law is favorable to both labor and agriculture and is beneficial to our industrial interests.

The chief opposition to the law comes from banking interests, which have such large interests abroad that they have an international rather than a national viewpoint; importers, who very properly seek to safeguard their own business and profits, and the very small number of large manufacturing companies which in recent years have built large factories abroad. To these might be added the small group of so-called economists composed mostly of college professors who advocate "free trade" on the theory that if we threw open our markets to the rest of the world we shall be able to pull foreign living standards up to ours instead of ours being dragged down to theirs.

BENEFITS MASSES

As opposed to these groups we have agriculture, industry, and the labor group of the American Federation of Labor, under the leadership of Matthew Woll, who has represented before the committees of Congress 19 of the largest national labor unions in the country, with membership of more than 1,000,000 skilled workers in industries which are directly affected by the tariff.

In the face of these facts it seems to me that this legislation is most certainly in the interests of the great mass of our people.

On this bill the Republican Party and others who support it stand with agriculture, labor, and our American industries. The Democratic Party, in its opposition to the bill, stands with Wall Street, which its orators have assailed on every soap box from here to California during the past half century, the importers and the big business interests, who are using American dollars to build factories in every part of the world where labor costs are low.

WHAT LABOR HAS TO SAY

With reference to work done by organized labor groups in shaping the present law and the changes made in existing rates at the request of these groups, I wish to insert here an article from the American Labor Banner, a publication issued by the International Labor News Service (Inc.), an association which in turn represents many hundreds of labor publications throughout the country.

The article in question follows, in part:

The Hawley-Smoot tariff bill is now a law. For many years trade-unionists have listened during every national campaign to the benefits which the workers received through tariff legislation, but only in a few cases were the workers really interested, as in most cases the product of their labor did not come into active competition in the American market with the product of the cheap labor of Europe and Asia.

However, with billions of American capital being invested in the upbuilding and the rehabilitation of European industries, directed by American engineers and with a market already in hand in America for the product of these foreign factories, with efficient labor available at wages from one-eighth to one-half the wages paid to American workers the officers of international unions were forced to, and under the direction and leadership of Matthew Woll did, get busy.

The results of this work, as written into the tariff law just signed, are now manifest.

WIN SUBSTANTIAL RATES

The Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, with imports of shoes having increased from less than 50,000 pairs in 1922 to more than 8,000,000 pairs in 1929, secured a tariff duty of 20 per cent which will help to offset the low labor cost of the foreign-made shoes. The tariff law of 1922 permitted the importation of boots and shoes without the payment of any duty.

The Brick and Clay Workers lost thousands of their members in the Atlantic Coast States, due to the heavy importation of bricks from Belgium, which, under the old law, were admitted free of any duty. Hereafter these foreign-made bricks will have to pay a duty of $1.25 per 1,000, which will partly offset the low labor costs in Belgium.

BOTTLE BLOWERS HELPED

The members of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Union, one of the oldest trade unions in America, have virtually been unable to secure employment at their trade, due to the heavy importations of hand-made bottles from France and other foreign countries. The old law carried a duty of 55 per cent, but, through a flaw in the law, the importers were able to bring these bottles in at a duty of only 5 per cent. The new law carries a duty of 75 per cent, which will permit a large percentage of these American workers to secure steady employment at their trade.

For many years more than 60 per cent of all the table chinaware and crockery used in America each year has been the product of the workers of Japan, Czechoslovakia, and Germany. The product of the American workers could not compete in the American market with the product of the cheap labor of Europe and Asia. The new law carries duties ranging from 55 per cent to almost 90 per cent, which is an average increase of more than 20 per cent on all forms of tableware. These increases, if properly administered and if undervaluations are prevented, will permit employment of American potters who have been idle for many months.

HATTERS GET INCREASE

Referring to straw hats, the article from which I have quoted makes clear that the rather substantial increase in rates carried in the new law were necessary in order to be effective.

GAIN FOR GLASSWORKERS

The article goes on as follows:

The product of the members of the American Flint Glassworkers' Union, which comes into competition with the product of the workers of Czechoslovakia, Germany, and Belgium, also secured increases ranging from 5 per cent on some products to 20 per cent on chemical and scientific glassware. The effort of the representatives of American colleges to secure the free entry of scientific glassware, which they were successful in having the Senate approve, was also finally defeated.

The efforts of the Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasters' Internatitonal Union to protect the product of their members from the cheap labor of Italy were successful, in that they secured an additional duty of 6 cents per foot on polished marbles. They also were interested in securing the duty on brick. This organization was also aided by the new duties levied on monumental stones.

MARBLES NOW PROTECTED

The church leaders of America, who receive their support from American workers, have for many years sought to import into America stained glass windows, church marbles of all kinds, and other articles, without the payment of any tariff duties. The officers of the Brotherhood of Painters, Paper Hangers, and Decorators, with which the American workers who produce stained glass windows are affiliated, secured an increase from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. They also secured in the new tariff law the same duty on parts which were not included in the old law. The members of this organization also produce mosaics, which the church organizations and importers sought to have admitted free of any duty. However, the importers will have to pay a duty of 60 per cent on these imported mosaics under the new law.

For many years the officers of the Pattern Makers' League have been trying to secure the imposition of a tariff duty on patterns, produced by cheap labor in foreign countries. The old law carried duties on some patterns of 33⅓ per cent, while the great majority of the patterns were admitted free of any duty. Under the new law all patterns, produced in foreign countries, will pay a duty of 50 per cent upon entry into America in competition with the product of American workers.

UPHOLSTERY RATES CHANGED

The upholstery workers have for years been fighting against the handicap of competing with the cheap labor of Europe in the finer grades of cabinets and supposed antique furniture. The old law carried a duty of 33⅓ per cent, while the new law carries a duty of 40 per cent. In addition to the increase in duty, the upholsterers also secured a protection in that hereafter supposed antique furniture will be permitted entry at only those ports where real experts can determine whether the antique is genuine or otherwise. The upholsterers are also interested in the matter of inlaid linoleum, and on this product they secured an increase in duty of from 35 per cent in the old law to 42 per cent in the new law.

WALL-PAPER CRAFTS GAIN

The lithographers who have to compete with the cheap labor of Germany, Japan, and other foreign countries secured increases in decalcomanias of from 33 per cent in the old law to 46 per cent in the new law. They also secured additional increases in other types of lithos, ranging from 10 to 25 per cent.

The United Wall Paper Crafts secured increases in the duties on print rollers of from 30 per cent, as in force under the old law, to 95 per cent in the new law. In addition, this organization secured the inclusion of language which will prevent the importers from having the customs court nullify the benefits of this increase.

The American Wire Weavers' Association, one of the few organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor which has a 100 per cent unionization, secured increases from 30 per cent to 40 and 45 per cent. In addition, this organization also secured the insertion of language which will prevent any reduction in these duties through action on the part of the customs court.

BARS CUBAN CIGARS

For many years the officials of the Post Office Department, the Department of Commerce, the State Department aided by the United States Chamber of Commerce, and others, who seemingly are governed by the wishes of foreign governments, have sought to secure the passage of legislation which would permit the entry of Cuban-made cigars in small lots, in effect, without the payment of tariff duties. The officers of the Cigar Makers' International Union, at times fighting almost alone, have successfully defeated this effort. As a result of hard work the Postmaster General has been forced to agree with the members of the Ways and Means Committee that when and if a parcel post convention is entered into with the Cuban Government that a clause shall be inserted which will provide that no cigars, not matter how few in number, will be admitted without the payment of full tariff duty.

PRINTING INDUSTRY VICTORY

The printing trades workers secured the insertion of a clause in the law which will prohibit hereafter American purchases of printing from having their work done in Europe and sent into America free of any duty.

OBJECTS SOUGHT BY LABOR

The above organizations, other than the typographical union, the Printing Pressmen and Stereotypers' Unions are affiliated with and comprise the America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, formed for the purpose of jointly seeking to secure the passage of and the enforcement of tariff legislation which will protect the product of American workers from the competition of the products of the cheaper paid labor of Europe and Asia.

The position of the unions engaged in the struggle has been that the passing of restrictive immigration legislation would be of little benefit to American workers if the products of the foreign workers were admitted without tariff levies which would at least equalize the difference in costs of production. If American wages and standards were to be maintained then, the belief of those who comprise the America's Wage Earner's Protective Conference, headed by Matthew Woll, is, the organization held, that America must have adequate tariff protection for the products of the organized American workers.

Other organizations which secured benefits through the passage of the new tariff law are the ladies' garment workers, which secured an increase in the duty on embroidered handkerchiefs from 70 per cent to 99 per cent; the granite cutters, who secured additional duties on hewn and dressed stone; the United Leather Workers, who secured a duty of 15 per cent on leather now admitted free of any duty; the slate makers, who secured an increase from 15 per cent to 25 per cent; and the wood carvers, who will also benefit from the increases secured through the efforts of the upholstery workers.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, the South in general, and North Carolina in particular, should welcome a protective tariff. New England became and is immensely rich because of protection. The soil of many New England States will scarcely sprout peas, but her factories have furnished employment for hundreds of thousands at high wages. Heretofore they have justly claimed first rank in education and social progress generally, but the South is forging ahead in these particulars. Of late years we have seen a gradual shift of industry from New England to the South. This has been caused by the fact that the South is the logical center for industry. We have industrial advantages in North Carolina in the matter of intelligent and dependable Anglo-Saxon labor, hydroelectric power, mild climate, raw products, and accessibility to markets that are not possessed by any other section of America. Industrial supremacy among the States is the destiny of North Carolina under continued protection.

The Republican Party, with the exception of three brief interruptions, has been continuously at the helm of the United States Government for the past 70 years. We have steadfastly maintained a high protective tariff. Under this policy the United States has advanced from a position of comparative obscurity to that of first rank in the family of nations. Our national resources stagger the imagination. The South has shared in the general prosperity brought about by protection, although her representatives in the National Congress have generally opposed this wise policy. She would have made much greater progress had her representatives been committed to the protective tariff and as diligent in protecting her economic interests as have the New England Members in looking after the welfare of their home folks.

Politicians and a few selfish interests are making a hue and cry against the present tariff act. Chief among those who would discredit it are John J. Raskob, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Henry Ford, and the international bankers and other investors in foreign properties and securities. Ford, with the help of energetic and intelligent American labor and the rich American market, has become the world's wealthiest individual. He has taken his millions, made in America, and constructed in Cork, Ireland, a huge plant for the manufacture of tractors. In his Ireland plant he is able to secure laborers at much cheaper wages than in America.

As a consequence the thousands of employees who formerly produced his tractors in America were left by him out of employment. Raskob is a large stockholder in General Motors, which also manufactures automobiles in Germany. The tragedy of it all is that Ford and other American manufacturers, who have transferred their plants to Europe, are sending their manufactured tractors and other products back to America for sale here in competition with the products and labor of America. That is the reason they are against the tariff bill. The international bankers who have invested their money abroad, in an effort to realize on those investments, would expose the American manufacturer and laborer to competition by peasant laborers of Europe. Wages and living conditions

of the American citizen are far superior to that of the people of any other nation in the world. In 1929, wages in the United States were three and one-half times higher than they were in Belgium, and 83 per cent higher than in Great Britain. They were twelve times higher than in Japan.

AGRICULTURE

For partisan reasons it is claimed that the present tariff act is unfair to agriculture. The Underwood Act of 1913, among other things, admitted milk, cream, cheese, potatoes, eggs, swine, cattle, and sheep, free of duty. This exposed every American farmer to competition from those European, Asiatic, and South American countries, which, owing to cheap labor and unlimited natural grazing fields, could produce and ship their products to America and sell cheaper than we could in our own home market. The Republican Party in 1922 placed duties on these and many other farm products. Under the present act we have placed still higher duties.

We raised the duty, for instance, from one-half cent to 2 cents per pound on swine; from 50 cents per 100 pounds to 75 cents per 100 pounds on potatoes; from $2 per head to $3 per head on sheep, and from 2 cents per pound to 3 cents per pound on cattle.

The people of Florida could not stand Cuban competition in truck growing. Cuba, being only a short distance away, they doubtless could see the scantily clad, poorly fed, cheaply paid Cubans producing beans, potatoes, celery, cabbage, and other products and underselling them in the American market in competition with their own vegetables. This they could not stand and survive. The welfare of their State was put above party tradition, and their Representative in Congress joined with the Republicans in voting for the Hawley-Smoot tariff act. Likewise some Members of the Louisiana delegation voted for the tariff act who also had seen and keenly felt destructive competition from cheaply produced Cuban sugar. The farmer has been favored in the present tariff bill, and as soon as the same shall have had a reasonable time to become operative will derive great blessings therefrom.

THE LABORING MAN

Of all classes the laboring man should stand firm for a high protective tariff. There are literally millions of pauperized European, Asiatic, and South American peasants who, through their governments, are clamoring for a change in the immigration laws and the right to enter America. We believe in restricted immigration. We say to the foreigners, "You shall not enter and take the jobs which are now held by the American laboring men." These foreigners have been oppressed for ages, and their condition is little better than that of slaves.

In Japan, for instance, goods are produced by wage earners who in many instances receive nothing but their board and clothes. They exist in hovels. To them an automobile, radio, or piano is unknown. We all agree that restricted immigration is a fine thing and that we should limit the number of foreigners who should be admitted to our country. We have particular need of severe restriction against Mexico. But it would be useless to restrict immigration and at the same time abandon the protective tariff. The immigration law says to the peasant laborer, "You shall not enter America to reduce wages and lower the standard of living of the American citizen." The tariff law says to the foreign manufacturer, "You shall not produce goods with your millions of pauperized laborers in Europe, Asia, and other foreign countries, and send them to America to close American factories and throw out of employment highly paid American wage earners." We might as well admit the laborers themselves as to admit their cheaply produced goods. Either course would destroy the American laboring man.

Under continued protection the South will blossom industrially as a rose. Our people realize this. Their good sense will cause them to send as Representatives to the National Congress men and women who are the friends of protection. They are rapidly breaking away from injurious party tradition. The manufacturer, the wage earner, and the farmer of the South have had their eyes opened to the tremendous benefits which they have reaped and will continue to reap under a protective system, which is in reality the American system.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, when I addressed the House on June 3 I did not have as complete information on the activities of American industrialists who have established branch factories in foreign countries as I have since been able to secure. It will be recalled that I then stated that something like $5,000,000,000 had been invested in such enterprises. In delving further into this very important phase of foreign development by American capital, I find that the amount invested abroad exceeds $20,000,000,000, which is approximately 5.7 per cent of our total wealth.

I herewith append a somewhat complete list of American corporations who have established themselves in other lands in order to take advantage of low wages, long hours, and cheap raw material to be found in such countries, and are now in open competition with American labor and industries:

SWEDEN

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill.	Aktb. International Harvester Co., Norrkoping, Sweden.
Boston Blacking Co., Cambridge, Mass.	Boston Blacking Co. Aktb., Halsingborg, Sweden.
Spirella Co. (Inc.), Meadville, Pa.	Kersettfabriken Spirella Aktb., Malmo, Sweden.
General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Mich.	General Motors Nordiska Aktb., Stockholm, Sweden.

SPAIN

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.	Ford Motor Co., S. A. E., Barcelona, Spain.
Boston Blacking Co., Boston, Mass.	Boston Blacking Co., S. A., Barcelona, Spain.
United Shoe Machinery Co.	United Shoe Machinery Co., A. E., Barcelona, Spain.
Union Sulphur Co., New York City, N. Y.	Union Sulphur Co., S. A. E., Tarragona, Spain.
Armstrong Cork Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Armstrong Cork Co. of Spain, Seville, Spain.
International Standard Corporation, New York.	Standard Electrica, S. A., Madrid, Spain.
International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation, New York City, N. Y.	Compania Telefonica Nacional de Espana, Madrid, Spain.
General Motors Acceptance Corporation, New York.	General Motors Peninsular, S. A., Madrid, Spain.
Warren Brothers, Boston, Mass.	Pavimentos Warrenite-Bithulithic, S. A. E., Valencia, Spain.
American Cynamid Co., New York.	American Cynamid Co., Valencia, Spain.
Singer Sewing Machine Co.	Singer Sewing Machine Co., Barcelona, Spain.

ITALY

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
General Electric Co.	Compagnia Generale di Elettricita, Milan, Italy.
Western Electric Co.	Standard Elettrica Italiana, Milan, Italy.
American Radiator Co.	Societa Nazionale dei Radiatore, Milan, Italy.
Boston Blacking Co.	Boston Blacking Co., S. A. Bovisa, Milan, Italy.
Consolidated Steel Strapping Co.	Societa Italo-Americana Brevetti Signode, Milan, Italy.
Westinghouse E. and M. Co.	Societa per Costruzioni Elettro-Meccaniche, Saronno, Italy.
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.	Societa Italo-American pel Petrolio, Genoa, Italy.
Edison Lamp Works.	Societa Edison Clerci, Milan, Italy.
Columbia Ribbon & Mfg. Co.	Columbia Ribbon & Carbon Mfg. Co., Milan, Italy.
American Radio Co.	American Radio Co., Milan, Italy.
Eastman Kodak Co.	Kodak, S. A. Milan, Italy.
James H. Rhodes & Co.	James H. Rhodes & Co., Lipari, Messina.
Ford Motor Co.	Ford Motor Co., Trieste, Italy.
General Motors Corporation.	General Motors Corporation, Trieste, Italy.

GREECE

The Standard Oil Co. of New York is the only American firm reported as having a branch factory in Greece. No information as to the location is available.

GERMANY

The following American firms have been reported as having branch factories in Germany. No information as to the name or location of the branch factory is available:

International Harvester Co., National Cash Register Co., Worthington Pumps Co., A. Mergenthaler Co., Otis Elevator Co., Steinway & Sons, National Radiator Co., Standard Varnish Works, Singer Sewing Machine Co., Eastman Kodak Co., First National Moving Pictures, Yale & Towne Mfg. Co., Frigidaire, Corn Products Co., Dessart Bros., Quaker Oats Co., Carborundum Co., Norton Co., Wrigley Co., Beechnut Co., Warner Brothers, Northam Warren, Erecht Corporation, Chesebrough Mfg. Co., Palmolive Co., Hudson-Essex Co., Union Special Machine Factory, Chicago Pneumatic Tools Co., International Combustion Engineering Corporation, Kardex Rand Corporation, Pfaudler Co., Sharpless Separator Co., Ford Motor Co., General Motors Corporation, Chrysler Co., and Willys-Overland Co.

AUSTRIA

The only American firm reported as having a branch factory in Austria is the Worthington Pump Co. The branch factory is the Worthington Pump Co., Vienna, Austria.

DENMARK

The Ford Motor Co. and the General Motors International are reported as having branch factories in Denmark, but no information as to the name or location of the branch is given.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Vacuum Oil Co., of Kolin, Czechoslovakia, is the branch factory of an American concern. Lavine Co., Philadelphia, Pa., also has a branch factory in Czechoslovakia, but no information is available as to its name or location.

NEW ZEALAND

The General Motors Corporation is reported as having a branch factory in New Zealand.

BELGIUM

The following American firms are reported as having branch factories in Belgium. All the available information is listed below concerning these firms:

Gregg Co. (Ltd.), Hackensack, N. J. (location not reported); General Motors, Ford Motor Co., Chrysler Sales Corporation, Bell Telephone Manufacturing Co. (location not reported); American Radiator Co (branch factory is National Radiator Co.; location not reported).

FRANCE

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill.	Compagnie Internationale des Machines Agricoles, France.
Bissel Carpet Sweeper Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.	Etablissements Bissel, Paris, France.
The Norton Co., Worcester, Mass.	Compagnie des Meules Norton, Paris, France.
American Radiator Co.	Compagnie Nationale des Radiaterus, France.
A. C. Spark Plug Co., Flint, Mich.	Societe des Bougies A. C. Titan, Levallois-Perret, Seine, France.
Boston Blacking Co.	Boston Blacking Co. (France), Montmagny, Seine, and Oise, France.
B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.	Societe Francaise B. F. Goodrich Colombes, Seine, France.
Pyrene Manufacturing Co., Newark, N. J.	Etablissements Phillips & Pain, Paris, France.
Worthington Pump & Machinery Corporation, New York.	Societe Francaise des Pompes & Machines, Worthington, Paris, France.
Hobart Manufacturing Co., Troy, N. Y.	Compagnie Internationale Hobart Ivry Port, Seine, France.
Hoffman Pressing Machine Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.	Hoffman Pressing Corporation, Paris, France.
S. F. Bowser & Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.	S. F. Bowser & Co., Paris, France.
Otis Elevator Co., New York.	Atellere Otis Pifro, Paris, France.
E. W. Bliss & Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.	E. W. Bliss Co., Paris, France.
Aeolian Co., New York.	The Aeolian Co., Paris, France.
Lobdell Emery Mfg. Co., Alma, Mich.	Compagnie Franco Americaine des Jantes en Bois, Paris, France.
Singer Sewing Machine Co.	La Compagnie Singer, Paris, France.
Kodak Co.	Societe Anonyme Francaise, Kodak-Pathe, France.
S. C. Brill & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Brill & Co., Paris, France.
Crane Co.	Compagnie Crane, France.
De Vilbris Mfg. Co., Toledo, Ohio.	S. A. de Vilbris, France.
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., Chicago, Ill.	La Compagnie Brunswick Francaise, France.
O'Cedar Corporation.	Etablissements O'Cedar.
New Home Sewing Machine Co., Orange, Mass.	Etablissements A. Rogalie, France.
A. Schrader's Son (Inc.).	A. Schrader's Son (Inc.), of France, Paris, France.
North-East Electric Co., Rochester, N. Y.	Societe Anonyme Francaise North-East, Paris, France.

In addition to the above, the following American concerns are also reported as having branch factories in France, but no further information regarding the location or name is available:

Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.; Ingersoll-Rand, New York; Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co., New York; Richardson & Boynton, New York; Delco, Dayton, Ohio. (Branch factory located at Cannes, France.) Syracuse Washing Machine Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.; Laundryette Mfg. Co., Cleveland, Ohio. (Plant for assembling at Paris.)

EGYPT

The following American companies have branch factories in Egypt:

Vacuum Oil Co., New York (branch factories at Cairo and Alexandria, Egypt); Ford Motor Export Co. (Inc.), Delaware (branch factory at Alexandria); and General Motors Corporation, New York (General Motors Near East Societe Anonyme, Alexandria, Egypt).

Turkey, Finland, Latvia, Rumania, and Switzerland are reported as having no American branch factories established there.

There is no list available of American branch factories in England.

NETHERLANDS

The following American firms have branch factories in the Netherlands:

The Quaker Oats Co., New York (branch factory at Rotterdam), and Corn Products Refining Co., New York (branch factory at Sasvan-Cent).

SOUTH AFRICA

The General Motors has a branch factory at Port Elizabeth, South Africa; the Ford Motor Co. a branch factory at Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

CHINA

The only American firm reported as having a branch factory in China is Messrs. Anderson, Meyer & Co.

JAPAN

The following firms are branches (in Japan) of American concerns:

Ford Motor Co. of Japan (Ltd.), Yokohama, Japan; A. P. Munning & Co. (Ltd.), Kobe, Japan; General Motors of Japan (Ltd.), Osaka, Japan; Truscon Steel Co. of Japan (Ltd.), Kawasaki, Japan; Victor Talking Machine Co. of Japan (Ltd.), Yokohama, Japan; Japan Quartz Lamp Co. (Ltd.), Tokyo, Japan; Shibaura Engineering Co., Tokyo, Japan; Nippon Electric Co., Tokyo, Japan; Tokyo Electric Co., Kawasaki, Japan; and Cine Kodak Service of Japan (Ltd.), Osaka, Japan.

JAVA

The following American firm and its branch factory (located in Java) has been reported to this office:

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
General Motors Export Corporation, New York City.	General Motors Corporation, Batavia, Java.

STRAITS SETTLEMENTS

The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. is reported as having a branch factory in Singapore, Straits Settlements.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
Franklin Baker Co., Hoboken, N. J.	Franklin Baker Co. of the Philippines, Manila, P. I.
Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Buffalo, N. Y.	Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Manila, P. I.
Powis-Brown, New York City.	Powis-Brown Corporation, Manila, P. I.
Feltman Bros. & Hermel (Inc.), New York City.	Feltman Bros. & Hermel (Inc.), Manila, P. I.
Marshall Field & Co., Chicago, Ill.	Marshall Field & Co., Manila, P. I.
Manila Lingerie Corporation, New York.	Manila Lingerie Corporation, Manila, P. I.
Bardwill Bros., New York.	Bardwill Bros., Manila, P. I.
A. S. Iserson, New York.	A. S. Iserson, Manila, P. I.
Mallouk & Bros., New York.	Mallouk & Bros., Manila, P. I.
Salamy & Baloutine, New York.	Salamy & Baloutine, Manila, P. I.
Shalom & Co., New York.	Shalom & Co., Manila, P. I.

CHILE

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. (Inc.), Wilmington, Del.	Cia. Sud Americano de Explosives, Rio Loa, Chile.
Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.	Ford Motor Co., Santiago, Chile.
United States Steel Products Corporation.	Cia. de Maestrenzas y Galvanizacion, Santiago, Chile.
Colgate's.	Mondion & Co., Santiago, Chile.

Colombia and Venezuela are reported as having no branch factories of American companies.

AUSTRALIA

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
Dearborn Chemical Co.	Dearborn Chemical Co., Sydney, Australia.
National Ammonia Co. of America, St. Louis, Mo.	Ammonia Co. of Australia, Sydney, Australia.
Anderson Barngrover Manufacturing Co., San Francisco, Calif.	Austral Otis Andebar Cannery Equipment Pty. (Ltd.), South Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
Branch of an American company manufacturing paper bags. No further information available.	Bates (A'sia) (Ltd.), Sydney, Australia.
General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.	Australian General Electric Co. (Ltd.), Sydney, Australia.
Warren Bros. Co., Boston, Mass.	Australian Roads (Ltd.), Sydney, Australia.
Bowser & Co., S. F., Fort Wayne, Ind.	Bowser & Co. (Inc.), S. F., Waterloo, New South Wales, Australia.

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
Cudahy Packing Co., Chicago, Ill.	Cudahy & Co. (Ltd.), Glebe, Sydney, Australia.
Disston, Henry, & Sons (Inc.), Philadelphia, Pa.	Disston, Henry, & Sons (Inc.), New South Wales, Australia.
Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.	Ford Motor Co. of Australia, Pty. (Ltd.), New South Wales (Sandown), Australia.
General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Mich.	General Motors (Aust.), Pty. (Ltd.), Carrington Road, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.	Goodyear Tyre & Rubber Co. (Aust.) (Ltd.), Sydney, Australia.
Jantzen Knitting Mills, Portland, Oreg.	Jantzen Knitting Mills, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Johnson & Co., S. C., Racine, Wis.	S. C. Johnson & Son, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.	Kellogg (Aust.), Pty. (Ltd.), Sydney, Australia.
Kraft Cheese Co., Chicago, Ill.	Kraft Walker Cheese Co., South Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
Life Savers (Inc.), Port Chester, N. Y.	Life Savers Australasia (Ltd.), Sydney, Australia.
Palmolive Co., Chicago, Ill.	The Palmolive Co. (Australasia) (Ltd.), Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Parke, Davis & Co., Detroit, Mich.	Parke, Davis & Co., Sydney, Australia.
Pepsodent Co., Chicago, Ill.	Pepsodent Co. (Australia) (Ltd.), Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Spalding & Bros., A. G., New York City, N. Y.	A. G. Spalding & Bros. (A'sia), Pty. (Ltd.), Sydney, Australia.
F. Stearns & Co., Detroit, Mich.	F. Stearns & Co., Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Stromberg Carlson Telephone Manufacturing Co., Rochester, N. Y.	Stromberg Carlson (A'sia), (Ltd.), Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Studebaker Corporation, South Bend, Ind.	Studebaker Corporation of Australasia (Ltd.), Rushcutters Bay, Sydney, Australia.
United States Light & Heat Corporation, Niagara Falls, N. Y.	United States Light & Heat Corporation (Aust.) (Ltd.), Sydney, Australia (New South Wales).
Vesta Battery Corporation, Chicago, Ill.	Vesta Battery Co. (Australia) (Ltd.).
Western Electric Co. (Graybar Electric Co.), New York City, N. Y.	Standard Telephones & Cables (A'sia) (Ltd.), Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Wrigley, Wm., & Co., jr., Chicago, Ill.	Wrigley's (Australasia) (Ltd.), Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Chamberlain Medicine Co., Des Moines, Iowa.	Chamberlains (Ltd.), Sydney, Australia.
Bristol Myers Co., New York City, N. Y.	Bristol Myers Co., Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
W. T. Hanson Co., Schenectady, N. Y.	Dr. Williams Medicine Co., Sydney, Australia.

Our offices in India have reported there are no branch factories in that territory at present.

MEXICO

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	Cia. Mexicana de Explosivos, S. A., Mexico, D. F., Mexico.
Simmons Co., New York.	Branch factory at Monterrey, Mexico.
International Match Corporation.	Cia. Mexicana de Cerillos y Fosfores, Mexico, D. F., Mexico.
Continental Mexican Rubber Co., New York.	Continental Mexican Rubber Co., Torreon, Mexico.
Crown Cork & Seal Co., Baltimore, Md.	Crown Cork & Seal Co. of Mexico, S. A., Mexico, D. F., Mexico.
Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.	Ford Motor Co., S. A., Mexico City, Mexico.
Armand Co., Des Moines, Iowa.	Armand de Mexico, S. A., Mexico City, Mexico.
Larkin Co., Buffalo, N. Y.	Cia. Commercial "Herdez," Mexico City, Mexico.
Colgate & Co., New York City.	Colgate & Co., Mexico City, Mexico.
The Palmolive Co.	The Palmolive, S. A., Mexico City, Mexico.
U. S. A. Corporation, Chattanooga, Tenn.	Branch office in Mexico City, Mexico.
Hard & Rand.	Hard & Rand, Cordoba, Mexico.
Arbuckle Bros.	Arbuckle Bros., Cordoba, Mexico.
British-American Tobacco Co.	Cia. Manufacturera de Cigarros, Mexico, D. F., Mexico.
Wm. R. Warner & Co., New York.	Cia. Medicinal "La Campana," S. A., Mexico City, Mexico.
Mennen & Co.	No information as to location of branch.

The following companies are branch factories of American concerns in Mexico. No further information concerning them is given:

International Sash & Door Co., Nuevo Laredo, Mexico; American Distributing Co., S. A. Mexico City, Mexico; and Reuter-Barry de Mexico, S. A. Mexico City, Mexico.

PORTO RICO

The Enegletaria Medicine Co., of New York, has a branch factory in Porto Rico (the Enegletaria).

PERU

The Sydney Ross Co., of New Jersey, has a branch factory at Arequipa, Peru.

URUGUAY

The Ford Motor Co., of Detroit, Mich., is reported as having a branch factory in Uruguay.

ARGENTINA

American company	*Branch factory abroad*
Portland Cement Co.	Cia. Arg. de Cemento Portland, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
Swift & Co., Chicago, Ill.	Frigorifico Swift, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
Armour & Co., Chicago, Ill.	Frigorifico Armour, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
Wilson & Co., Chicago, Ill.	Frigorifico Wilson, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.	Ford Motor Co., Buenos Aires, Argentina.
General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Mich.	General Motors, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
Scott & Bowne (Inc.).	Scott & Bowne (Inc.) of Argentina, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
Victor Talking Machine Co.	Victor Talking Machine Co., Buenos Aires, Argentina.
Walk-Over Shoe Co.	Walk-Over Shoe Co., Buenos Aires, Argentina.
Sydney Ross & Co.	Cia. Arg. Sydney Ross (Inc.), Buenos Aires, Argentina.
Newark Shoe Co.	Newark Shoe, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
Standard Oil Co.	Cia. Nacional de Petroleos, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
National Lead Co.	National Lead Co., Buenos Aires, Argentina.

BRAZIL

The following American companies have been reported as having branch factories in Brazil:

Wilson & Co. (Inc.) (Cia. Wilson); General Motors Corporation (General Motors of Brazil); Ford Motor Co. (Ford Motor Co. Exports (Inc.)); Sparks Milling Co. (Sparks Milling Co. of Brazil); Armeo International Corporation; Swift Co. (Cia. Swift); Armour Co. (Armour of Brazil, Corp.); Continental Products Co.; Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co. (Cia. Brunswick do Brazil); General Electric Co.; Universal Pictures (Universal Pictures do Brazil); Columbia Phonograph Co.; Auto-Strop Safety Razor Co.; Dennison Manufacturing Co.; Kolynos Co.; S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Co.; Middletown Car Co.; Scott & Bowne; Parke, Davis & Co.; Sydney Ross Co.; and Otis Elevator Co.

It has been charged time and again that a tariff bill with rates so high that they really give protection tends to destroy our foreign market. That charge is disproven by figures compiled by the Department of Commerce, and I herewith insert a compilation of imports and exports by the Department of Commerce during the time that the Fordney-McCumber tariff law was in effect from 1922 to 1929:

Imports	
1922	$3,113,000,000
1923	3,792,000,000
1924	3,610,000,000
1925	4,227,000,000
1926	4,431,000,000
1927	4,185,000,000
1928	4,091,000,000
1929	4,400,000,000
Exports	
1922	3,832,000,000
1923	4,167,000,000
1924	4,591,000,000

1925	$4,910,000,000
1926	4,809,000,000
1927	4,865,000,000
1928	5,128,000,000
1929	5,241,000,000

From the foregoing it will be seen that both imports and exports showed a corresponding increase from year to year. In 1927 it is estimated that our total production in this country was $80,000,000,000, of which $62,718,000,000 was in the form of manufactured goods, while the gross value of our agricultural products was $17,153,000,000. It will thus be seen that our exports represent a small percentage of the total value of our production and that the home market consumes by far the greatest part of that which we produce. It therefore becomes increasingly evident that it is necessary for us to protect the American market that it may be preserved to American producers. So long as competing countries maintain low wage scales, long hours of toil, and poor living conditions, it will be necessary for the American people to maintain the protective-tariff system. We must bear in mind that we are living under the best conditions of any people in the world and our civilization is the highest. Until other countries have reached our level it will be necessary for us to maintain the protective-tariff system, or, abandoning that, we must reconcile ourselves to descending to the levels that are to be found in foreign and competing lands.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add to the volumes that have been spoken and written about the new tariff act of 1930 just a few words and some convincing figures.

In comparison to the great quantity of stuff that has been spoken and written about this tariff act I think that probably fewer actual facts have lodged in the minds of hearers and readers than in connection with any other incident in history.

I am going to cut out the oratory and argument and try to get down to a few brief facts and discuss this tariff act chiefly as to its benefit to the State of Colorado.

To begin with it should be emphasized that two-thirds of the imports into the United States are on the free list. So the tariff applies only to about one-third of the imports that come into this country.

Of approximately 3,300 items in the tariff list, only about 890 receive an increased rate, 235 are decreased, and 2,175 items remain the same as they were.

Of the total value of all imports into the United States, the increases in the tariff act will apply to only 22½ per cent. So that 77½ per cent of the total values of imports remain the same or are reduced.

Collections for customs under the 1922 tariff act for 1928 was $522,649,383. If the rates in this new act had been applied on same imports, the collections would have been $630,456,280.

The increases in the new act are divided 68 per cent on agricultural products and 32 per cent on industrial items. So in money value of duties collected on 1928 imports the increase would have been $72,181,314 on agricultural products and $36,402,057 on industrial items.

Clearly agriculture has the best of it under this tariff act. No tariff ever written has treated the products of the farm, the stock range, and the dairy so favorably.

COLORADO AN AGRICULTURAL STATE

Colorado is chiefly an agricultural State. Many people do not know that. Our own people are just beginning to realize and appreciate this fact.

Agricultural production for Colorado for 1928, from her farms, gardens, and stock ranges, including sugar, amounted to about $180,000,000.

Mineral production, including gold, coal, and oil, was about $58,855,000.

Many, perhaps most, of the items of agriculture in that $180,000,000 yearly production will receive an increased benefit by this tariff act of 1930.

Look over this table furnished me by the Tariff Commission which will show you what the tariff on many products of Colorado farms was under the Democratic tariff act of 1913, was under the 1922 tariff act, is now under the tariff act of 1930, and the increases made by this new law.

Comparison of tariff rates

Commodity	Underwood Act, 1913, Democratic	Fordney-McCumber Act, 1922, Republican	Hawley-Smoot Act, 1930, Republican	Increase over 1922 law
Wheat	Free	30 cents per bushel.	42 cents per bushel.	$0.12
Corn	do	15 cents per bushel.	25 cents per bushel.	.10
Oats	6 cents per bushel.	do	16 cents per bushel.	.01

Comparison of tariff rates—Continued

Commodity	Underwood Act, 1913, Democratic	Fordney-McCumber Act, 1922, Republican	Hawley-Smoot Act, 1930, Republican	Increase over 1922 law
Barley	15 cents per bushel.	20 cents per bushel.	20 cents per bushel.	
Rye	Free	15 cents per bushel.	15 cents per bushel.	
Alfalfa seed	do	4 cents per pound.	8 cents per pound.	$0.04
Sweet clover seed	do	2 cents per pound.	4 cents per pound.	.02
Red clover seed	do	4 cents per pound.	8 cents per pound.	.04
Cattle weighing less than 700 pounds.	do	1½ cents under 1,050 pounds.	2½ cents per pound.	.01
Cattle weighing more than 700 pounds.	do	2 cents per pound over 1,050 pounds.	3 cents per pound	.01
Beef and veal	do	3 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	.03
Swine	do	½ cent per pound	2 cents per pound	.01½
Pork	do	¾ cent per pound	2½ cents per pound.	.01¾
Bacon, ham, and shoulders.	do	2 cents per pound	3¼ cents per pound.	.01¾
Lard	do	1 cent per pound	3 cents per pound	.02
Lard substitutes	do	4 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	.01
Sheep	do	$2 per head	$3 per head	1.00
Mutton	do	2½ cents per pound.	5 cents per pound	.02½
Wool, scoured	do	31 cents per pound.	34 cents per pound.	.03
Poultry, live	1 cent per pound	3 cents per pound	8 cents per pound	.05
Poultry, dressed	do	6 cents per pound	10 cents per pound.	.04
Turkeys	2 cents per pound	do	do	.04
Eggs, fresh	Free	8 cents per dozen	11 cents per dozen.	.03
Eggs, dried	10 cents per pound.	18 cents per pound.	18 cents per pound.	
Butter	2½ cents per pound.	8 cents per pound	14 cents per pound.	.06¾
Oleo and butter substitutes.	20 per cent	do	do	.06
Cream	Free	20 cents per gallon.	56.6 cents per gallon.	.366
Milk	do	2½ cents per gallon.	6½ cents per gallon.	.04
Cheese and substitutes.	do	5 cents per pound.	7 cents per pound.	.02
Honey	10 cents per gallon.	3 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.	
Potatoes	Free	50 cents per 100 pounds.	75 cents per 100 pounds.	.25
Beans, dried	25 cents per bushel.	1¾ cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.	.01¼
Onions	20 cents per bushel.	1 cent per pound	2½ cents per pound.	.01½
Peas, dried	Free	do	1¾ cents per pound.	.00¾
Broomcorn	do	Free	$20 per ton	20.00

The average increase of import duties in the 1930 act as compared with the 1922 act on the above-named farm products is 97 per cent.

Under the flexible provisions of the 1922 act, President Coolidge, by proclamation, increased the duty on wheat from 30 to 42 cents per bushel; butter and butter substitutes from 8 to 12 cents per pound; cream from 20 to 30 cents per gallon. Flax was increased from 40 to 56 cents per bushel by President Hoover in May, 1929.

LIVESTOCK

One of the most important industries in Colorado is livestock. The value of our dairy cattle is estimated at $18,788,000, and of beef cattle $54,014,000.

The total United States imports of cattle during a recent year amounted to $20,000,000 in value. These cattle come chiefly from Canada. The duty on cattle in this new law carries an increase of about 60 per cent over the rates in effect at present under the 1922 act. Lightweight cattle come in at a lower rate than heavier cattle. This new law reduces the upper limit of the lightweight cattle group from 1,050 pounds to 700 pounds, thus, under the new law, making all cattle weighing from 700 pounds to 1,050 pounds dutiable at a higher rate. Therefore, in effect, the new law virtually doubles the duty on cattle.

The rates on cattle have been raised as follows: Cattle weighing less than 700 pounds, from 1½ cents up to 2½ cents. Cattle weighing 700 pounds and more, from 2 cents per pound up to 3 cents per pound.

The tariff on beef and veal, however, is more important and that rate has been raised from 3 cents to 6 cents per pound—a 100 per cent increase.

And hides have been given a protection for the first time since 1909—the rate being 10 per cent of their value.

SHEEP

Sheep raising is an important enterprise in a number of counties in Colorado—especially in the San Luis Valley and in the lower Arkansas Valley. Many snug little fortunes have been made by sheepmen. And nobody anywhere appreciates the value of a tariff more than does an owner of a sheep ranch, for on no thing is the tariff so definitely and quickly reflected

as is a tariff on sheep and wool. Really, the tariff on sheep is not so very important as we import only a few, but the tariff on wool and mutton does have a quick and beneficial effect on the price of a sheep. It is estimated that we have in Colorado about 2,780,000 sheep and lambs valued at $29,615,000. The tariff on sheep has been raised from $2 per head to $3 per head, and the tariff on mutton has been raised from 2½ cents to 5 cents per pound.

WOOL

It is estimated that we produce in Colorado about $3,000,000 worth of wool in a year.

In wool, however, we find large imports, amounting to $42,000,000 in 1929. The new law carries a rate of duty of 34 cents per pound on clean wool, which represents an increase of 3 cents per pound over the present rate. In wool we find the present duty practically fully effective in that the United States price of wool is higher than the London price for the same grade of wool by the amount of duty.

This tariff on sheep, mutton, and wool is certainly worth millions of dollars to the growers of Colorado. I recall traveling through the San Luis Valley about 1920, when there was no tariff on wool and mutton. Growers could not sell their wool for 12 cents a pound, and many ewes sold at $3 or less per head. The sheepmen were all broke. But with the passage of the 1922 tariff the industry became prosperous. I know on account of general conditions it is none too good just now; but picture if you can what it would be now if all the enormous crop of wool grown in New Zealand and Australia could come in free of duty. And even now, try to buy a bunch of ewes at $3 per head, if you can.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

The dairy industry is growing to be one of our most important. The annual stock show in Denver brings out some of the finest dairy stock in the country. Dairy cattle in the State in 1929 were estimated to have a value of $18,788,000. Milk and milk products from our Colorado farms and dairies in 1928 had a value of $21,470,000.

We import a great deal more milk and cheese than we export. So that a tariff on these items is directly beneficial to our farmers. On dairy products the new tariff act has been very liberal.

Tariff on milk has been raised from 2½ cents per gallon under the act of 1922 to 3¼ cents per gallon by President's proclamation, and now to 6½ cents per gallon in this new law. Tariff on cheese was 5 cents under the old law, has been raised to 7 cents per pound, but not less than 40 per cent of its value. Butter was 8 cents per pound, then raised by presidential order to 12 cents, and now under this act it goes up to 14 cents per pound.

SUGAR

Colorado produces more beet sugar than any other State in the Union. The value of the sugar beets raised by the farmer is about $16,758,000. This crop simply could not be raised without a tariff on sugar. The tariff has been 1.76 cents per pound on Cuban raw sugar and this act boosts the rate to 2 cents per pound on Cuban sugar.

This increase is the equivalent of 70 cents on the average refined sugar content realized from a ton of beets. The average price of sugar is relatively low at this time under the present tariff. With the increase provided the price to the consumer would not be relatively higher, and the increase in the tariff will stabilize the sugar production in this country and also avoid the necessity of depending upon the foreign producer for our supply, which we would have to do if the sugar industry in our country is not amply protected.

BEANS AND PEAS

Beans and peas are becoming one of our big crops; many are raised on dry lands. You might be surprised to know that one of the largest shippers of beans and peas in the United States is located at the city of Trinidad, Colo., which city is chiefly noted for its coal-mining operations.

Colorado produced last year 803,000 bushels of field peas, valued at $1,518,000, and 1,390,000 bushels of dried beans valued at $4,726,000.

The new tariff act raises the duty on dried peas from 1 cent per pound to 1¾ cents per pound. And on dried beans the rate is raised from 1¾ cents to 3 cents per pound. This little item will certainly help a lot of people, many of whom are in dry-farming sections.

ONIONS

The production of onions on a large scale is rather a new thing in Colorado, but some sections have been going ahead rapidly. Otero County probably produces more than any other county in the State, and when the price is good it is a profitable crop. The production of onions for Colorado for 1928 is given at 1,147,000 bushels, valued at $1,629,000.

The trouble with the onion market has been heavy imports from foreign lands. In 1928 the imports were valued at $2,660,875.

The tariff on onions was 1 cent per pound under the 1922 act. By presidential proclamation it was raised to 1½ cents in January, 1929, and this new act brings the duty up to 2½ cents per pound. If our American growers do not overdo a good thing, they should get a better price in the future.

POTATOES

Colorado's potato crop is quoted at about 13,420,000 bushels, valued at about $6,039,000.

Much of this crop is raised in the San Luis Valley. The value, of course, depends upon the current price, and that varies greatly with the question of under or over production in this country. Our imports and exports of potatoes run about equal in value, a little in excess of $3,000,000 annually. The tariff on this item is not always fully effective, especially when we produce much more than we can consume. The rate under the 1922 act was 50 cents per 100 pounds. It has been raised under the new act to 75 cents per hundred pounds, which is a 50 per cent increase. It will help stabilize the price and discourage imports from Canada.

BROOMCORN

This is a little-heard-of crop in any country, but is becoming important in some sections of Colorado. Probably more is raised in Baca County, Colo., than in any other county in the West. It is a profitable crop and an excellent quality is produced in some western dry-farming sections without irrigation.

In 1929 Colorado produced 9,100 tons, estimated value, $1,019,000. The production in 1930 will probably be greater and it will be greatly increased in future years. I think there has never been a tariff on broomcorn—certainly not in the acts of 1913 and 1922—but this new act now gives a duty of $20 per ton. This item will be a great encouragement to the growers of Baca County and eastern Colorado.

POULTRY

Poultry is a big product on most farms and many a housewife gets her spending money by raising chickens, turkeys, and eggs for the market. In addition to that source, many are going into the poultry business on a bigger scale and are making it pay. Colorado is especially well adapted for poultry raising. The tariff has a decided effect upon the price of poultry and eggs, and, strange to say, our heavy imports come from China.

In 1928 the income in Colorado for poultry (chickens) was estimated at $4,253,000; for eggs, $6,952,000. Turkeys large—but not given.

This new tariff act has treated those who sell poultry, eggs, and so forth, very well indeed. Duty on poultry alive has been raised from 3 cents per pound to 8 cents per pound; dressed, from 6 cents to 10 cents per pound. Turkeys, from 6 cents to 10 cents per pound. Eggs, fresh, have been raised from 8 cents to 11 cents per dozen.

IN CONCLUSION

Much buncombe has been and will be spoken and written about the tariff. Nothing new will probably be said about this act that was not said about the act of 1922 and previous tariff laws.

Millions of dollars have been spent by interested parties in spreading publicity and propaganda to discourage the passage of this bill and to make it unpopular in the country. Chief among these is the minority party which would profit by making any legislation passed by this Congress unpopular in the country at and near election time.

The Cuban sugar interests have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for propaganda to make a higher tariff on sugar unpopular. Big business men in the automobile and other lines who are establishing factories in foreign lands to profit by low wages and escape taxation do not want a tariff on their imports.

Big merchants and importers who like to buy low in foreign lands of cheap wages and sell high to the American trade have contributed to the propaganda. International bankers who know no country and have their investments spread out over the world oppose the theory of protection.

The opposition to the tariff has been systemitized, highly financed, and efficiently managed by high-powered executives, clever publicity men, and scheming politicians.

In the big cities the agricultural rates are attacked. People are told that the raise in tariff on sugar will limit the workingman to fewer spoonfuls for his coffee and rob the children of their stick candy; that the tariff on cream, butter, cheese, mutton, beef, and a dozen other products of the farm will make living inordinately high for the workingmen in factory

towns. In these sections the propagandists complain that the new tariff is not high enough on the things they make but too high on the things we grow in the West.

In the agricultural sections of the country this well-planned propaganda takes the form of attacks on the industrial rates. Efforts have been and will be made to show the farmer that the things he buys will cost more; that the price on harness and shoes, neckties and furniture, shaving mugs and wrist watches will go up. Most of the stuff you hear about increased cost of living under a new tariff measure is largely exaggerated, and many complaints will be heard about the price of things which are on the free list and on which no duty is paid.

However, the object of a protective tariff is to preserve the American market for the American producer. If the factories of the great industrial centers can be kept open and can afford to pay living wages of American standards to their employees who consume largely the products of the farm, I presume we of the agricultural producing sections can afford, if necessary, to pay a little more for a little of the stuff we wear or use.

It is interesting to note that a great many items which the farmer is interested in are on the free list entirely unaffected by the tariff.

This free list includes all agricultural implements and machinery, including cream separators up to a certain value, tractors, milk cans, all materials used chiefly for fertilizer, fuel oil and gasoline, harness and saddlery up to a certain value, binding twine, and numerous other items.

And finally the flexible provision of the act of 1922 is retained and improved so that the President on recommendation of the Tariff Commission can raise or lower the duty on any item 50 per cent at any time. This is a safeguard and offers opportunity for correcting any inequality or meeting any emergency that may arise. Under this same provision agriculture has benefited sometimes in the past—notably when the duties were raised by presidential proclamation on wheat, onions, milk, cheese, butter, frozen eggs, and so forth.

DETAILED INFORMATION ABOUT COLORADO AGRICULTURAL CROPS

As a matter of information some may like to know more about what Colorado produces in various agricultural lines. So I am inserting here three interesting tables:

Table 1 shows the acreage production and value in 1928 of Colorado farm crops. It will be noted from this table that in addition to the expected production of staple grains, such as wheat, corn, barley, rye, and oats, there is a production of specialty crops. The reason for this is that there has been developed in Colorado the practice of growing more and more of its farm crops under irrigation.

I have already pointed out that Colorado is the leading State in the production of beet sugar, the value of the annual production of sugar being about $41,000,000.

TABLE 1.—*Colorado crops: Acreage, production, and value, 1928*

Kind of crop	Acreage	Production	Value
Winter wheat	923,000	11,076,000 bushels	$9,525,000
Spring wheat	416,000	7,488,000 bushels	6,290,000
All wheat	1,339,000	18,564,000 bushels	15,815,000
Corn [1]	1,438,000	18,694,000 bushels	12,712,000
Oats for grain [2]	193,000	5,983,000 bushels	2,692,000
Barley for grain [3]	547,000	13,128,000 bushels	7,089,000
Rye for grain [3]	74,000	814,000 bushels	570,000
Emmer	16,000	432,000 bushels	238,000
Grain sorghums [4]	256,000	2,560,000 bushels	1,536,000
Sweet sorghums	94,000	282,000 tons	736,000
Broomcorn	36,000	6,100 tons	518,000
Field peas [4]	73,000	803,000 bushels	1,518,000
Dry beans	309,000	1,390,000 bushels	4,726,000
Potatoes	110,000	13,420,000 bushels	6,039,000
Sugar beets	179,000	2,322,000 tons	16,254,000
Cabbage (commercial)	3,100	44,600 tons	580,000
Onions (dry)	3,700	1,147,000 bushels	1,629,000
Cauliflower	1,700	510,000 crates	1,148,000
Tomatoes for manufacture	1,600	11,800 tons	130,000
Cantaloupes and honeydew melons	9,000	1,170,000 crates	1,100,000
Cucumbers for pickles	2,300	202,000 bushels	145,000
Cucumbers for seed	1,800		126,000
Peas for canning and market	9,500		713,000
Lettuce (commercial)	9,800	1,127,000 crates	1,206,000
Celery	900	270,000 crates	702,000
Millet seed [5]	34,000	340,000 bushels	360,000

[1] This item includes the entire acreage of corn, whether harvested for mature corn, cut for silage or dry forage, or hogged off.

[2] In addition to the acreage harvested for grain, it is estimated that approximately 92,000 acres of oats was cut green for hay, this additional acreage appearing in the hay table.

[3] In addition to the rye and barley acreage harvested for grain, there is some acreage of barley and about 33,000 acres of rye cut green for hay or used for pasturage.

[4] Acreages of grain sorghums and field peas include the crop actually saved for grain and such acreage as is cut green and fed as forage, the grain value being about the same in either case.

[5] This acreage of millet saved for seed is in addition to the area harvested for hay as shown in the hay table.

TABLE 1.—*Colorado crops: Acreage, production, and value, 1928*—Contd.

Kind of crop	Acreage	Productions	Value
Alfalfa seed [6]	2,000	6,000 bushels	$70,000
Other garden and seed crops	6,455		803,000
Tame hay, all varieties	1,207,000	2,497,000 tons	29,215,000
Wild hay	376,000	338,000 tons	3,481,000
Apples		3,020,000 bushels	1,963,000
Peaches		600,000 bushels	720,000
Pears		185,000 bushels	194,000
Cherries		1,500 tons	180,000
Grapes		357 tons	40,000
Miscellaneous fruits			625,000
Sugar-beet tops [7]	179,000		895,000
Rye for pasture	33,000		165,000
Farm gardens	13,000		650,000
Total	6,376,855		117,283,000

[6] The acreage of alfalfa cut for seed is included in the alfalfa-hay acreage and is not carried into the totals on this page.

[7] This acreage is identical with the acreage shown for sugar beets and is not carried into the totals on this page.

Colorado, because of its extensive grazing lands, early developed to an important cattle and sheep country. In addition, there has been established an important dairy enterprise. Table 2 shows the estimated number and value of livestock in the State of Colorado as of January 1, 1929:

TABLE 2.—*Livestock in Colorado: Estimated numbers and value, January 1, 1929*

	Number	Value
Horses and colts	308,000	$14,554,000
Mules and mule colts	32,000	1,850,000
Dairy cattle	244,000	18,788,000
Beef cattle	1,026,000	54,014,000
Sheep and lambs	2,780,000	29,615,000
Swine	550,000	6,630,000
Goats	17,825	72,000
Poultry—chickens	4,502,000	3,376,000
Bees (hives)	56,819	233,000
Total		129,132,000

The preceding tables show the value of the farm production of crops and livestock in Colorado. Table 3, which follows, is an estimate of the gross income received from farm production in 1928. This estimate is taken from the official figures of the United States Department of Agriculture and should be studied with the knowledge that certain crops, such as corn, which have a large farm value yield relatively a small income to the farmer from sale as corn. The main part of the income, however, is derived from the sale of livestock to which the corn has been fed. Thus in the table following, which gives the gross income, the income derived from corn applies to corn sold as such. The remainder of the corn produced by the farmer has been included in the various livestock and livestock products listed.

TABLE 3.—*Estimated gross income from farm production in Colorado by commodities, 1928*

CROPS	
Corn	$3,983,000
Wheat	12,684,000
Oats	770,000
Barley	2,505,000
Rye	330,000
Potatoes	4,103,000
Truck crops	8,882,000
Hay and sweet sorghum forage	6,439,000
Alfalfa seed	24,000
Clover seed (sweet and Japanese)	111,000
Field beans	3,486,000
Apples	1,125,000
Peaches	698,000
Pears	188,000
Grapes	16,000
Strawberries	63,000
Other berries	66,000
Other fruit	279,000
Farm gardens	1,822,000
Nursery products	83,000
Forest products	310,000
Greenhouse products	1,062,000
Sugar beets	16,758,000
Other crops	546,000
Total crops	66,411,000
LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS	
Cattle and calves	30,663,000
Hogs	11,616,000
Sheep and lambs	9,411,000
Poultry (chickens)	4,253,000
Eggs (chickens)	6,952,000
Milk and milk products	21,470,000
Wool and mohair	2,914,000

Bee products	$233,000
Horses	884,000
Mules	289,000
Total, animal products	88,685,000
Total, crops and animal products	155,096,000

Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the American watch manufacturer was seriously handicapped because of the inadequacy of the tariff act of 1922, and the unfair and unethical practices of unscrupulous importers.

For anyone to realize what the American manufacturer of watches has been confronted with during the past few years, he must know the story of the nefarious methods and practices of the ring of those unscrupulous importers, who have stooped to the lowest and meanest of crimes in order to line their pockets with gold.

American business prides itself on the high plane upon which it is conducted; honesty and integrity mean something to the American manufacturer. But to the dishonest and crooked band of watch importers the term "good business practices" is only a joke.

The race between American-made and foreign-made watches in the United States is unfair from the very start. The American manufacturer with a tremendous investment in real estate, plant, and equipment; with an army of highly skilled and highly paid artisans and a reputation for honesty and integrity of many years standing must sell his product in competition with the product handled by the unscrupulous importer of Swiss watches, a product wholly inferior to the American-made product; produced by cheap labor, at a niggardly wage, hardly enough to furnish the bare necessities of life, even according to the European standard; a large proportion, estimated at one-third of the total imports, smuggled into the United States, thus escaping the payment of the whole duties, or so falsely undervalued as to avoid the payment of the tax required by law, the Swiss watches are landed in New York at a cost that would not even begin to represent the real value of any watch honestly made, honestly imported, and honestly sold.

Then, by blatant advertising, using radio broadcasting, extensive advertising in magazines, newspapers, billboards, and every other conceivable agency, the campaign for extermination is on.

Full page advertisements in the leading national magazines playing up American heroes, American landmarks, such as the National Capitol at Washington, the Statue of Liberty, and so on, linked with these cheap watches, are a part of the scheme to deceive the American public into thinking that they are purchasing an American-made product.

This costly and persistent ballyhoo continues day after day, week after week, and month after month, until the unsuspecting American people come to believe that such product has great merit.

The millions of dollars spent on extensive merchandising and advertising campaigns could only have been obtained by unconscionable profits.

Not only is the quality of the product misrepresented but its origin is attempted to be concealed, a meaningless guaranty is glibly quoted, and high-sounding trade names are applied to the watches sold by a firm which has no long-established factory, nor a name of which it can be proud.

To beguile and mislead the retailer is the next step, and the means resorted to to accomplish this end are almost unbelievable.

The tales of enormous profits which can be made and great nation-wide advertising campaign are pictured. The good American-made watches, honestly made by workers who are paid a high wage, honestly merchandised and honestly priced, are slandered in the most malicious way, and fanciful stories are poured into the ears of greedy retailers to tell to innocent purchasers. Such ridiculous stories are told as that one of the American factories is located on the banks of a river and the fog comes up and rusts the plates, therefore this American watch should not be recommended; that the American watch has no escapement and the hands only turn one way; that the pinions are ground in salt; that the watches will not keep time and are troublemakers.

Notwithstanding all the foregoing, the American watch-buying public still asks for American-quality watches, and so the gentle art of "switching" is used as a last resort. The customer is gently and gradually "switched" to an alien watch bearing a fanciful adopted name, and in many instances, believing the local retail jeweler to be the last word in honesty and integrity, yields.

CRIMINAL PLOT BY WATCH IMPORTERS UNCOVERED

There was disclosed during the consideration by Congress of the 1930 tariff act, and particularly during the consideration of paragraphs 367 and 368, known as the watch and clock paragraphs, indisputable evidence of a gigantic watch-importer's ring and of an evil conspiracy by a gang of watch-smuggling criminals by whose wholesale operations the United States Government has been and is being defrauded of immense sums of money in import duties, and millions of smuggled, spurious, inferior foreign watches are being foisted on the American buying public.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL JEWELERS IN DANGER OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION

Many helpless wholesale and retail jewelers throughout the United States are in danger of criminal prosecution for unwittingly having smuggled watches in their possession; and the whole American watch industry has been and now is imperiled by nefarious secret practices of unscrupulous importers in evading the provisions of the tariff act and in causing the American market to be flooded with cheap, inferior Swiss watches sold through unfair and questionable trade practices with the design to destroy or seriously injure the watch and clock industry in the United States.

There has been disclosed a wholesale systematic evasion of the tariff laws through importing knocked-down watches as parts; false marking; leaving a small part out of a movement to avoid duty on complete mechanism; gross undervaluations; and stripping movements until they could not be identified as a clock or watch.

NATIONAL BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU FINDS BULOVA'S ADVERTISING FALSE

As a part of nation-wide selling campaigns to force the sale of foreign-made watches, unscrupulous importers have resorted to false and misleading statements over the radio. Those of the Bulova Watch Co. were so grossly and flagrantly violative of fair and ethical trade practices and business principles that the matter came to the attention of the National Better Business Bureau (Inc.), of New York City, affiliated with 48 local bureaus from coast to coast, which reported that the Bulova Observatory investigation shows that Bulova Watch Co. uses Western Union time in broadcasting Bulova time announcements, and Bulova watches are not "cased and timed" in an observatory, the report being as follows:

BULOVA OBSERVATORY ATOP FIFTH AVENUE SKYSCRAPER DESCRIBED

The national advertising of the Bulova Watch Co. was recently called to the attention of the National Better Business Bureau. The claims questioned involved:

(1) The use of the term "Bulova Observatory."

(2) The illustration used in connection with the term "Bulova Observatory."

(3) The statement—"Cased and Timed at the Bulova Observatory."

(4) The description of the "Lone Eagle" watch as 14 K. White Gold Filled.

(5) The statement: "'Listen In' Nightly for Bulova Radio Time Announcements."

Bulova "Observatory" sheet-metal booth, 5 by 8 by 6 feet 2 inches

Through the courtesy of the Bulova Watch Co., bureau representatives were permitted access to their observatory. It was found that the observatory consists of a sheet-metal booth atop 580 Fifth Avenue, New York, the dimensions being about 5 feet wide, 8 feet long, and about 6 feet 2 inches high. Inside the booth was a transit anchored to a concrete pier. A section of the roof of the booth could be raised to permit celestial observations. The bureau representatives were informed that the Bulova astronomer carried a chronometer up to the booth from the Bulova offices and workshop on the eleventh floor of the building when astronomical readings were taken.

PICTURES IN BULOVA ADS MISLEAD AND DECEIVE

The head of the agency handling this copy frankly acknowledged that the observatory was created for the purpose of "dramatizing the client's Fifth Avenue address." We feel that readers of this advertising have a right to believe that the tower shown in the illustration is the Bulova Observatory—and that it is equipped as an observatory. Actually, the highest part of the tower houses a water tank, the sheet metal booth being atop the roof shown below and to the left of the tower in the advertisement reproduced in this bulletin. As previously noted, the observatory consists of a small sheet metal booth equipped with a transit. Ships use the same method of taking time readings, although they use two or more permanently fixed chronometers for the purpose, but one would not describe the bridge of a ship as an "observatory." While the showing of the skyscraper is quite effective for dramatizing the manufacturer's location on Fifth Avenue, it can not be said that it readily permits of an accurate understanding of the physical appearance and structure of the housing for the Bulova Co.'s transit.

BULOVA'S ADS UNTRUE—WATCHES NOT "CASED AND TIMED" IN OBSERVATORY

The advertisement states that the watches are "cased and timed at the Bulova Observatory." The company occupies the eleventh and part of the twelfth floors of the building. The watches are "cased and timed" on the eleventh floor. The agency executive handling this copy explained that his client's lease with the owners of the building permitted them to designate the building as the "Bulova Observatory." He also mentioned that the building is known by two other names. The impression given the public that the watches are cased and timed in an observatory is not in accordance with the facts.

BULOVA "LONE EAGLE" WATCH NOT 14-KARAT WHITE GOLD FILLED

A circular recently sent to Bulova dealers, advertising Bulova watches as graduation gifts, referred to their "Lone Eagle" model as 14-karat white gold filled. Several watches were shopped by the bureau and found to be represented as 14-karat white gold filled by retailers. Assays made of the cases for the bureau showed that the cases were not 14-karat gold filled, in accordance with the trade practice conference rules of the watchmaking industry. An executive of the Bulova Co. acknowledged this fact, but pointed out that the "Lone Eagle" model is now stamped "Bulova Quality." When attention was called to the misdescription of the "Lone Eagle" model in this circular, the firm acknowledged the error and asserted that it was unintentional.

BULOVA RADIO PROGRAMS FALSE—TIME BROADCAST ONLY WESTERN UNION TIME

By using the statement "Listen in nightly for Bulova radio time announcements" in advertisements showing the Bulova Observatory, the Bulova Watch Co. gives readers the impression that they are broadcasting time signals determined by Bulova at their observatory. According to the executives of the company and of the agency handling the account, the time signals broadcast by the Bulova Co. are based upon the time given by Western Union clocks in the various broadcasting stations from which the announcements are made.

PUBLISHERS, RADIO STATIONS, AND JEWELERS ASK NATIONAL BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU TO INVESTIGATE BULOVA ADVERTISING

The report is made to publishers, broadcasting stations, and the jewelry industry because of requests from these sources to the bureau for a report of the bureau's investigation of Bulova advertising.

RADIO COMMISSION'S LICENSES PROHIBIT BROADCASTING FALSE AND MISLEADNG STATEMENTS

The authority and control over all commercial radio broadcasting stations is vested by law in the Federal Radio Commission, which renews the licenses of the aforesaid stations every three months, each of such licenses issued by the commission containing a clause prohibiting the station from broadcasting or disseminating, or permitting to be broadcast or disseminated from it, false and misleading statements; and if the Radio Commission has not taken steps to prevent the dissemination of false and misleading statements such as used by the Bulova Watch Co. over the radio it should do so at once.

WATCH AND CLOCK PARAGRAPHS OF TARIFF ACT

The watch and clock paragraphs of the 1930 tariff act have been the subject of more concern and more discussion than any other paragraphs in the entire tariff bill. This was not entirely on account of the technical nature of the subject and the great number of involved schedules, but was the direct result of attacks inspired by persons with sinister motives, insinuating that the American watch manufacturers were rich and powerful and that their activities for a change in the tariff law were actuated by avarice rather than by dire necessity.

TARIFF PROTECTION IMPORTANT TO ELGIN WATCH CO.

The people of the city of Elgin, in my congressional district, became thoroughly aroused over the fate of House paragraphs 367 and 368 of the tariff bill when, on November 13, 1929, the Senate agreed to the Barkley amendment striking out the intended relief. These paragraphs were designed to protect the Elgin National Watch Co. and other American watch companies from the onslaught of inferior, foreign-made watches, which threatened to put the Elgin Co. out of the watch business just as this same foreign competition had put it out of the clock business.

The Elgin National Watch Co. had already laid off more than 1,100 employees, and put the balance on a 5-day week, with the prospects of a further lay off, causing a pay roll reduction of $600,000 a year.

Elgin is a modern city of over 35,000 population, built up by and entirely dependent on the watch industry. Unless relief was afforded by the pending tariff bill a serious situation would result.

WATCH TARIFF IMPORTANT TO ILLINOIS

I was appealed to, as were others, to help. The matter was exceedingly important not only to my congressional district, but to the entire State of Illinois, because the Elgin National Watch Co. and the Illinois Watch Co. of Springfield, Ill., produce 63 per cent of the American-made jeweled watches, and one of the largest clock factories in the world is in La Salle County, Ill., a short distance from my home city.

The Elgin National Watch Co. pays its employees an extremely high wage rate, and 85 per cent of them own their own homes.

The city of Elgin is an up-to-date Mid West city, and, of course, it is highly desirable that it be kept so.

ADEQUATE TARIFF NECESSARY TO EQUALIZE COST OF PRODUCTION

It was said that if a tariff were given to the American watch industry which would equalize the domestic cost of production with the cost of an imported watch, the American industry would immediately make a bid to recapture the market which it had lost under the 1922 tariff act. It was said that the Elgin National Watch Co. alone had machinery and ample facilities for 5,000 people instead of the 3,410 it was then employing, which capacity would be utilized if given an opportunity.

This same thing, I understand, holds true as to the Waltham, Hamilton, and Illinois Watch Cos.

Therefore I began immediately, notwithstanding my primary election campaign was imminent, a thorough study of the situation to ascertain whether there was a real need in the watch industry for a revision of the tariff laws. My investigation showed the American watch industry is in a critical condition through no fault of its own and that partial relief could be afforded by the amendment of the clock and watch paragraphs of the tariff bill, so I got on the job and never stopped until the tariff bill had finally passed both Houses.

I appealed to many Members of the House and many Senators to see that this industry was given a square deal. The response was so generous that I now deem it my duty to inform them of the true state of affairs so they will know that the merit of the cause fully justified their confidence in me.

ALL AMERICAN WATCH AND CLOCK MANUFACTURERS INCLUDED HEREIN

Before proceeding further I desire to state that I refer more frequently in my remarks to the Elgin National Watch Co., because I have personal knowledge thereof, as it is located in my home county.

The fundamental facts stated about the Elgin Watch Co. hold true as to the Waltham Watch Co, the Hamilton Watch Co., and the Illinois Watch Co., the other high-class reliable manufacturers of high-grade watches in the United States; and the same things said about the watch industry apply in general to the clock-manufacturing industry.

WATCH INDUSTRY ASSET TO NATION IN PEACE AND WAR

The American watch-manufacturing industry is an important asset to this country both in peace and war, in peace time employing thousands of skilled mechanics at high wages, while hundreds of thousands have related employment; the products are of higher quality and of greater value than like products anywhere else in the world; millions of dollars are spent in advertising and merchandising; other millions of dollars are invested in raw material; still other millions of dollars are invested in plants and equipment; and other millions of dollars are invested in real estate.

WALTHAM WATCH CO.

The Waltham Watch Co. went into World War work on a large scale and produced 375,000 time fuzes for hand grenades, and also furnished timepieces and chronometers for the military and naval services, its most signal contribution to the war service being the furnishing of skilled toolmakers, die makers, and mechanics to the ammunition plants.

HAMILTON AND ILLINOIS WATCH COS.

The Illinois and Hamilton Watch Cos. during the World War furnished fine jigs, tools, and dies to the arms and ammunition companies; specialized in making aerial camera shutter-control devices for use in airplanes, and also furnished tachometers, fine tools, timepieces, and chronometers to the War and Navy Departments.

ELGIN NATIONAL WATCH CO.

The Elgin National Watch Co. during the World War furnished many products to the Government for the use of the military and naval services, namely, timers or stop watches for the Ordnance Department, torpedo-boat watches for the Navy for use as chronometers, ship watches for the Shipping Board, wrist watches for the Army Signal Corps, comparison watches for the United States Navy, chronometric tachometers for the United States Army, altimeters for the United States Army, oxygen gas masks, which were developed and perfected just as the war ended, and turnbuckles for airplanes.

ALARMING DECREASE IN THE WATCH INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES SINCE 1923

The American watch industry from 1923 to 1928 suffered an alarming decrease of business, while imports during the same period increased 85 per cent. There were originally 65 watch companies in this country. To-day there are but three left.

The clock manufacturers showed an income on invested capital of a number of the most successful representative companies of less than 6 per cent in 1928. This was considerably less in 1929, as there was not a company in the clock business which made this amount of profit in that year.

The watchcase manufacturers made less than 3 per cent return on their invested capital in 1928; in fact, less than 4 per cent for the last five years of the act, and they were, and still are, confronted by competition which seems incredible from the price standpoint of base-metal cases.

Under the 1922 tariff, Elgin, the largest manufacturer, was obliged to lay off 1,100 workers out of 4,500, and put the balance on a 5-day week. Waltham had to reduce its force by 2,800 employees.

Foreign-made watches of inferior grade have been coming in to such an alarming extent that in 1928 imports were 218 per cent of domestic production—not including millions of smuggled watches which I will mention later.

The export of American-made watches decreased from $2,273,045 in 1919 to $1,238,049 in 1928, over a million dollars decrease.

In 1929 the foreign-made movements imported were 5,146,029 and the domestic production was only 1,816,019, or nearly three and one-half millions more imported than produced in this country.

Great numbers of clocks without the escapement were imported as parts, which fact probably accounts in great measure for the increase from $13,000 per year to $467,000 per year in the importation of parts.

In addition to this, the fact that from 1923 to 1929 the domestic inventories have increased approximately $7,000,000 did not make the future in the industry look any brighter.

MARKETING PRECARIOUS

A large and increasing inventory in the watch business is very serious because six months after a watch is built it has to be taken down and cleaned at a great expense before it is safe to put it on the market.

IMPORTS INCREASED FROM 2,000,000 TO 6,000,000 NOTWITHSTANDING TARIFF RATES IN THE 1922 ACT

The argument has been made that higher duties would prevent importation and thereby deprive foreigners of making money with which to purchase exports from the United States.

In 1922 this same argument was advanced because Europe was so poor after the war, but the imports at what were then called exorbitant rates have increased from 2,000,000 movements in 1923 to 5,000,000 in 1929, plus $1,000,000 of parts, which means at the very least 1,000,000 more movements.

TREND OF AMERICAN WATCH INDUSTRY WAS DOWN

That the trend of the American watch industry was not upward can be seen from the tabulation issued by the bankers for the principal importer opposed to the present requests for revision of rates on watches, and which is found in the record of the committee hearings.

It discloses more vividly than anything else that there is great danger that the watch business of the United States will succumb to and be taken over by foreign manufacturers.

Compare Bulova, importers increased profits of 312 per cent with the Elgin and Waltham decrease.

Company	1926	1928	Percentage of increase or decrease in 3-year period
Bulova (importer)	$291,066	$1,201,004	Increase 312 per cent.
Elgin	2,314,746	1,846,067	Decrease 20.2 per cent.
Waltham	1,291,104	888,873	Decrease 31.1 per cent.

BULOVA'S EARNINGS INCREASE 312 PER CENT WHILE ELGIN'S DECREASE

To get a fair picture of the situation, compare the Elgin National Watch Co., producing more than half of all the jeweled watches made in the United States, with the Bulova Watch Co., the largest importer of jeweled watches.

While the Bulova Watch Co. was increasing its net earnings 312 per cent in three years, the earnings of the Elgin National Watch Co., in spite of all it could do, decreased.

The Bulova Watch Co., incorporated in 1923, had an original capital of $200,000 and in 1928 it made a net profit of $1,200,000. This tremendous profit could have been made only through the use of very cheap labor in the manufacture of Swiss watches and the laxity of the American tariff law, together with enormous sales to the American watch-buying public at an unconscionable profit.

CAREFUL MANAGEMENT RETARDS DECLINE

By the development of previously unheard of automatic machinery, by the most efficient factory management, and by avoiding excessive salaries and large overhead, by advertising, intensive sales efforts, consistent and absolute fidelity to the watch-making business as a science rather than as a basis for exploitation of the public either by producing an inferior product, or by stock promotion of any kind, the American manufacturer was able to stay in business.

Such excellent business management should call for commendation rather than censure, and this example should be held up to the American business world as one worthy of emulation instead of being used as an excuse by some to refuse adequate tariff protection.

CAUSES OF REDUCED PRODUCTION OF THE AMERICAN WATCH INDUSTRY

The critical condition of the American watch-manufacturing industry was caused by—

First. The inadequacy of the 1922 tariff act both as to rates and regulations.

Second. Extensive smuggling of Swiss watches into the United States.

Third. Unfair merchandising of Swiss watches by unscrupulous importers.

TARIFF LAW EVADED BY UNSCRUPULOUS IMPORTERS

The 1922 tariff law has been continuously evaded by the importers, who have adopted many subterfuges to avoid the payment of the duties levied by law. Scores have been indicted for smuggling, bribery, and conspiracy, and attempted evasions running into millions of dollars have been discovered by customs officials, who have seized thousands of watches for undervaluations, and so forth.

These things have resulted in unfair competition to the American watch manufacturer, who has been deprived of millions of sales because the buying public has been misled into the belief that jewels and alleged adjustments in a foreign watch bring it up to a standard of excellence of the American watch as known to the buying public. These evasions have also resulted in the Government being deprived of millions of dollars in duties.

It is obvious that the act of 1922 was intended to cover all watches in commercial use at that time, and that it of necessity failed to cover approximately 80 per cent of the present commercial sizes, types, and grades.

Here is a list of evasions of the intent of the act of 1922 by unscrupulous importers:

Gross undervaluations of parts difficult to appraise.

Avoidance of the specific duties in paragraph 368 by knocking down movements and reassembling them in the United States under classification of watch parts.

Importing movements with some small unimportant part left out to get the lower duty on parts.

Marking movements or parts falsely.

Failure to mark properly movements or parts.

Entering goods under paragraph 367 instead of paragraph 368, and vice versa, to evade proper duties.

Stripping movements until they can not be identified as clock or watch.

Dials were the subject of fraudulent importation by attaching expensive dials to cheap movements and paying a low specific duty thereon.

HONEST IMPORTERS SUPPORT POSITION OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY

To show that the complaint of the American watch-manufacturing industry is sincere and well-founded, I desire to call to your attention excerpts from the statement of Mr. George J. Gruen, a manufacturer of watches, both in Switzerland and America, a man whose business and personal integrity is beyond question, representing the Gruen Watchmakers' Guild, and other importers, before the Senate Finance Committee, starting on page 716, Schedule 3:

I am a member of the Gruen Watchmakers' Guild, that was formed in 1874 by my father, and we maintain manufacturing plants on both sides of the Atlantic.

At page 717:

I will state at this time that the position of Mr. Strawn [referring to Mr. Taylor Strawn, vice president of the Elgin National Watch Co., and who testified for the American watch industry], and the domestic manufacturers relative to adjustment is correct, in that there is a lot of

cheap trash in this country marked 4, 5, and 6 adjustments, that only costs a dollar. That is a lie on the face of it. They are not adjusted. They never were and they never could be at that price, because adjusting is an expensive process. The importers of the better class of merchandise, as well as the domestic companies, have always maintained that adjustments meant something, and tried to sell it to the public on that theory.

So far as making any agreement that we would have a monopoly between ourselves is concerned, believe me, each one will fight for his business as hard as he ever did before. But there were troubles in the industry that I think we can help—smuggling, undervaluation, and other things that we want to take up in the future.

But, with regard to the ad valorem rate, they had it in previous bills, and it proved that it was not an effective measure, not as effective as specific rates were, due to undervaluations. Those importers that would abide by it 100 per cent were penalized, and also the domestic manufacturer.

At page 722:

Those were not correctly stated. For example, they quoted a 7-jewel watch as having adjustment rates, and charging an adjustment rate. There has never been a 7-jewel watch made that has been adjusted, and I defy the man to swear that he ever produced a 1-jewel adjusted watch. They were marked that way, but they never were made that way, because they can not be made that way.

At page 724:

Mr. GRUEN. * * * You can make a 7-jewel watch cost you $50 by making or attempting to make a number of fine adjustments, but that is not a commercial article. It is said that they import movements at a dollar having four adjustments. The markings on them are a lie, because it never could be so adjusted for a dollar.

Senator REED. If that is true of a 7-jewel watch, it is all the more true of a 6-jewel watch.

Mr. GRUEN. Absolutely. Anything under 6 jewels, or practically any watch under 15 jewels.

At page 726:

All of these watches, with the exception of the last one, namely 879, which is a 17-jewel watch, obviously are fraudulently marked "adjusted," as at these prices it can not be done. No. 879, on account of the low cost in Switzerland, may possibly be adjusted, and for that reason the ink figure shows the four adjustments; but this duty rate of $7.56 would be a very small part of the difference in cost of production of that watch abroad and in this country.

The honest importers, led by Mr. George J. Gruen, deserve high commendation for their efforts to place the importation of watches on a high plane and to drive out of business those unscrupulous importers whose vicious practices will eventually not only ruin the American watch manufacturers but will ruin the entire trade as well.

GOVERNMENT APPRAISERS BRIBED—$1,000,000 WORTH OF WATCHES SMUGGLED

United States District Attorney Charles H. Tuttle, of New York City, recently revealed that two Government appraisers had accepted bribes of $8,000 to smuggle more than a million dollars' worth of watch parts into this country within the last year.

GOVERNMENT CHEATED OF $359,000—WATCHES SOLD BY SMUGGLERS FOR LESS THAN DUTY

Mr. Tuttle stated that by paying bribes of $8,000 the smugglers saved $359,000 in duties due the Government, which enabled them to sell the merchandise at prices against which legitimate merchants could not compete, and in some cases, Mr. Tuttle said, the smugglers sold the watches for less than the regular duty on them.

"WATCH-SMUGGLING RACKET" EXTENSIVE AND PERSISTENT

The "watch-smuggling racket" is one of the most extensive and persistent with which the customs officials have to contend.

IMPORTERS PLEAD GUILTY TO BRIBING AND SMUGGLING

The public press reports that three importers, Joseph Perleman, Paul Rabkin, and Solomon Rubman, who did business under their own names and also under the firm name of Federal Mail Order Co., pleaded guilty to bribing Government appraisers; and three other importers—Joseph Feinstein, Max Epstein, and Richard Biechuns—pleaded guilty of smuggling in $1,154,000 worth of watch parts concealed in boxes declared as containing chocolates and crockery dishes.

PRESS REPORTS BRIBERY BY IMPORTERS

The New York World, in its issue of April 25, 1930, carried the following article:

CUSTOMS MEN TOOK $8,000 BRIBE TO PASS WATCHES WORTH MILLION

Two Government appraisers accepted bribes of $8,000 to help smuggle more than $1,000,000 worth of watch parts into this country within the last year, United States Attorney Tuttle revealed last night.

CUSTOMS OFFICIALS CONFESS TO PLOT—THREE OFFICIAL INVESTIGATIONS BEGUN

The Federal employees, arrested yesterday on information supplied to Assistant United States Attorney Sylvester, have confessed to their share of the plot, according to Mr. Tuttle. They are Samuel Stansfield and William F. Gilroy, dish experts at the appraisers' stores. Three official investigations are under way to determine whether other and higher Government officials are involved.

The men were detained at the customhouse last night and will be arraigned before a United States commissioner to-day. It is expected they will be immediately suspended from duty.

GOVERNMENT SEIZES WATCHES LABELED AS "DISHES"

Last September Federal agents seized at the pier a shipment of 10 cases labeled "dishes" which actually contained parts of Swiss watches, on which heavy duties are levied. The merchandise was consigned to the Superfine Watch Co.

IMPORTERS PLEAD GUILTY

Joseph Y. Perleman, Paul Rabkin, and Solomon Rubman, who did business under that name and as the Federal Mail Order Co., were arrested and pleaded guilty. They will be sentenced Monday.

CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES CONNIVE WITH SMUGGLERS

Their activities, which had very wide ramifications, were investigated by Special Treasury Agent O'Keefe, in charge of smuggling; Mr. Sylvester; and the grand jury. The authorities learned recently that employees at the appraisers' stores had connived with the smugglers, but the allegations against Stansfield and Gilroy were first made to them yesterday.

SMUGGLERS PAID APPRAISERS $100 PER CASE

According to the alleged confessions of the two appaisers, the cases of watch parts were marked "dishes" because the smugglers knew Stansfield and Gilroy would have to examine such merchandise. The appraisers are said to have admitted they were paid $100 for each case passed. It was hinted that a customs broker had established the connection between the smugglers and the appraisers.

WATCHES SOLD BY SMUGGLERS AT PRICES AGAINST WHICH LEGITIMATE MERCHANTS CAN NOT COMPETE

Mr. Tuttle explained that by paying bribes of $8,000 the smugglers saved $359,000 in duties to the Government. This saving enabled them to sell the merchandise at prices against which legitimate merchants could not compete. In some cases, Mr. Tuttle said, the smugglers sold the watches for less than the regular duty on them.

OTHERS MAY BE INVOLVED—FEDERAL GRAND JURY WORKING ON CASE

"We are pursuing our inquiries," Mr. Tuttle continued, "to find out whether other Federal men were involved. Appraiser of the Port Kracke has been notified and Special Agent O'Keefe and the grand jury also are working on the case. The Watch Importers' Association has given us valuable assistance."

THREE OTHER IMPORTERS PLEAD GUILTY OF SMUGGLING—WATCHES HIDDEN IN CANDY BOXES

The watch-smuggling racket is one of the most extensive and persistent customs officials have to contend with, it was revealed. Three other importers, who have pleaded guilty of smuggling in $1,154,000 worth of watch parts, on which the duties average 40 per cent, will be sentenced Monday. They are Joseph Feinstein, Max Epstein, and Richard Biechuns. They hid their shipments in boxes apparently containing chocolates.

NEW YORK TIMES REPORTS BRIBERY AND SMUGGLING

The New York Times, in its issue of May 27, 1930, carried the following article:

CUSTOMS EXAMINERS INDICTED IN SMUGGLING—TWO GOT $12,000 FOR SAVING $300,000 TO IMPORTERS OF WATCHES, IT IS CHARGED

William F. Gilroy and Samuel Stansfield, customs examiners in the office of the United States appaiser, who confessed recently, according to Federal Attorney Tuttle, that they had passed undeclared watch movements valued at $500,000 into this port, were indicted yesterday by a Federal grand jury on a charge of smuggling and conspiracy to smuggle.

SMUGGLERS' CONSPIRACY COSTS GOVERNMENT $300,000

Mr. Tuttle said the Government had lost $300,000 in duties as a result of the alleged conspiracy. The investigation leading to the indictment was conducted by Alvin McK. Sylvester, assistant United States attorney, and has resulted in the dismissal of John De Valstedt, another agent, and the suspension of Frank Philan, a clerk in the watch department.

CUSTOMS OFFICIALS INDICTED FOR ACCEPTING BRIBES

The indictment charges that between March 10 and September 10, 1929, Gilroy received $7,000 and Stansfield $5,000 for allowing watches to enter the port as "crockery," though both agents, it is charged, knew that they were watches shipped in from Switzerland.

IMPORTERS CONNIVED WITH GOVERNMENT MEN IN PLOT

The indicted men, it is charged, worked with Paul Rabkin, Joseph Perleman, and Sol Rubman, officers of the Superfine Watch Co. and the Federal Mail Order Corporation, both of 561 Broadway.

IMPORTERS PLEAD GUILTY IN FEDERAL COURT

Rabkin and the others pleaded guilty recently to their part in the conspiracy and will be sentenced on June 9 by Judge Francis T. Caffey, who will hear pleas from Gilroy and Stansfield next Monday.

THIRTY-THREE WATCH SMUGGLERS INDICTED—FOURTEEN IMPORTING COMPANIES VIOLATE LAW

The records of the Treasury Department, hereinafter set forth in detail, show that 33 persons have been indicted for smuggling watches, and 14 companies have been apprehended in the act of violating the customs laws by false entries.

BULOVA WATCH CO. VIOLATES LAW BY FALSE ENTRY

Recently about $250,000 worth of watches imported into the United States from Switzerland by the Bulova Watch Co. were seized by the Government for attempted false entry of the shipment as parts of watches instead of watches, thereby escaping the payment of $30,424.50 in duty.

BULOVA WATCH CO. PAID GOVERNMENT $52,000 TO MITIGATE PENALTY

The records of the Treasury Department show that the Bulova Watch Co. paid to the Government $52,000 in mitigation of the penalty prescribed by law for such false entry.

WATCH IMPORTERS APPREHENDED BY GOVERNMENT IN LAW VIOLATIONS

The records of the Treasury Department hereinafter set forth in detail show that the following importers of foreign-made watches were apprehended by the Government in the act of violating the customs laws by false entry or smuggling watches or parts, viz: Bulova Watch Co., Superfine Watch Co., Benrus Watch Co., Federal Mail Order Corporation, Jenkins Corporation, Joseph Gottlieb, Weinstrum Watch Co., I. Tannenbaum & Co., Bernstein & Chatelain, Newark Clock Co., Preston Bros., Charles Kivel & Co., Arlington Watch Co., O. Maire & Co.

TWO WATCH SMUGGLERS GET 30 DAYS IN JAIL

The records of the Treasury Department show that:

In case No. 33-28-27, Maurice Julien and Joseph Julien were indicted on November 18, 1929, for smuggling 795 watch movements, valued at $4,107, pleaded guilty on December 12, 1929, and were sentenced to 30 days in jail.

THREE SMUGGLERS GET ONE YEAR AND ONE DAY IN ATLANTA PENITENTIARY

In case No. 33-1757-3, Louis Poller, Joseph Feinstein, Richard Bieshuns, Samuel Weisman, Max Epstein, and Henry Bernard were indicted on March 28, 1930, for smuggling watch movements valued at $46,523 concealed in shipments of candy. Poller, Feinstein, and Bieshuns pleaded guilty on April 11, 1930, and were sentenced to one year and one day in the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta; Weisman, Epstein, and Bernard still awaiting trial.

ELEVEN IMPORTERS INDICTED FOR SMUGGLING—THREE PLEAD GUILTY

In case No. 33-1757-2, Paul Rabkin, Solomon Rubman, Joseph Perlemen, Meyer Person, Henry Weidhorn, Vincent Valvo, Charles Valvo, Jules Mettez, Henry Bernard, Miss M. Salzman, and Leo Robinson, officers and employees of the Federal Mail Order Corporation and the Superfine Watch Co., were indicted on November 30, 1929, and February 26, 1930, for smuggling watch movements valued at $183,497 concealed in shipments of earthenware. Rabkin, Rubman, and Perlemen pleading guilty on February 17 and 18, 1930, the other defendants still awaiting trial.

THIRTEEN SMUGGLERS INDICTED—TWO PLEAD GUILTY AND PAY $1,000 AND $400 FINES—TWO YEARS AT HARD LABOR IN CANADA FOR ONE

In case No. 33-1757-1, Isidore Tarnow, Abraham Bloom, Isidore Milstein, Adolph Speyer, David Gilden, Joseph Jacobs, Paul Feldhuhn, Norman Flaxman, H. Perlman, Irving Victoroff, J. Lichtenfels, Sydney Mandel, and Max Spiro, were indicted on July 1, 1929, for smuggling of 387 watch parts, Flaxman and Perlman pleading guilty on August 7 and July 16, 1929, respectively, and being fined $1,000 and $400, respectively, the case against Victoroff being nolle prossed on July 18, 1929, Speyer having been sentenced in Canada to two years at hard labor for the same offense, the other defendants still awaiting trial.

DEFENDANT FINED $250 FOR SMUGGLING WATCHES IN METAL WHEELS

In case No. 33-1632, Werner Matter was indicted for smuggling 60 watch movements concealed in metal wheels, pleaded guilty on December 21, 1928, and was fined $250.

BULOVA WATCH CO. PAYS $52,000 FOR LAW VIOLATIONS

In case No. 95-282, the Bulova Watch Co., of New York City, on February 7 and March 5, 1930, violated the law by undervaluing 22,032 knocked-down watch movements, and thereby escaped the payment of $30,424.50 in duty, the penalty being mitigated by the payment of $51,557.20, the true duty.

BENRUS WATCH CO. PAYS $29,000 FOR UNDERVALUING WATCHES

In case No. 95-282, the Benrus Watch Co. on February 7 and February 27, 1930, violated the law by undervaluing 7,451 knocked-down watch movements, and thereby escaped the payment of $26,458 in duty, the penalty being mitigated by the payment of $29,207, the true duty.

JENKINS CORPORATION PAYS $2,837 TO MITIGATE PENALTY

In case No. 95-282, the Jenkins Corporation on February 7, 1930, violated the law by undervaluing 3,562 knocked-down watch movements, and thereby escaped the payment of $1,891 in duty, the penalty being mitigated by the payment of $2,000, plus $837, the duty paid on entry.

JENKINS CORPORATION PAYS $12,350 TO ESCAPE PENALTY FOR VIOLATING LAW

In case No. 95-282, the Jenkins Corporation, on February 15 and 19, 1930, violated the law by undervaluing 13,508 knocked-down watch movements, and thereby escaped the payment of $6,829 in duty, the penalty being mitigated by the payment of $12,350.

JOSEPH GOTTLIEB PAYS $8,450 TO MITIGATE PENALTY

In case No. 95-282, Joseph Gottlieb, on February 7 and 19, 1930, violated the law by undervaluing 10,406 knocked-down watch movements, thereby seeking to evade the payment of $3,247 in duty, the penalty being mitigated by the payment of $8,450.

WEINSTRUM WATCH CO. UNDERVALUES 1,907 WATCH MOVEMENTS—PAYS $2,500

In case No. 95-282, the Weinstrum Watch Co., on February 19, 1930, violated the law by undervaluing 1,907 knocked-down watch movements, thereby seeking to evade the payment of $849 in duty, the penalty being mitigated by the payment of $2,500.

I. TANNENBAUM VIOLATES LAW BY UNDERVALUATION—WATCHES SEIZED

In case No. 95-282, I. Tannenbaum & Co., on March 10, 1930, violated the law by undervaluing three cases of knocked-down watch movements, the duty that should have been paid being $4,051, the amount of duty sought to be evaded being unknown, the merchandise being still under seizure and no action taken.

BERNSTEIN & CHATELAIN UNDERVALUES TWO CASES OF MOVEMENTS—PAYS $600

In case No. 95-282, Bernstein & Chatelain, on February 1 and 7, 1930, violated the law by undervaluing two cases of knocked-down watch movements, thereby seeking to evade the payment of $2,418 in duty, the penalty of forfeiture being mitigated on one case by the payment of $600.

I. TANNENBAUM PAYS $600 TO MITIGATE PENALTY

In case No. 95-282, I. Tannenbaum & Co., on April 16, 1930, violated the law by undervaluing four cases of watch parts, the merchandise not having been appraised as yet, and the penalty of forfeiture being mitigated on one case on payment of $600.

NEWARK WATCH CO. SMUGGLES 2,664 WATCHES MIXED IN WITH CLOCK PARTS

In case No. 33-2636, the Newark Clock Co., on July 17, 1929, violated the law by smuggling 2,664 watches mixed in with a shipment of 18 cases of clock parts, the merchandise being released on payment of $4,515 48, the forfeiture value.

PRESTON BROS. PAID $25,000 FOR SMUGGLING WATCHES

In case No. 33-1028, Preston Bros., on September 25, 1925, violated the law by smuggling an unknown quantity of watches, the case being settled by a compromise payment of $25,000.

WATCHES FALSELY INVOICED BY CHARLES KIVEL & CO. SEIZED BY GOVERNMENT

In case No. 29-649, Charles Kivel & Co., on May 5, 1925, violated the law by invoicing 7-jewel watch movements as having six jewels, the duty that should have been paid being $37.50, the duty evaded being $15, and the duty sought to be paid being $22.50, the merchandise being seized.

WEINSTRUM WATCH CO. FALSELY INVOICES WATCHES—GOODS SEIZED

In case No. 95-63, the Weinstrum Watch Co., on January 19 and February 2, 1925, invoiced 7-jewel watch movements as having six jewels, the duty that should have been paid being $172.50, the duty evaded being $69, and the duty sought to be paid being $103.50, the merchandise being seized.

ARLINGTON WATCH CO. AND O. MAIRE & CO. FRAUDULENTLY ENTER WATCHES AS AMERICAN GOODS RETURNED—PAY $25,000

In case No. 77-156, the Arlington Watch Co. and O. Maire & Co., in September, 1924, and February, 1926, violated the law by fraudulently entering watch movements as American goods returned, thereby seeking to evade the payment of $16,969 in duty, the case being settled by a compromise payment of $25,453.50.

INVESTMENT IN WATCH INDUSTRY TREMENDOUS

The investment in the watch and clock industry in the United States is tremendous and labor forms approximately 90 per cent of the cost of a watch. The large American manu-

facturing companies, Elgin National Watch Co., Hamilton Watch Co., Illinois Watch Co., and Waltham Watch Co., have investments alone of over $50,000,000. Very few products, if any, have such a high labor proportion and in addition this labor is skilled; and in the consideration of this subject that fact should be kept foremost in mind.

The Elgin National Watch Co. wage earners average $8.52 per day; some are paid as high as $16 per day. They work in the most modern, light, sanitary factories; have sick and death benefits; are pensioned by the company after 60 to 65; and are among the most highly skilled artisans in the industrial world.

WATCH IMPORTS IN 1927 TOTAL $38,000,000—UNITED STATES PRODUCTION ONLY $21,000,000

A comparison of imports and domestic production on the basis of contemplated dollar value of imports against total domestic reported production is unfair and misleading, the imports being based on Swiss franc values of labor and materials and not including cases, nor advertising and other overhead, which goes to make up by far the larger proportion of the total domestic reported production value. An imported watch potentially displaces an American-made watch, and figures based on numbers of movements imported is the only fair basis of comparison.

One hundred dollars expended in Switzerland will buy as many movements as $350 will buy in the United States. Therefore the total Swiss imports, in francs, should be multiplied by 3½ to show the real competitive impact on the United States market.

This would mean total imports of movements in 1927 of $10,800,000 times 3½ equals $38,000,000—the real foreign competition against total United States production of $21,000,000. (See Department of Commerce Census of 1927.)

WATCH EMPLOYEES IN SWITZERLAND TRAINED BY GOVERNMENT

In Switzerland the training of watch workers is done by schools which it is understood are financed and run by the Government, and skilled workers are turned over to the industry without the cost of education, which, of course, really amounts to a subsidy.

WATCH EMPLOYEES IN UNITED STATES TRAINED OVER LONG PERIOD AT GREAT EXPENSE

In the American watch industry the employees are trained over a long period of time at great expense to private employers, and it is a very serious matter to lose the investment in those skilled workers which must happen when the factories are not working full time.

KINDS OF WATCHES MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES

There is no size or shape or jewelling or adjustment of any properly built foreign watch produced in commercial quantities but what is manufactured in the United States. The so-called low-price watches imported sell to the consumers at prices from $4.50 upward. Good jeweled watches are made by the Waterbury Watch Co. and the New Haven Clock Co. which sell for approximately the same price to the consumers. More refined watches made by the Elgin and Waltham companies in the 7-jewel type sell to the consumers at from $12 up, and all of these prices are substantially the same as the consumers' price of an equivalent foreign-made watch, except that the American manufacturers have not yet indulged in the manufacturing of spurious watches for trade purposes.

The statement that the American schoolgirl or housewife can not buy an American-made watch at $15 to $25 is incorrect. Current magazines and American watch manufacturers' national advertisements show a complete line of these watches. Seven-jewel American-made watches of the finest type are made and sold to the consumer by such firms as Elgin and Waltham from $12 up, depending on kind of case.

The competing foreign-made watch is invoiced to the United States importer at a price of about $2 each and sometimes sells to the consumer for $15 to $25 each.

INTEGRITY OF THE UNITED STATES MANUFACTURER

How can any American watch manufacturer who has a tremendous investment in factory, plant, and equipment, on whom thousands of men and their families depend for a living wage, whose whole business career is founded upon integrity and his success attained through years of production of goods of high quality, sold at a small profit, long survive this unfair and deadly foreign competition?

Every foreign-made watch purchased displaces an American-made watch, and as the demand for American watches decreases employment proportionately decreases.

WHAT A WATCH IS

A modern watch is an instrument for the correct recording of time and its quality depends on its ability to do so with the least amount of error. Quality in a watch is obtained by highly skilled mechanics operating highly efficient machines of minute accuracy, to produce parts mechanically perfect, and when properly put together by skilled labor, inspected, tested, adjusted, and regulated, an accurate timekeeper should result. Quality in a watch also is indicated by the number and character of jewels and the number and kinds of adjustments.

WATCH ORIGINALLY A TOY

In olden times one thing was particularly noticeable. A timekeeper was esteemed primarily on account of its exterior ornamentation or unusual form or on account of its intricate and curious mechanism and was considered a jewel or ornament. Accuracy in keeping time was always of very minor importance, just the opposite from the demand of the people to-day.

The old idea that watches were not timepieces but toys is gone forever, although the merchandising campaigns of some dealers in imported watches to-day would indicate otherwise.

JEWELS MAY BE A MARK OF QUALITY

A jewel is a bearing made out of precious or semiprecious stones used in the movement.

The importance of jewels is often misunderstood even at the present day. Many people do not know why jewels are used in a watch, assuming that they are intended for ornament or in some way to increase the value. But most of the jewels in a watch movement are placed out of sight; and, although they often consist of real rubies or sapphires, they are so tiny that their intrinsic value is small. They are strictly utilitarian in their purpose.

Jeweling in some inferior imported watches means nothing, except to beguile the purchaser, while the number of jewels in American-made watches is indicative of their degree of excellence.

AMERICAN AGAINST SWISS WATCH MANUFACTURE—AMERICAN WATCH MANUFACTURE

American watches are made in modern plants under scientifically and accurate and the most comfortable and sanitary conditions, and with the finest of precision instruments and care, all parts made under one roof, and carefully and thoroughly inspected.

The difference in manufacturing procedure is basic, and past history and experience with mechanical devices have proven over and over again that assemblies of separately manufactured units into a whole result in imperfections and inaccuracies.

Brearley in his book Time Telling Through the Ages, on page 182, says:

> American watchmaking is typical of the difference between the American and European industry in the nineteenth century. Here a complete watch is produced in one factory, while in England, Switzerland, and France most establishments specialize in the manufacture of particular parts and these parts are then assembled in other factories. Some 50 different trades there are working separately to produce the parts. And the manufacturer, whose work is chiefly that of finishing and assembling, takes a large profit for inspection and for the prestige of his name.

It is apparent that a complete watch assembled from separate manufacturing plants, each making one or two parts could not be expected to deliver the accurate and faithful service over a period of time that American watches do.

The American people would not buy the assembled automobile, much more would they never buy an assembled watch if they knew it was an assembled one, especially when the assemblers of the watches have little or no reputation for skill in the watch-manufacturing industry.

SOME SWISS WATCHES MADE IN SMALL SHOPS AND WORKERS' HOMES

A great many of the so-called "cheap" grade watches sold in the United States are watches produced in Switzerland by companies who contract with individuals, families, groups, or other companies to make different parts at different places, which they assemble and sell for export.

There is small investment in plant, equipment, or materials, and watches are produced at such low prices that the cheap labor must be employed and crude work must be accepted, such as we get in this country from what is termed "sweatshop" labor employed by certain industries.

EXPERT SKILL REQUIRED TO MAKE GOOD WATCH

The making of a watch is a difficult mechanical task requiring expert skill, accurate tools, and excellent working conditions.

Stop to realize that in the making of an American watch there are 211 separate parts, one-third of which are screws; that it requires 3,136 operations to complete a watch; that it requires 120 operations to finish a balance wheel; that a balance wheel must vibrate 5 times a second and 18,000 times an hour, 1 more or less vibrations an hour making the watch run 4.8 seconds fast or slow a day, or 2.4 minutes a month; that some drills, taps, and reamers are one-third the size of

a human hair; that certain watch gages must be tested every hour for accuracy; that drills actually finer than human hair are used to drill holes in steel and brass, and that over 1,000,000 per year are used; that steel pivots are used which are only twenty-eight ten-thousandths of an inch in diameter; that the hairspring is made of steel, drawn down through a hole in a diamond to get the correct size; that the gold and steel screws that go to make the watch are so small that it takes 500,000 to make a pound; that 20,000 will go into any ordinary thimble; that many operations are accurate to within one ten-thousandths of an inch; it then becomes easy to understand how difficult it would be to make valuable timepieces of good mechanical service by the assembly of different parts made by different workmen at different places.

SWISS WATCHES BEST AND POOREST IN WORLD

It will be easily seen from the foregoing that there can be no comparison in the quality and workmanship of an American-made watch and large numbers of many foreign-made watches.

I do not maintain that there are no fine, high-class watches of great quality made in Switzerland, for there are many, but they sell at a price in the United States commensurate with their worth, and as against these the American manufacturers ask no protective tariff, being willing to meet their competition on the merits and desirability of their respective articles.

Milham in his book Time and Time Keepers, on page 429, says:

Some one has said that the Swiss make the best and the poorest watches in the world.

UNSCRUPULOUS IMPORTER THE COMMON ENEMY

The honest importer and domestic manufacturer had a common enemy, the unscrupulous importer, whose activities were flooding the American market with cheap trash, which was not only unfair to the honest importer and domestic manufacturer but served also to deprive the Government of lawful duties.

The high-class importers were represented before the House and Senate committees by George J. Gruen. His testimony showed the evils practiced by the unscrupulous importers and the need of a revision of the 1922 act to protect the domestic manufacturer as well as the honest importer, and of certain raises in rates in the tariff act as very necessary.

It is inconceivable that these important foreign firms of substantial capital would agree to a tariff proposal that would injure the legitimate importation of watches.

Obviously, if they were not interested in cleaning up the evils of the business, they would not have agreed to a higher duty on certain watches that were being brought into this country in violation of high standards of the watch industry by unscrupulous importers.

BULOVA LEADS OPPOSITION TO ADEQUATE TARIFF

The opposition to the revision of the tariff bill intended to afford relief to the American watch manufacturer centered around the Bulova Watch Co., as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 13, 1929, page 5520, Senate proceedings:

The Bulova Watch Co. heads the list of those that have not agreed to the proposed rate. The watch produced by that company has received considerable attention here because it is a well-known brand. The Bulova Co. is able to have an hour or half an hour set apart, I believe, each night over WRC or some other radio broadcasting station to advertise the Bulova watch, and they give a fairly good program, as a number of other industries do which are able to employ the radio in advertising their products. The other companies on the list are as follows:

Gothic Watch Co., Westfield Watch Co., Arrow Manufacturing Co., Louis Adels & Co., Goldsmith Stern & Co., Knickerbocker Watch Co., Namdor Watch Co., United Jewelers (Buren watch), Speidel Chain Co., North American Watch Co., Norman Morris & Co., Piedmont Watch Co., Awon Watch Co., Savoy Watch Co., Korones Bros., Hamel Riglander & Co., M. J. Lampert & Co., Manhattan Watch Co., Sonpalan Watch Co., Jagot Watch Co., Modern Watch Co., American Standard Watch Case Co., Pioneer Watch Case Co., Etna Watch Co., Weinstrum Watch Co., I. Ollendorf & Co., Gotham Watch Co., Strickland Watch Co., Pennant Watch Supply Co., Boston Watch Co., Toledo Watch Co., Bayer Pretzfelder & Mills (Elaine Goering Watch Co.), Glycine Watch Co.

A careful consideration of those importers who were said to be opposing these paragraphs will demonstrate a somewhat desperate search for the support of one importer's (Bulova) contentions.

Turning to the list of importers named (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Nov. 13, 1929, p. 5520) as not supporting this proposal, we find the following peculiarities:

First. Not one is listed in Moody's Manual.

Second. Knickerbocker Watch Co., Westfield Watch Co., Arrow Jewelry Mfg. Co., American Standard Watch Case Co. are listed separately but in reality are nothing but subsidiaries of Bulova Watch Co.

Third. Glycine Watch Co. is the foreign watch distributed exclusively by Bayer Pretzfelder & Mills, but both are listed.

Fourth. Goldsmith, Stern & Co., United Jewelers, Speidel Chain Co., Mandor Watch Co., Piedmont Watch Co., Avon Watch Case Co., Lonpalon Watch Co., Jagot Watch Co., Gotham Watch Co., and Strickland Watch Co. are not even listed by the National Jewelers Board of Trade (the recognized trade authority) as being in the watch business.

Swiss watches sold for whatever consumer will pay—No standards

Swiss watch importers catalogue as many as 400 models under 10,000 trade names. The harm of this is obvious because there are as many different prices as there are different names on the same base value or as imagination can invent, and which are sold at any price the customer can be persuaded to pay.

Compare this with the American manufacturer who must accept the obligation of the high standards of the industry, and who must arrive at his price range based on the value of the movement, its size, its jeweling, its adjustments, as well as the value of the case, dial, and attachments.

How duties are to be levied under the new tariff act

The language of the new act provides a new method of computing duties on watches and clocks made necessary because of the 1922 act, basing duties on movements according to the number of jewels and adjustments, was not adapted either to meet conditions resulting from complete transformation of the watch business since 1922 or the change in the manner of importation of watches and clocks.

Duties are now governed by:

First. True marking.

Second. Size of movement.

Third. Number of jewels.

Fourth. Number of adjustments.

Fifth. Running period under and over 47 hours.

Sixth. Parts at specific rates per piece on subassemblies or at 65 per cent ad valorem on parts for assembly here, the following summary showing the rates on representative parts:

For repair purposes, 45 per cent ad valorem (same rate as in 1922 act; limited to 4 per cent of movements in each shipment). Plates for assembly purposes, one-half duty on watch; parts for subassembly, 3 cents per piece; parts for assembly, 65 per cent ad valorem.

EFFECT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 AS TO WATCHES AND CLOCKS

The effect of the tariff act of 1930, which was signed by President Hoover on June 17, 1930, may be summarized as follows:

First. It will more nearly equalize the cost of manufacture at home and abroad.

Second. The American manufacturer will be given an opportunity to recapture a portion of his own market.

Third. Additional employment will be provided for American labor.

Fourth. The profits of the importer will be somewhat lessened.

Fifth. There will be less possibility of fraud and evasion.

Sixth. The unscrupulous importers will no longer be able so easily to deceive the watch-buying public, and it will be more difficult to dispose of spurious watches in this country.

TARIFF DUTIES ON CLOCKS

Paragraph 368 of the tariff act of 1930 materially reduces from the 1922 act the duty on such clocks as are placed in automobiles, as well as what are known as boudoir and traveling clocks, and this constitutes a very considerable item of clock manufacture in the United States under the act of 1922. These clocks, most of which were 6-jewel, carried a duty of $4 specific, plus 45 per cent ad valorem. The duty under the 1930 act on the same article is $1.50 for jewels, and on a basis of $2 value, 90 cents ad valorem, with a value specific of $1 each, making a total of $3.40 duty, compared with a duty of $4.90 under the 1922 act.

It is impossible to compare the other operations of this paragraph with the 1922 act because of the combined specific and ad valorem duties levied in both; it being, therefore, necessary to determine the value of any particular clock or timepiece and the number of jewels contained therein before a comparison can be made.

The clock manufacturers were probably the greatest sufferers from the fraudulent practice under the 1922 act in the way of importation of mechanisms with one small part removed in order to obtain the part rate on the balance. Practically no clocks containing escapements were imported during the latter years of the 1922 act. Parts increased from $13,000 per year to $467,000 per year during that act, and it was parts of the higher-priced timepieces which were thus imported and which consequently caused an evasion of the very highest rate brackets in the paragraph.

AMERICAN WATCHES MODERATELY PRICED TO CONSUMER

The new tariff act will not prevent the purchase of reasonably priced watches by people in all walks of life. Good American watches can be purchased in price classes.

For instance: For a schoolboy, in price range from $10 to $15; for the schoolgirl, sports watches, $15 to $27.50; factory hands and day laborers, $10 to $20; housemaids, $24.75 to $30; clerks, $15 to $40; business men, $39.50 to $150; railroad men, $50 to $75; sportsmen, $23 and up; luxury class, any price from $15 to $650.

BULOVA WATCH CO. IMPORTS CONTRACT ALIEN LABOR

The Bulova Watch Co. secured from the Secretary of Labor permits to bring into the United States foreign workmen who would compete with American workmen, thereby depriving American workmen of employment, by representing to the Department of Labor that there were not available in the United States craftsmen who were able to perform the type of work desired.

LOW WAGE SCALE PAID FOREIGN WORKERS

The foreign workmen were brought into the United States and were paid wages below the standard wage paid to American workmen performing similar work.

LABOR DEPARTMENT ORDERS BULOVA TO RETURN WORKMEN TO SWITZERLAND

It was later discovered by the Department of Labor that the Bulova Watch Co. failed to carry out the representations made to the department, and the department thereupon ordered it to return the foreign workmen to the country whence they came.

NO LACK OF AMERICAN WORKMEN

There is not now nor has there been any scarcity of competent, skilled American watch and clock workmen in the United States.

AMERICAN WAGE AND LIVING STANDARDS SOUGHT TO BE LOWERED BY BULOVA

The Bulova Watch Co. has sought to undermine and lower the American standards of wages and living, and has deliberately sought to evade the contract labor laws of the United States.

WATCH AND CLOCKMAKERS' UNION PROTEST IMPORTATION OF ALIEN CONTRACT LABORERS

The following letter, dated April 25, 1930, showing in detail the foregoing facts, was received by me from the Chicago Watch and Clockmakers' Union:

Congressman FRANK R. REID,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The inclosed is a copy of an article taken from the January, 1930, issue of the Keystone, a publication devoted to and having a large circulation among the jewelry trade. The facts disclosed therein clearly show an evil, which, if not effectively curbed, will incur considerable damage to the watchmaking trade in the United States.

BULOVA WATCH CO. DECEIVES SECRETARY OF LABOR

It appears that the offending party in the case cited, the Bulova Watch Co., of New York, through misrepresentations and misleading statements, succeeded in procuring from the Secretary of Labor a permit to import from Switzerland to the United States a number of watchmakers. It further appears that in order to get those watchmakers to come here similar tactics have been resorted to, namely, misrepresentations and misstatements of facts and intentions. We only learned of the mischief done from this Keystone article, when it was, of course, too late to do anything in the matter.

TWO OTHER WATCH IMPORTERS SEEK TO IMPORT SWISS CONTRACT LABOR

A similar attempt to import watchmakers from Europe to this country was made by another concern in Cincinnati, Ohio, to whom a permit had been issued, but revoked in time after the Secretary of Labor had been made acquainted with the true facts. Also a firm in this city applied for such a permit, but has been refused it because we laid facts before Secretary Davis proving that the reasons presented for such permit did not exist.

FACTS OUTLINED BY WATCH AND CLOCKMAKERS' UNION

We respectfully submit that the facts in the case, briefly, are:

MANY UNEMPLOYED AMERICAN WATCHMAKERS

1. That there is no shortage of watchmakers in the United States. Although exact statistics to prove this statement are not available, we know, however, that in the city of Chicago—the second largest center of this industry in the United States—there are normally on an average of from 5 per cent to 15 per cent idle during the year. We can, therefore, assume that this condition prevails in the rest of the country.

UNITED STATES WATCHMAKERS CAPABLE AND EFFICIENT

2. That the watchmakers in the United States are fully as competent and efficient as those of any country in the world, barring none.

WAGE SCALE OF WATCHMAKERS LOW

3. That watchmakers' wages, considering the highly skilled nature of the trade, are considerably below what they should be.

UNSCRUPULOUS WATCH IMPORTERS SEEK TO LOWER WAGE SCALE

4. That the true reasons for the attempts made by some unscrupulous employers to import watchmakers from other lands is to increase the surplus of this particular labor and thereby lower the wage standard.

AMERICAN LIVING STANDARDS MUST BE PROTECTED

From the foregoing it is clear that in order to safeguard the living standard of the watchmakers in this country a means must be found to effectively curb the importation of watchmakers from abroad, which, however, under the existing method of issuing permits, seems to be impossible.

UNION URGES PUBLICITY TO APPLICATIONS TO IMPORT CONTRACT ALIEN LABOR

Therefore we, the Chicago Watch and Clockmakers' Union, a labor organization with a membership of about 400, all citizens of the United States, demand that a law be passed requiring the Secretary of Labor, prior to the issuance of a permit for the importation of skilled artisans to the United States from any foreign country, to post a notice in three consecutive issues of at least two trade journals devoted to the trade for which the importation of skilled artisans may be sought in accordance with the law relating thereto now in existence. Such notice is to state the name of the applicant for such permit, his reasons therefor in detail, and the number of such artisans sought to be imported. This would enable the parties interested in opposing the issuance of such a permit to submit facts disproving claims which have no basis in fact.

ENACTMENT OF LAW SOUGHT TO SAFEGUARD AMERICAN WORKMEN

We respectfully request that you use your official and personal influence in the promulgation and passage of such a law.

UNION'S LETTER SENT TO SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN

A copy of this letter and inclosure has been forwarded simultaneously to the following honorable gentlemen: CHARLES S. DENEEN, OTIS F. GLENN, WILLIAM E. BORAH, HIRAM W. JOHNSON, SMITH W. BROOKHART, HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, GEORGE W. NORRIS, LYNN J. FRAZIER, ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, E. M. IRWIN, WILLIAM W. ARNOLD, RICHARD YATES, RUTH HANNA MCCORMICK, OSCAR DE PRIEST, MORTON D. HULL, ELLIOTT W. SPROUL, THOMAS A. DOYLE, ADOLPH J. SABATH, JAMES T. IGOE, M. A. MICHAELSON, CHARLES ADKINS, HENRY T. RAINEY, STANLEY H. KUNZ, FRED A. BRITTEN, WILLIAM E. HULL, HOMER W. HALL, WILLIAM P. HOLADAY, FRANK M. RAMEY, THOMAS S. WILLIAMS, CARL R. CHINDBLOM, JOHN T. BUCKBEE, WILLIAM R. JOHNSON, JOHN C. ALLEN, and EDWARD E. DENISON.

Very truly yours,

CHICAGO WATCH AND CLOCKMAKERS' UNION,
F. R. SCHROEDER, *President*.

SK:ET
LEO MORGAN, *Secretary*.
(Keystone, January, 1930.)

PROTEST IMPORTATION OF SWISS WATCHMAKERS

When the Swiss consul in New York recently advised his home office in Geneva, Switzerland, that 18 watchmakers, brought to this country from Switzerland by the Bulova Watch Co., had asked him for assistance when their wages were reduced below the figure said to have been agreed upon in Switzerland, attention was drawn to a subject that may have far-reaching effects. Investigation disclosed that the Bulova Watch Co. had obtained permission from the United States Department of Labor to bring 25 Swiss watchmakers to this country to assist with the assembling of knock-down movements. In obtaining a waiver of the labor-contract clause, the Bulova Watch Co. set forth that the Swiss were needed to do work for which Americans had not been trained and that they would form the nucleus of a new industry.

SWISS LAWS VIOLATED BY EMIGRATION OF CONTRACT LABOR

Swiss watch interests objected to the exodus of the watchmakers from Switzerland, two reasons being set forth: First, the press of that country pointed out that the emigration laws of Switzerland prohibit any subject of that country going to any other country for the purpose of doing any kind of work under a contract previously arranged in Switzerland. Second, horological publications stated that the taking of skilled watchmakers out of Switzerland tended toward decentralization of that nation's watch industry.

SWISS PROTEST EMIGRATION OF WATCHMAKERS

The Swiss press generally, and the horological publications in particular, devoted much space to the matter and, as a result, the Swiss consul in New York has been advised that no more watchmakers will be allowed to leave under contract to do work in the United States.

AMERICAN UNION LABOR AROUSED—UNITED STATES WORKMEN UNEMPLOYED

The situation also aroused various elements of the watch industry in this country. Organizations of watchmakers have

become interested in the question, especially with regard to the claim that American workmen are not equipped to do the work for which Swiss watchmakers are being used by the Bulova Watch Co. Both the Watchmakers' Union in New York City and the Watchmakers' Society have had watchmakers apply for work during the last several months, and these workmen, it is claimed, are qualified to assemble knockdown movements. In fact, members of these organizations say that, with very little practice, the American workmen can assemble as many or more pieces than the average Swiss. In order to prevent further injustice to American watchmakers, many of whom have been out of work in recent months, the authorities have been asked to exclude foreign watchmakers, regardless of what representation may be made to bring them here.

LAW EVADED BY IMPORTING KNOCKDOWN WATCH MOVEMENTS

Under the tariff act the importation of knockdown movements is legal. They are admitted at 45 per cent ad valorem, and it is common report in the industry that this method of bringing watches into the United States saves the importer about half of the regular duty, which is $2 on a 15-jewel movement. The saving is said to depend upon the value placed on the parts in the consular invoice. It is also said that, in some cases, the value is as low as 60 cents for all of the parts that comprise a movement with 15 jewels.

BULOVA'S FOREIGN WORKMEN COMPETE WITH AMERICAN LABOR

In the United States much of the interest that attaches to the importation of Swiss watchmakers to assemble movements is found in labor circles, where watchmakers have found it increasingly difficult in recent months to get employment. The watchmakers say that, to make the situation still worse, some of the men imported by the Bulova Watch Co. have left its employ and are competing in the open market for jobs that should go to Americans.

BULOVA ISSUES DEFENSE IN SWITZERLAND

In Switzerland the interest became so intense that the Bulova Watch Co. recently issued a statement which was printed in a number of Swiss newspapers and also in La Federation Horologers. In its issue of November 27 the latter publication quoted extensively from the Bulova bulletin. A part of the statement attributed to Mr. Bulova follows:

IMPORTED WORKMEN SECURE NONQUOTA VISAS

None of the men who have departed for the United States is an emigrant or counts on the list of the American quota. The American consulate in Berne has given them only a visitor's visa for a year, and they have to return to Switzerland after that period. Therefore it can not be said that this is a question of emigration.

SIXTY SWISS WORKMEN EMPLOYED BY BULOVA IN NEW YORK

In our repair department in New York we employ 100 watchmakers, 60 of whom are Swiss. The foreman is also a Swiss, Oscar Buerki, of Bienne, who has been foreman of this department for the past 10 years. Last spring when Mr. Buerki was visiting in Switzerland he said we needed a number of watch repairers. I told him that it was impossible to get watchmakers into the United States because the Swiss immigration quota was complete for two years but that we could perhaps obtain permission for these men to enter on visitors' passports, good for one year, to take care of the ever-growing quantity of repairs.

SWISS WORKMEN COMPLAIN OF TREATMENT

I have learned from articles which have been published in Swiss newspapers, that certain of these men complained that they have not been well treated, which is not correct.

BULOVA COMPLAINS OF SWISS ATTITUDE

This propaganda is very discouraging. I, myself, as well as the whole Bulova organization, which I represent, find that we are not treated loyally by the Swiss. We are fed up and find there is nothing else for us to do except to close our factories until these various questions are adjusted.

SWISS PUBLICATION ANSWERS BULOVA

In its comment on the Bulova statement, La Federation Horologere states, in part:

IMPORTED SWISS WORKMEN ASSEMBLE WATCHES—NO REPAIR WORK DONE

The watchmakers sent by Bulova assemble movements in chablons, retouch the regulation, case them, and do finishing. Therefore, this is not a question of repairs.

BULOVA SAYS IMPORTED WORKMEN INCAPABLE

Further, it (the Bulova Co.) adds that not enough care was taken to find good watchmakers and good characters, and that Mr. Buerki has advised from New York that a large number of the watchmakers are not as capable as they claimed, and although they are paid $50 a week, they are lazy and do not want to work.

La Federation Horologere printed the following, which it said was information received from its correspondence in New York:

WAGE SCALE OF IMPORTED WATCHMAKERS REDUCED TO $35 BY BULOVA

The watchmakers have been engaged for one year at $50 a 48-hour week, second-class passage paid. The contracts are verbal only. Since their arrival there has been deducted from their pay $5 a week to repay the expenses of the trip. Bulova obtained visitors' visas for our compatriots, but had to give a guaranty of $500 for each one to assure his departure at the expiration of his permit to stay. Bulova had obtained beforehand from the Department of Labor permission to engage these workers abroad. On November 6 Mr. Buerki told the watchmakers that the first group would be put on piecework and that the other groups would follow in six weeks. The number of pieces to be made being very high, the wages were reduced to $35 a week. This was the principal cause of the dissatisfaction and led to demands for repatriation, if Bulova did not keep his promises.

EIGHTEEN WORKMEN APPEAL TO SWISS CONSUL FOR AID

The particulars stated in the foregoing paragraph correspond in substance with the statement made by the Swiss consul in New York to a Keystone representative at the time the 18 Bulova employees appealed to him for aid.

HOW TO TELL A SMUGGLED WATCH

When a watch may be considered smuggled:

First. When there is no record of it having been included in a legal shipment passed through the customhouse.

Second. When it is sold to the retail jeweler at less than cost of manufacture plus the tariff duty.

Third. When it is sold to the public at a price much lower than cost of production of similar watches plus the duty.

Fourth. When it can not be identified by markings usual in legal watch importations.

THREE CLASSES OF IMPORTED WATCHES

Foreign watches that are sold in the United States may be divided into three classes:

First. Watches on which proper duty has been paid and brought in by honest importers.

Second. Watches which have evaded payment of proper duties by fraud or evasion and brought in by unscrupulous importers.

Third. Watches paying no duties and which are smuggled in by criminals.

How is the watch-buying public to know whether the watch offered for sale is—

A watch smuggled in by a criminal,

A watch brought in by fraud and evasion by an unscrupulous importer, or

A watch brought in by an honest importer?

THREE TESTS OF AN HONEST WATCH

The safeguards are as follows:

First. The honesty and integrity of the importer and the record of the watch offered as a part of a legal shipment passing through the customhouse.

Second. The honesty and integrity of the local retail jeweler; if the price he pays for the watch is not too low for the worth of the article, and if the price to be charged the purchaser does not permit an unconscionable profit.

Third. If the price is too low for the article if it were what it is offered as being, or the importation of the article can not be traced, then beware; the article may be smuggled.

GOVERNMENT LOSES MILLIONS BY ACTS OF UNSCRUPULOUS WATCH IMPORTERS—RESOLUTION INTRODUCED FOR INVESTIGATION

By reason of the smuggling, undervaluation, and evasions in the importation of watches and clocks, millions of dollars are lost by the Government yearly in import duties; and by reason of the loss of business by the American watch manufacturers and their reduced financial position the Government has lost large sums of money in income taxes, the loss of this revenue by the Government directly affecting every man, women, and child in the United States and imposing additional tax burdens on the American people as a direct result of the alleged dishonest, illegal, and fraudulent conspiracy on the part of the watch-importers' ring; the United States Government has a direct and vital interest in this subject. So on the 30th of June this year I presented a resolution to the House of Representatives (H. Res. 282) to require the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Radio Commission, and the Attorney General to furnish the House of Representatives information relative to the illegal, fraudulent, false, and unfair acts and practices of the watch importers.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, a vote against the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill of 1930 was not a vote for free trade. It was a question whether or not you favored the new bill with its increased rates or whether you favored retaining the rates of the other Republican bill, the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922. It was merely a choice between two Republican bills. I favored the old one. The President of the United States never asked

anybody to vote for this latter bill nor made any statement favoring it during its passage. After the final conference report had been adopted by both Houses, he announced for the first time that he would sign it, his main reason being to end tariff uncertainty. This was the sole reason given by Senator REED, of Pennsylvania, when, voting for the bill, he said:

My strong inclination has been to vote against the bill, however paradoxical it might seem for a Republican protectionist from Pennsylvania to do such a thing. In recent hours, however, I have come to the conclusion that that would be wrong, not because of merit in the bill itself, although it does give some relief in some places, but because American industry is entitled to be relieved of the agitation that has been going on now for nearly two years; because American business has stood about all of us that it can stand; because it is almost better that tariff agitation be ended than that it be ended right. It used to be said of litigation that it was more important in the public interest that litigation should come to an end than that it should come to a just end, and I believe the same thing is true of tariff legislation.

However, the old adage is vivid in my memory that a thing is never settled until it is settled right.

It was a universally recognized fact that agriculture had not been benefited in the 1922 act equal to industry. Experience had proven it. Agriculture had not prospered generally in the past eight years, while it was the pride of the Coolidge administration that industry had seen unparalleled prosperity. Now, we met in special session in April of 1929 to aid agriculture in a tariff bill. We ascertained in the beginning of this debate that the manufacturers of this country were enjoying something over 97 per cent of the home market; that, as a practical proposition, they were enjoying the home market in its entirety, and therefore there was no justification, as it seemed to me, under any reasonable theory of protection, to increase industrial rates. Two weeks after we were here it was evident to me that our purpose was to be thwarted. I observed the geographical make-up of the Ways and Means majority, which prepared the tariff bill. There was only one man on it from the west Mississippi Valley. I saw the very determined effort for everybody to "get his while the gettin' was good." Instead of a scientific tariff, it resolved itself into a log-rolling proposition, and in the end it took five Democrats in the Senate, who got "their backs scratched," to put the bill over. We would not have had this tariff bill if it had not been for those five Democrats.

In the first district of Kansas the three most important things we produce that are money crops are corn, hogs, and wheat. Of course, we feed cattle, but these cattle we bring in. But the corn and hogs and wheat we raise. We feed the corn to the hogs, and we sell the wheat and the hogs, and these are both exportable surpluses. Without the debenture in it the tariff does no good for these products. The protection we have on beef in this country is largely due to the quarantine against Argentine cattle, and the importation of meat into this country is infinitesimally small at this time. So how much is a tariff raise to 6 cents from 3 cents going to help us? It is the quarantine that saved our hides. In speaking of hides, we got a 10 per cent duty. But we had to take compensatory duties on shoes and leather that are three times greater than the actual protection on hides. This is an example of our ability to swap with the Yankees. On the other hand, just take a glimpse of what they put on our backs—the increased cost of all kinds of clothing we buy, an increased cost for sugar that we universally use, and shoes, cement, brick, lumber, hoes, and forks, and 100 other things we buy. These are some of the reasons why I have opposed this tariff bill from the beginning. There is not a manufacturing institution in my district that has taken any interest in this tariff bill or asked me to vote for it. If there is a single industrial interest in northeast Kansas that would be benefited by this tariff bill, I can not discover it. There are some benefits in it for poultry, eggs, and dairy products—I will be fair enough to admit that. But these benefits do not outweigh the burdens of the bill. What possible compensation can the people of Topeka, Leavenworth, and Atchison find in this measure to offset the increased prices they are going to have to pay for most of the things they use?

There has been an honest question raised as to the proper representation of western Republicanism. In that tier of States in which Kansas is located, reaching from Canada to the Gulf, there were just 2 votes in the United States Senate for the bill. In the next tier running north and south, east of us, there were just 3 votes for the tariff bill, including the two Democrats from Louisiana. In the sum total of all these States between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountain States there were 9 Republican votes against it and 3 for it. I voted as the 9 voted, and I am claiming that it is a reasonable presumption that the 9 may be as fairly representative of western Republicanism as the 3. Senator PINE, of Oklahoma, running for reelection this year, voted against the bill. Mr. HOWELL, of Nebraska, formerly a national committeeman, opposed it.

The farmers would have been thankful for some of the agricultural duties in this bill. The farmers would have enjoyed the benefit of the protective tariff under this bill to some extent; but in this instance they have to pay for it to such an extent that their inequality rests where it was prior to the enactment of the law. More is taken from them than they can possibly receive. Is this keeping our pledge to restore equality? The greatest benefits in the bill for agriculture have gone to the fruit and nut growers of California and Florida, to the sugar growers of Louisiana and the sugar-beet communities, to the peanut industry of Virginia, and to the pea and bean and tomato canning communities.

Senator REED of Pennsylvania, to my mind the ablest Senator east of the Alleghenies, in explaining his opposition to the new flexible clause, expressed my sentiments exactly on that point. Here are his words:

I believe that the administrative provisions of the bill as it stands are not as good as those of the 1922 law. The flexible-tariff provision seems to me to be less elastic and less satisfactory than that of the existing law. I think I can foresee the same kind of controversy over the membership of the Tariff Commission organized under this new law that has risen to bother us so often over the membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is said that we take the tariff out of politics by these provisions. In my judgment, we are putting the tariff deeper into politics by these new flexible provisions than it has ever been before; and we will see it when appointments begin to come along for membership on the Tariff Commission. I think it is a mark of great weakness in the administrative provisions to have repealed the present section 510 of the 1922 law, which permits us to put an embargo on the products of any foreign manufacturer who refuses to give information to our Treasury agents abroad as to his sales prices. I believe the repeal of that section is equivalent to a recall of the Treasury agents that we now have abroad in competing countries; and I regret it very much. I need not go into details about other administrative sections. It is enough to say that on the whole I think the 1922 law is better. As a protectionist, as one who believes in the wisdom of the Republican platform adopted at Kansas City, it has been a most embarrassing choice to have to choose, not between free trade and a protective bill—that would have been easy—but between two protective tariff bills; that of 1922, under which we have waxed very prosperous, and this new one, written under the disadvantages under which it has been written.

On the hope that the bad things in this tariff bill are going to be corrected by the flexible clause and without the debenture permit me to quote here a passage from Senator BORAH's last speech before the bill's passage, which expresses my view in better language than I can formulate:

It is said that this bill, with its iniquities—if I may use that term—with its mistakes and its errors, will all be corrected under the flexible provision of the tariff. Language is inadequate to express my surprise at that contention. We have had a flexible tariff from 1922 to 1930. In what respect, in what instance, did the Tariff Commission, through the President, change the relationship of agriculture and industry in those eight years? In what respect, to what extent, did it restore equality? At the end of eight years the inequality was greater than in the beginning. Heaven pity the farmer if his only relief is to come in that way.

After we had had it upon the statute books for six years, and after it had been in operation and they had been dealing with both agricultural products and industrial products, the inequality was so pronounced and getting worse that both parties made pledges to remedy it. More rates were increased upon industrial schedules than upon effective agricultural schedules; and they dealt with how many during that time? There are 21,000 items in this bill, and about 10,000 that ought to be overhauled, undoubtedly. How long will it take the Tariff Commission, operating as speedily as it did from 1922 to 1930, to finish the job? Nearly 100 years.

What will happen is that the relationship, the relative position of agriculture and of industry, will remain precisely the same under the Tariff Commission's activities. Doubtless they will make some changes; but unless they have the power to invoke the principle of the debenture they never can establish equality between the two industries. There is no means by which it can be done by mere rate making. As I have said before upon this floor, those who organized and created the protective system understood that perfectly; and it is just as true to-day as it was at the time it was first promulgated.

I ask, Senators, in conclusion, how are we going to fulfill the pledge which we made at Kansas City, and restore equality between agriculture and industry without the application of the debenture system? If we increase the rate of agriculture and correspondingly increase the rate of industry, we get nowhere. It makes the farmer the burden bearer of the whole protective system.

Therefore, Mr. President, the great disappointment in regard to this bill is, first, that we increase these industrial rates; and, secondly, that we refuse to write into the bill the only fundamental principle by which we can restore equality between agriculture and industry. That is no ordinary problem. There is not a country in the world to-day of which I have any knowledge where agriculture is not struggling for existence—not struggling for prosperity but struggling for existence—and it is by reason of the fact that they are applying the world over a system which is effective as to industry and which is not effective as to agriculture. The fight must go on. A system must be adopted which will wipe out this injustice. I can not vote for a bill which perpetuates and legalizes this inequality. I can not vote for a bill which does injustice to a large portion of our people by placing them at a confessed disadvantage with others in our economic system.

William Allen White, a member of President Hoover's Haitian commission, has this to say on the subject:

It is no loyalty to President Hoover to vote for this bill, and the Congressman who votes for the bill as it seems now to be shaping up will be disloyal to his constituency, unless they be constituents in some small special industry, who have access to the cream jug of special privileges, which is drained from the American people in this bill. Particularly, a Kansas Congressman or Senator will be justified in voting "no" on this bill.

Arthur J. Carruth, managing editor of the Topeka State Journal, gives expression on June 21 to the following convictions:

Under the provisions of the new tariff bill it will cost $1,000 more to build a $5,000 house; a $30 suit of clothes will cost $35; for men and women the present $500 clothing bill will be $600; the $70 monthly grocery bill will be $75; the household furnishings that cost $1,000 will bring $1,200.

What does it mean? It means an increase of 20 per cent in the cost of living.

We hate to spoil your vacation for you, but this tariff bill went into effect at midnight Tuesday.

In other words, it's another blow for the salaried man and the fellow who has no means of boosting the figures on what he has to sell. The salaried man and the worker has only his time and his life's blood for sale. The other fellows shorten that whenever a move for big business is made. Some of these days the boys and girls of the worker class are going to get together. A great leader will light the torch and they will follow. Their first move will be a buyers' strike. And that one move will tumble down a good many castles of greed built up in this country to-day.

Bolshevism? Communism? Parlor uprising? Call it anything you want! We think we are pretty well acquainted with the solid, hard-working, honest, conscientious people, who are the backbone of this country. They are of the good old American stock—patient, long suffering, resigning, and timid. But they have a huge reservoir for the storage of suffering; and when that dam breaks—watch out! In the last few years they have asserted themselves to the extent of buying a certain amount of luxuries. They have matched their flivvers against the high-hattin' Lincolns; they have built their radio sets to share the air with the massive consoles; they have seen the world on the picture screen and have heard it over the air. They have tasted luxury—a taste to which they were justly entitled.

And now comes the protection of big business and the wave of unemployment and the increase in the cost of the necessities of life and the affliction of mounting taxation. This is a pretty steady old ship of State in which the pay passengers of America are riding, but if the pilots don't watch out the boat will begin to rock. And when she starts rocking, nothing will prevent the folks down in the steerage kicking the idle from the cabins above. The common folks are not to give up their radios and their flivvers and their picture shows and their silk hose as long as the other fellow makes no move to share in the sacrifice.

I have just quoted four able Americans—two among the ablest of the United States Senate and two prominent civilians of Kansas—two progressives and two conservatives, but all Republicans. I am thankful that there is room in the Republican Party for men who differ. Every Republican Member of the Kansas delegation in the House and in the Senate this year sometime has not been in accord with the administration. We have not read each other out of the party by our mere difference of opinion. We give each other credit with being conscientious and supporting the thing he thinks is for the best interest of his country and his party. My party was born in a great conflict for equal rights; we are still battling for equal rights. I do not want people to say that my party is the one of special interest; that it is the party of the rich and not the poor. I want my party to be the party of the underdog. I want it to be popular with the humblest citizen. It is possible that I have erred in my judgment of the tariff bill and what I thought was for the best interests of the country. If I have, then I was in error before being sent here. I am merely trying to hold fast to the same ideals many times expressed by me at home. At least I have voted in Washington as I talked in Kansas.

No tariff bill, good or bad, is the sole determining factor in the perpetuity of our Nation. There are falling world prices; there are many important questions left before our Nation which are immediately before us. Our President has my most sincere confidence that he will handle them as ably as any other living American—that there will be dawning before us in the near future a brighter day.

PRINTING THE TARIFF BILL AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 and consider it at this time.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 31

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, as enrolled and presented to the President of the United States for approval, be printed as a Senate document with an index, and that 9,000 additional copies be printed, of which 2,000 shall be for the Senate document room, 5,000 for the House document room, 1,000 for the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and 1,000 for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, I want to call attention to the fact that the Senate resolution call for an additional 9,000 copies. The Senate resolution carries with it 2,000 copies for the Senate document room. The Senate will get 4,500 copies, whereas the House will only get 6,000 copies. That is not in just proportion to the membership of the respective bodies. It is not a fair resolution. I shall not object to it, because it is probably the best that we can get, but I call the attention of the membership to the fact that the Senate gets 4,500 copies of this document whereas the House of Representatives as an entirety gets only 6,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. This will give us some immediate copies, and we can provide for our own needs by a subsequent resolution.

Mr. GARNER. But it will have to be a concurrent resolution, because the cost of the document will be so great that a simple House resolution would not authorize us to print it, and it might be the Senate would be just as unfair again and cheat us in the distribution.

Mr. HAWLEY. But we will hold the cards the next time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

MEXICAN IMMIGRATION

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the subject of immigration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the Harris bill, S. 51, which puts Mexican immigration on the quota basis, and I hope the bill will be passed before adjournment.

At this time, when hundreds of thousands of native-born Americans can not get work, it is tragically wrong to permit aliens of a different race and lower standard of living to glut our labor markets. But the essence of the Mexican immigration question is that the Mexicans are largely of a different race. They are either Indian or mixed Indian and white, and their presence in this country has already created a serious new race problem.

The only real argument against Mexican restriction is that it will disturb our harmonious relations with Mexico. I can see no reason why, if restriction is put on the true basis, protection to our labor and prevention of a new race problem, Mexico should feel offended at a policy which has been applied to every country of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia. Moreover, I believe that Mexican sensibilities will be far more injured by the racial discrimination and segregation and bitter feelings which have already arisen and will increase if the number of Mexicans increases, than they will be by a fair and reasonable quota policy. There is a mass of evidence that the Mexicans are so different from us that they will not harmoniously combine with us. An illustration is the fact that in 1920 only 8,869, or 4.6 per cent, of the Mexican-born population of 189,974 was naturalized or had secured first papers.

Congress, exclusively charged with the great responsibility of protecting the country from the menace of infiltration by alien

people whose numbers, economic standards, social and racial qualities threaten serious injury to the country, should meet that responsibility with American welfare as a paramount consideration. The Republic of Mexico has been sending us through the immigration stations Mexican immigration in the following numbers:

Fiscal year—	
1920	51,042
1921	29,603
1922	18,246
1923	62,709
1924	87,648
1925	32,378
1926	42,638
1927	66,766
1928	57,765
1929	38,980
Total legal entries in 10 years	487,875

The immigration act of 1924 went into effect at the end of the fiscal year 1924, so that the Mexican immigration during the last five fiscal years, averaging more than 48,000 per year, has been admitted under the act of 1924 now in force.

Current reports and testimony indicate that Mexican immigration during the recent months has been greatly reduced that, according to the estimate, it will probably amount to about 12,000 immigrants for the fiscal year 1930, which is itself several times the number which could be admitted under the proposed law computing both quota and nonquota immigrants. However, there would be no limit in addition to those limitations under existing law with reference to the arrival of nonquota immigrants from Mexico.

The foregoing statements are sufficient to show how important it is that this bill be passed. If it is not considered at this session it will be the fault of the Republican leaders of the House in not letting it be voted on.

RIVER PROTECTION AT CORNING, MO.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of inland waterways, and to include therein a letter from the Chief of Engineers and also a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, on May 27 I submitted to the Members of this Congress a petition signed by more than 1,000 citizens of northwest Missouri requesting that early action be taken by the Federal Government along the line of placing river-protection works at Corning, Mo., so as to confine the river to the present channel and prevent further destruction of valuable property.

This petition was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for consideration. Following is a letter I have just received from Mr. WALLACE DEMPSEY, chairman of that committee:

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 13, 1930.

Hon. DAVID HOPKINS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: The petition which you presented to the House in behalf of the people along the Missouri River at and near Corning, Mo., was referred to this committee.

The law providing for the improvement of the Missouri River from Kansas City to Sioux City was passed during the Sixty-ninth Congress and approved by the President January 21, 1927. This provided for the total project at a minimum depth of 6 feet, the entire cost of which is estimated to be between forty-five and fifty million dollars. When the bill reached the Senate it was amended so as to limit the amount that could be spent to $12,000,000, or about one-fourth of the total cost. Naturally, it has been impossible for the engineers to undertake more than one-fourth of the work when but one-fourth of the total cost has been authorized.

Recognizing this unfortunate situation, and the necessity for an increased authorization, you, along with the other Representatives of the Missouri Valley, appeared before the Rivers and Harbors Committee during this Congress and urged an amendment to the present law.

On April 21, 1930, the Rivers and Harbors Committee presented to the House H. R. 11781, in which it was provided that "The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to expend * * * within a period of three years after passage of this act, an amount not exceeding $15,000,000." This bill passed the House May 22 and is now pending before the Senate.

I see no possible way of getting special work done at Corning, Mo., under the regular law. Like many other points on the Missouri River and elsewhere, it must await the orderly development of a systematic and continuous improvement of the river. The only other method of relief under existing law would be by special act, whereby Corning would pay two-thirds of the cost, and the Government one-third. I might say that this policy has been tried at Niobrara, Nebr., and at Yankton, S. Dak.

Cordially yours,

S. WALLACE DEMPSEY,
Chairman.

I have had this matter up with the War Department continuously since June, 1929. At my request the late Hon. James Good, then Secretary of War, had the chief engineer of the western division make a thorough inspection of the situation, and the present Secretary of War, Hon. Patrick Hurley, has authorized a continuous inspection and observation of the cutting taking place there. Following is a letter in which the War Department outlines its policies:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, June 10, 1930.

Hon. DAVID HOPKINS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOPKINS: Recalling your recent conference with me relative to the prosecution of work on the Missouri River, I wish to inform you definitely of certain phases of that work.

I am fully informed of the interest of the citizens of the valley in the progress of the work, as well as of your own, and of the energetic and vigorous action on your part to further the work in all possible ways consistent with the circumstances that no one can modify or control.

It pleases me very much to know that you are fully informed of the difficulties of the work and of all the other pertinent phases of its condition.

I wish to assure you of my keen interest in the whole matter and that I will give it all personal attention possible. I have already placed in charge of the work the best personnel that we have, and will see that it is kept at the same high standard. That is the most important action that is in my power to take.

I would inform you again, as heretofore, that it is my intention to carry on the work on the Missouri River on as large a scale as the funds available will permit, and to do the work vigorously and consecutively so as to guard to the utmost of economy the money that Congress has and may appropriate.

You know, I believe that we can not jump around haphazard on the river in obedience only to local demands, however insistent they may be. The giving way in any instance of this sort in favor of one community would not be in justice to others, and would wreck any well-laid scheme of progress. However, I would assure you that at no time will I or those under me ever fail to give careful and considerate attention to the situation at any locality, with a view of doing work that extreme emergency requires.

Finally, I would point out one consideration that has preponderating weight, and that is that primarily the interests of commerce, as embodied in navigation, are the guiding motive of the law which requires us to work on the Missouri River, and all other considerations must be subordinated to that consideration in the general case.

Sincerely yours,

LYTLE BROWN,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Last Thursday I addressed this House on the importance of passing the rivers and harbors bill providing an additional authorization of $15,000,000 for the upper Missouri River. At that time I pointed out that within one year after the completion of the Missouri River project the entire cost would be saved the people who live in this section. This is the most important river project before Congress.

I again urge the membership of the House to aid us to secure speedy passage of this bill, as this seems to be the surest and quickest way to get protection work done at points such as Corning, Mo.

GEN. JOHN CAMPBELL GREENWAY

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 and consider it at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 29

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations and bound 5,000 copies of the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings held at the unveiling in Statuary Hall, upon the acceptance of the statue of Gen. John Campbell Greenway, presented by the State of Arizona, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,500 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 copies shall be for

the use and distribution of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Arizona.

The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer and shall procure suitable illustrations to be published with these proceedings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BLAND, for to-day, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 43. An act for the relief of W. W. Payne; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 155. An act for the relief of Jesse J. Britton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 181. An act for the relief of James H. Roache; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 325. An act for the relief of former Lieut. Col. Timothy J. Powers; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 594. An act for the relief of Lemuel Simpson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 676. An act for the relief of James Evans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1640. An act for the relief of John E. Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2068. An act for the relief of Lester L. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2134. An act to provide for the investigation of certain claims against the Choctaw Indians enrolled as Mississippi Choctaws; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2471. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant a patent to certain lands to Minerva E. Troy; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3416. An act repealing various provisions of the act of June 15, 1917, entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes" (40 Stat. L. 217); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3557. An act to provide for the acquisition of certain timberlands and the sale thereof to the State of Oregon for recreational and scenic purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3839. An act for the relief of Fred N. Dunham; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4164. An act authorizing the repayment of rents and royalties in excess of requirements made under leases executed in accordance with the general leasing act of February 25, 1920; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4308. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4612. An act for the relief of the Corporation C. P. Jensen; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4636. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to resell the undisposed of portion of Camp Taylor, Ky., approximately 328 acres, and to also authorize the appraisal of property disposed of under authority contained in the acts of Congress approved July 9, 1918, and July 11, 1919, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2667. An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other porposes;

H. R. 11679. An act to provide for acquiring and disposition of certain properties for use or formerly used by the Lighthouse Service; and

H. R. 12348. An act to provide for the partial payment of the expenses of foreign delegates to the Eleventh Annual Convention of the Federation Interalliee Des Anciens Combattants, to be held in the District of Columbia in September, 1930.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, June 16, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MICHENER: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 254. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 11204, a bill to regulate the entry of persons into the United States, to establish a border patrol in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1900). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Elections No. 2. A report on the contested-election case of John Philip Hill *v.* Vincent L. Palmisano, third Maryland district, recommending that Palmisano is not entitled to a seat in the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1901). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 12487. A bill to amend the naturalization laws in respect of residence requirements, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1903). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 10211. A bill to provide for a more equitable distribution of earnings of Federal reserve banks; without amendment (Rept No. 1909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 12740. A bill relating to clerical assistance to clerks of State courts exercising naturalization jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEHLBACH: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. J. Res. 190. A joint resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to accept the bid of the Mississippi Shipping Co. to carry mail between United States gulf ports and the east coast of South America; without amendment (Rept. No. 1911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3614. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois; without amendment (Rept. No. 1921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4501. A bill to authorize funds for the construction of a building at Fort Sam Houston; without amendment (Rept. No. 1922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12602. A bill to authorize an appropriation for construction at Carlisle Barracks, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAPES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12643. A bill creating the Port Huron-Sarnia International Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1924). Referred to the House Calendar.

By Mr. COLTON: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 12811. A bill to amend sections 17 and 27 of the general leasing act of February 25, 1920, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. 1925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 3156. An act providing for the final enrollment of the Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation in the State of Oregon; with amendment (Rept. No. 1926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12661. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands in Alameda and Marin Counties, Calif., and the construction of buildings and utilities thereon for military purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RANSLEY: Committee on Military Affairs: H. R. 4858. A bill for the relief of Margaret Thonrkin; with amendment

(Rept. No. 1904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7525. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth J. Edwards; with amendment (Rept. No. 1905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8858. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Moncravie; without amendment (Rept. No. 1906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9816. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Gibbons; with amendment (Rept. No. 1907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GARRETT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9866. A bill for the relief of Walter G. Harrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8998. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis H. Debayle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOXEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11464. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Holder; with amendment (Rept. No. 1913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11839. A bill for the relief of Robert Pease; with amendment (Rept. No. 1914) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12184. A bill for the relief of C. B. Bellows; without amendment (Rept. No. 1915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12239. A bill for the relief of Lela B. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 1916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12679. A bill for the relief of Kenneth G. Gould, with amendment (Rept. No. 1917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 1042. An act for the relief of Mary Altieri; without amendment (Rept. No. 1918). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 1251. An act for the relief of the Ayer & Lord Tie Co. (Inc.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 4070. An act for the relief of Patrick J. Mulkaren; with amendment (Rept. No. 1920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12885) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Folsom, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 12964) to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12965) to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: A bill (H. R. 12966) authorizing H. C. Brenner Realty & Finance Corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Cherokee and Osage Streets, St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 12967) granting certain land to the city of Dunkirk, Chautauqua County, N. Y., for street purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 12968) authorizing an appropriation for the construction of officers' quarters at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 12969) to repeal the agricultural marketing act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEERS: Resolution (H. Res. 255) providing for the printing of the proceedings of the Tenth National Convention of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KIESS: Resolution (H. Res. 256) providing for the printing of the proceedings of the Thirty-first National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 367) to amend the act entitled "An act to create in the Treasury Department a Bureau of Narcotics, and for other purposes," approved June 14, 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EATON of New Jersey: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 368) to create a commission to cooperate with the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey in preparing plans for the construction of the Washington Crossing Memorial Bridge across the Delaware River; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 369) to create a commission to cooperate with the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey in preparing plans for the construction of the Washington Crossing Memorial Bridge across the Delaware River; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 12970) granting an increase of pension to Hannah L. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 12971) for the relief of Wilson G. Bingham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 12972) granting an increase of pension to Sophia C. Schaeffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 12973) for the relief of Myrtle M. Hitzing; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 12974) granting a pension to Margaret Gegel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINZER: A bill (H. R. 12975) granting an increase of pension to Susan Keperling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12976) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12977) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie A. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12978) granting an increase of pension to Catherine L. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 12979) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Harbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12980) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12981) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Meckley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 12982) granting a pension to Esther E. Stark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: A bill (H. R. 12983) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 12984) for the relief of J. B. Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 12985) for the relief of Charles W. Bethauser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 12986) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12987) granting an increase of pension to Isabelle C. Hundley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12988) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Armour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12989) granting an increase of pension to Almira B. Evans; 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:

7567. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of citizens of Hanford, Calif., urging passage of House bill 9986, the Hudson bill, for the regulation of the moving-picture industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7568. By Mr. BLACKBURN: Petition of Henry C. Barnes, commander of Man O' War Post of the American Legion, of Lexington, Ky., urging upon Congress the imperative necessity of enacting into law the Johnson-Rankin bill, to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924, before the adjournment of this session of Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7569. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of Crawford Business Men's League of Chicago, protesting against chain stores; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7570. Also, petition of Siskiyou County (Calif.) Bar Association, indorsing the Curry bill, proposing to create a new Federal judicial district in the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7571. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of Oklahoma State Division of the Izaak Walton League of America, in full support and urging passage of Senate bills 2350 and 2351, by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, and House bills 6320 and 6321, by Hon. JED JOHNSON; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7572. Also, petition of Oklahoma Multigraphing Co., Oklahoma City, Okla., in opposition to House bill 11096 and in support of House bill 10344; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7573. Also, petition of Hollywood Technical Directors Institute, Hollywood, Calif., opposing further showing of the film All Quiet on the Western Front; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7574. Also, petition of Dorchester (Mass.) American Legion Post, urging Congress to not adjourn until constructive disabled legislation for immediate relief actually becomes law; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

MONDAY, *June 16, 1930*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, in whose tender keeping are the hearts of Thy children and from whom all thoughts of truth and peace proceed, kindle, we pray Thee, in all men the true love of peace, and guide with Thy pure wisdom those who take counsel for the nations of the earth, especially all who bear rule in our beloved land.

Let humility triumph over pride and ambition, charity over envy, hatred, and malice, purity and temperance over lust and excess, meekness over passion, that we, with all the brethren of the Son of man, may draw together as one comity of peoples and evermore dwell in the fellowship of Him who is the Prince of Peace, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, June 9, 1930, when, on request of Mr. FESS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. William Tyler Page, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 420. An act for the relief of Charles E. Byron, alias Charles E. Marble;

S. 1447. An act for the relief of Pasquale Iannacone;

S. 1469. An act to quitclaim certain lands in Santa Fe County, N. Mex.;

S. 2371. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional justices of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia; and

S. 3939. An act to authorize the appointment of two additional justices of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print and bind the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings of the unveiling in Statuary Hall, of the statue of Gen. John Campbell Greenway, presented by the State of Arizona; and

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of House bill No. 2667, the tariff bill, as enrolled and presented to the President for approval.

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

S. 969. An act for the relief of Edna B. Erskine;

S. 3784. An act for the relief of John Marks, alias John Bell; and

S. 3866. An act for the relief of Joseph N. Marin.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4189) to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COLTON, Mr. SMITH of Idaho, and Mr. EVANS of Montana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12235) to provide for the creation of the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COLTON, Mr. SMITH of Idaho, and Mr. EVANS of Montana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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

H. R. 247. An act validating certain applications for, and entries of, public lands;

H. R. 456. An act for the relief of Hans Roehl;

H. R. 524. An act for the relief of the I. B. Krinsky Estate (Inc.) and the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland;

H. R. 531. An act for the relief of John Maika;

H. R. 574. An act for the relief of Moreau M. Casler;

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of John S. Conkright;

H. R. 1452. An act for the relief of Melissa Stone, widow of Francis Stone;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Gussin;

H. R. 1717. An act for the relief of F. G. Baum;

H. R. 1761. An act for the relief of John L. Friel;

H. R. 1882. An act for the relief of Harry Cinq-Mars;

H. R. 2120. An act for the relief of Malven A. Williams;

H. R. 2170. An act for the relief of Clyde Cornish;

H. R. 2173. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Nicholas;

H. R. 2464. An act for the relief of Paul A. Hodapp;

H. R. 2782. An act for the relief of Elizabeth B. Dayton;

H. R. 2831. An act for the relief of Jasper Johnson;

H. R. 2863. An act for the relief of Harvey O. Willis;

H. R. 3122. An act for the relief of William J. Frost;

H. R. 3231. An act for the relief of Walter P. Hagan;

H. R. 3238. An act for the relief of Martin E. Riley;

H. R. 3441. An act for the relief of Meta S. Wilkinson;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Fernando Montilla;

H. R. 3950. An act for the relief of David A. Dehart;

H. R. 4159. An act for the relief of Harry P. Lewis;

H. R. 4176. An act to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Dr. Charles W. Reed, a former employee of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 4269. An act for the relief of William L. Wiles;

H. R. 4564. An act for the relief of E. J. Kerlee;

H. R. 4595. An act for the relief of Maurice J. O'Leary;

H. R. 4731. An act for the relief of Frederick Rasmussen;

H. R. 4760. An act for the relief of Guy Braddock Scott;

H. R. 4907. An act for the relief of Thomas Wallace;

H. R. 4946. An act for the relief of Ned Anderson;

H. R. 5292. An act to authorize the city of Napa, Calif., to purchase certain public lands for the protection of its water supply;

H. R. 5810. An act to pay the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. the sum of $1,900.80, money paid as duty on merchandise imported under section 308 (5) of the tariff act;

H. R. 5872. An act for the relief of Ray Wilson;

H. R. 6243. An act for the relief of A. E. Bickley;

H. R. 6264. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to donate a bronze cannon to the town of Avon, Mass.;

H. R. 6268. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Parker;

H. R. 6416. An act for the relief of Myrtle M. Hitzing;

H. R. 6453. An act for the relief of Peder Anderson;

H. R. 6627. An act for the relief of A. C. Elmore;

H. R. 6665. An act for the relief of B. C. Glover;

H. R. 6825. An act to extend the measure of relief provided in the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Robert W. Vail;

H. R. 7013. An act for the relief of Howard Perry;

H. R. 7068. An act for the relief of Fred Schwarz, jr.;

H. R. 7664. An act to authorize payment of fees to M. L. Flow, United States commissioner, of Monroe, N. C., for services rendered after his commission expired and before a new commission was issued for reappointment;

H. R. 8117. An act for the relief of Robert Hofman;

H. R. 8127. An act for the relief of J. W. Nelson;

H. R. 8347. An act for the relief of the Palmer Fish Co.;

H. R. 8440. An act for the relief of Henry A. Levake, deceased;