

Also, a bill (H. R. 10728) for the relief of the heirs of William Bailey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10729) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Polly Callahan, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10730) for the relief of the heirs of William M. Kimmons, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10731) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Susan L. Bailey, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10732) for the relief of the heirs of J. B. Fuller, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10733) for the relief of the heirs of Abraham Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10734) for the relief of the heirs of W. E. Tomlinson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10735) for the relief of the heirs of W. T. Eason, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10736) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Louisa Ragsdale—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10737) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. M. A. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10738) for the relief of the heirs of John Parham, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10739) for the relief of heirs of Joseph A. Brunson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10740) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Ingram, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10741) for the relief of heirs of John Hosten, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10742) for the relief of heirs of Durant Lane Tyer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10743) for the relief of heirs of Sidney Dean, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10744) for the relief of heirs of Robert W. Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10745) for the relief of the heirs of Charles T. Alexander and Jane B. Alexander, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10746) for the relief of the heirs of John Carruth, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10747) for the relief of the heirs of John C. McGehee, deceased, late of De Soto County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10748) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Scott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10749) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of A. M. Rayburn, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10750) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Charity Clements, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10751) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Baker, deceased, of Senatobia, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10752) for the relief of the heirs of John D. Martin, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10753) for the relief of Kate Oakes Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10754) granting an increase of pension to Phillip Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10755) granting an increase of pension to James G. Durham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. AUSTIN: Petition of Golden Rule Council, No. 131, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Tennessee, favoring an exclusion law against all Asiatics to the United States and possessions of the same—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Augustus Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONRY: Petition of Publishers' Association of America, favoring free pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles N. Prouty, favoring free hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Gem Company, of New York, favoring moderate duty on gems—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of American Newspaper Publishers' Association and Butterick Publishing Company, favoring free pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Darling & Co., of Long Island City, N. Y., for reduction of duty on glue—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Farm Life, of Chicago, Ill., favoring free lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hall & Ruckel, of New York, favoring reduction of duty on soda ash—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Lithographers of America, favoring duty on postal cards and lithographs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Silk Conditioning Works, favoring division of schedule on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Isaac Prouty & Co., of Spencer, Mass., for free hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Powers & Moyer, of New York, favoring duty on precious stones—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Standard Fashion Company, of New York, favoring free pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas & Thompson, of Baltimore, Md., favoring duty on sheep dips—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DODDS: Petition of citizens of Trupant, Mich., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of J. F. Steward, of the International Harvester Company, favoring section 41 of the original Payne bill, concerning patents issued to nonresidents—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Samuel P. Kinkert, John T. Broke, Miss Fay Milligan, Oscar M. Peck, and Thomas Braswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, against any parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Martha J. Hill and Michael Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Josephine McGuire—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Hatfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts, favoring reduction of tariff on wheat to not over 10 cents per bushel—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of citizens of West Virginia, asking increase of pensions of survivors of Mexican and civil wars to \$25 per month, and pensions of widows to \$20 per month; for payment of pensions monthly and through postal savings banks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, June 15, 1909.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.
Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of Fannie B. Stothard, widow of Thomas Stothard, *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 96);

In the cause of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Athens, Ala., *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 92);

In the cause of the trustees of the Endora Baptist Church, of White Station, Tenn., *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 97);

In the cause of William Halloran *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 95);

In the cause of Louis V. Metoyer, administrator of estate of Theophile Metoyer, deceased, *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 94);

In the cause of the vestry of St. Thomas's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Hancock, Md., *v. United States* (S. Doc. No. 90);

In the cause of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Chattanooga, Tenn., v. United States (S. Doc. No. 91); and
In the cause of Andrew J. Meade v. United States (S. Doc. No. 93).

The foregoing causes were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Helena Commercial Club, of Helena, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation giving power to the Interstate Commerce Commission to suspend the taking effect of proposed advances in existing rates, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Helena Commercial Club, of Helena, Mont., praying that an appropriation be made to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to make valuations of all railroad property in the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SCOTT presented memorials of sundry citizens of West Virginia and Ohio, remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on feldspar, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Warren M. Crosby Company, of Topeka, Kans., remonstrating against any increase of the duty on gloves above those provided for in the pending tariff bill, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the removal of the duty on hides, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of the city council of Cleveland, Ohio, praying that crude asphalt be placed on the free list, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the National Refining Company, a corporation in the State of Ohio, praying that an ad valorem tax of not less than 50 per cent be placed upon all crude oil and products imported into the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented a memorial of members of the Evening Mail chapel, stereotype department, of New York City, N. Y., and a memorial of members of the New York World chapel, electrotype department, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the inclusion in the new tariff bill of any duty on news print paper or wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rochester, Melrose, Bath, Gorham, Mount Morris, Canandaigua, Middlesex, Rushville, Penn Yan, Elmira, Murray, Wolcott, Benton, Auburn, Alabama, Batavia, Seneca Falls, Buffalo, Pavilion, Dresden, Victor, Halls Corners, Holley, Troy, Urbana, Syracuse, Stanley, Phelps, Fleming, Hammondsport, Dansville, Geneva, Waterloo, Italy, Romulus, Oakfield, Akron, Medina, and Brockport, all in the State of New York, praying that a protective duty be placed on foreign-oil productions, which were ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 2616) granting an increase of pension to George A. Hamilton; and

A bill (S. 2617) granting an increase of pension to John Otto; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER:

A bill (S. 2618) granting a pension to John Ammerman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2619) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Thiemann (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2620) granting a pension to Joseph R. Allred (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. KEAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that 2,000 copies of Senate Document No. 225, Sixtieth Congress, first session, entitled "Development of the American Ocean Mail Service and American Commerce," together with a brief additional paper, be printed as a document for the use of the Senate document room. It is a document that is being constantly called for and is out of print.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SUGAR TRUST.

Mr. BORAH. I have an article, appearing in the New York Times of June 13, relative to the sugar trust's loan deal with the Pennsylvania Sugar Refining Company. I move that it be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 87, pt. 2).

The motion was agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed and the first bill on the calendar will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Chamberlain	Frye	Oliver
Bacon	Clapp	Gallinger	Overman
Beveridge	Clay	Guggenheim	Page
Borah	Crane	Hughes	Paynter
Brandegee	Crawford	Johnson, N. Dak.	Penrose
Briggs	Cullom	Johnson, Ala.	Perkins
Bristow	Cummins	Jones	Piles
Brown	Davis	Kean	Root
Bulkeley	Dick	La Follette	Scott
Burkett	Dillingham	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Dolliver	McCumber	Sutherland
Burrows	Fletcher	McLaurin	Tallaferro
Burton	Flint	Martin	Tillman
Carter	Foster	Nixon	Warner

Mr. PAYNTER. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. BRADLEY] was ill last night and is ill to-day. Hence he could not attend the session last night and he will not be able to be here to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] is detained by illness in his family.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President, I will detain the Senate but a very few moments this morning, to conclude the remarks which I had prepared and was not able to finish at the time of the adjournment of the Senate last night.

I was endeavoring to impress upon Senators the position of the tobacco industry, particularly in the Philippine Islands. My remarks, and my quotations from the report of the Philippine Commission, the Secretary of War, and the Collector of Internal Revenue I might supplement by very extended quotations from the governors of the various provinces in which the tobacco industry especially is carried on, but it would only be accumulating the evidence which I have striven to present to show that the tobacco of the Philippine Islands is to-day actually unfitted for the American market, in addition to the fact that the tobacco is not of that character which, up to the present time, at least, has acquired favor in this country.

I wish to read one or two quotations from the report of the collector of internal revenue of the Philippine Islands in regard to this industry. This is on page 226 of the Annual Report of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, Volume XIII, being the report of the Philippine Commission, part 4:

In the districts where tobacco cultivation has been carried on for years, no one should be contented with the results obtained, but should by constant experimentation with new seed and improved cultivation endeavor to improve the quality of the crop. Here in the Philippines it is commonly stated that the tobacco grown to-day is inferior to that formerly grown. This is greatly to be regretted, and it should be the especial effort of every planter to produce tobacco, not equal to that grown a few years ago, but far superior to the finest crops that were ever harvested. The tobacco markets of the world willingly pay, and pay well, too, for tobacco of a superior quality, whether it is to be used for cigars, cigarettes, or manufacturing purposes. The trade does not pay well for common tobacco, for anyone can grow coarse, common tobacco of low grade. The quality of the tobacco must be superior to that formerly grown to command a good price, for tobacco consumers are becoming more fastidious and constantly demand better goods for their money.

The author is of the opinion that the Philippine Islands can and should produce cigar-filler tobacco that is fully equal to the finest product of the famous Vuelta Abajo district of Cuba and a cigar wrapper equal to Sumatra tobacco. With careful attention to soil and climatic conditions, it is believed districts can be found that will raise tobacco similar in flavor and aroma to that grown in the best districts of Turkey. These results can only be obtained, however, by persistent, intelligent, well-directed efforts on the part of the planter.

Philippine tobacco to-day does not occupy the position it should, and every planter or company engaged in its cultivation should strive to place it on the high standard it deserves.

In his report, one of the provisional governors in the island of Cagayan writes as follows:

The principal source of wealth and revenues of the province is in tobacco, from which business nearly all of the pueblos derive profit, even where the plant is not cultivated, as, for example, the pueblos of Gattaran and Lal-loc, because they supply the packing and rattan needed for this article to others producing tobacco.

In another place:

Another contributory cause of the evil from which the tobacco business suffers is the internal-revenue tax—

Not the customs duty, but the internal-revenue tax—

that, excessively increasing the expense of production, makes it impossible for our tobacco to compete with that of other countries. Formerly the Spanish Government favored the introduction of Cuban and Philippine tobacco in Spain, and even went so far as to prohibit the planting of tobacco in the latter nation, but with the change of sovereignty we at once lost the protection extended to us by Spain.

In the island of Isabela, another province where tobacco is raised in large quantities, the governor reports:

Tobacco is the only crop that is raised for export, and this province raises more and a better tobacco than any other province in the island. Great fears are entertained by the people in regard to the internal-revenue law, but as its provisions are being explained and understood the objections are disappearing. There are no manufactories of any kind in this province, all the tobacco being shipped to Manila.

But I will not prolong the reading of these reports. They are all of a similar character, indicating that, in the mind of the most intelligent observers of the industries of those islands, it is the inferior quality of their products that is losing them the markets of the world, and that their own internal-revenue laws are interfering more with the production of tobacco on account of its excessive cost than are the customs duties laid by the United States.

As a matter of fact, the customs duties of the United States are all returned to the Philippine Islands for the purposes of their government, and to-day, with that condition, we have practically actual free trade, so far as the Government of the United States is concerned, with the Philippine Islands.

My own view of the matter, as I have studied the question, is that we had far better, for the benefit of the Filipinos and their future, put a prohibitory duty on all their products until they have raised their quality so that they will be fit to enter into competition with the markets of the United States and the products of our own industry. We should educate them with the idea that they can not come into competition with the world and its markets and its wage-earners until they produce a quality of goods, either tobacco or sugar or anything else, that warrants entering into that competition.

I believe to-day, Mr. President, that the Filipinos can probably receive no benefits from this proposed legislation, and that the only benefit which can accrue, if any accrue, will be to the large manufacturing tobacco industries and the five or six large tobacco companies and cigar manufacturers of the city of Manila, who to-day fix the price in the rural districts of all the commodities for which we are legislating. But let us educate them first not only in their schools, but in their agricultural industries, with the idea, as I have said before, that it is the quality of goods that they put upon the market which produces a market for the goods themselves, and that a poor quality of goods will never find a market in the United States of America.

The only benefits, to my mind, that can accrue to anyone from free trade in the principal products of the Philippines, especially in tobacco, are to the two or three large companies located in Manila who control very largely the dealings with the producers as well as the exportation of the manufactured products. The producers of tobacco are limited in number, and the tobacco-producing lands are located largely in the valleys of the islands I have heretofore named; their land holdings are small, generally about a single acre, and their product is traded for merchandise almost exclusively with Chinese dealers, fairly to be presumed in the interest of the Manila companies; it is possible, of course, that with the advent of free trade, even to a limited extent in the greater productions of the islands, that the great corporations of our own country may see another opportunity for the development of their varied interests.

On behalf of the tobacco industry of this country, and particularly of my own State, for which I speak here to-day, and

representing, I believe, the views of the growers of leaf and wrapper tobacco and manufacturers engaged in its use, I ask you to give due consideration to this section before permitting it to be enacted into law.

I ask to have inserted as a part of my remarks, without reading, sundry letters and petitions from individuals and trade unions, which I now send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EAST HARTFORD, CONN., April 21, 1909.

HON. MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Inclosed you will find a copy of resolutions recently passed by the directors of the New England Tobacco Growers' Association, which in themselves speak the sentiment of the New England tobacco growers, who number in this vicinity about 5,000, and producing, on a safe estimate, about 20,000 acres of a type of the best tobacco that can be grown.

This product is the moneyed crop grown in the Connecticut Valley in the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts, and our growers have expended large sums of money to develop the finest tobacco for cigar purposes, and to-day there are thousands of dollars invested in the industry, and we feel that if any of the Philippine tobacco should get free entry into this country that it would be a deathblow to the tobacco growers in New England.

We know well that the Philippines to-day are not developed, but that they have climatic and soil conditions favorable to produce a type of tobacco which would be equal to Sumatra goods, which now have a market of 85 per cent of the entire wrapper trade in this country.

We are of the opinion that if the present proposed tariff bill is passed capitalists will go into the islands to develop them, and with the cheap labor put our industry out of business, and then demand entire free trade, thus depriving the Government of any revenue whatever on wrapper tobacco, as this would naturally supersede the tobacco now coming into bond as grown in Sumatra.

We ask that you use your best influence to defend our industry and defeat the measure as proposed.

Yours, truly,

W. K. ACKLEY,

Secretary pro tempore New England Tobacco Growers' Association.

[FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 27, 1909.]

HARTFORD, CONN., April 20, 1909.

At a meeting of the directors of the New England Tobacco Growers' Association the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas the present tariff measure which is now before the United States Senate, known as the "Payne bill," is a menace to the tobacco-growing industry of the New England States on account of allowing a certain portion of the product of the Philippine Islands to enter this country free of duty, thereby compelling the tobacco growers of the United States to enter into competition with the cheap labor of the Filipino;

Whereas we believe that if the present tariff measure now before Congress becomes a law that part of the bill which relates to the free entry of the Philippine tobacco will be used as an entering wedge for a greater quantity to come into this country free of duty in the near future;

Whereas we, the directors of the New England Tobacco Growers' Association and the growers of Connecticut tobacco, strongly reiterate our former action on this subject and strenuously object to any measure in the proposed tariff bill which may become a hardship to the producers of leaf tobacco in this country;

Resolved, That Mr. Marcus L. Floyd and Joseph G. Mitchelson, of Tariffville, Conn., are hereby duly appointed as delegates to represent the New England Tobacco Growers' Association at Washington, D. C., and are requested to use every honorable means in their power to defeat this proposed legislation;

Resolved, That we fully concur in any action which they may take in our behalf; be it further

Resolved, That we, the directors of the New England Tobacco Growers' Association, appreciate the efforts which have been made by our Senators and Congressmen to protect our interests, and that it is the sense of this meeting that a copy of the above resolutions be forwarded to them.

The above is a true copy.

Attest:

W. K. ACKLEY,

Secretary pro tempore New England Tobacco Growers' Association.

NORTH BLOOMFIELD, CONN., April 8, 1909.

Senator MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I inclose copy of resolutions adopted by the Connecticut Valley Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade at a meeting held April 6 at Hartford.

Tobacco men in general, both farmers and dealers, feel that any tobacco admitted free into this country from the Philippine Islands, no matter how small a quantity, serves as an entering wedge to develop the industry in the islands, thus making one more competitor for the tobacco grower.

Connecticut tobacco now costs about 12 cents per pound in the bundle; and by the government report, from 1901 to 1906, inclusive, the average price of tobacco in the bundle was about 10 cents per pound; and if the crops of 1907 and 1908 were included in this average, it would have figured between 14 cents and 15 cents per pound in the bundle; so you will easily see that the farmer, even at the present protection, is not making an exorbitant profit.

Thanking you in advance for anything you may be able to do for us, we remain

Yours, very truly,

THE CONNECTICUT VALLEY
LEAF TOBACCO BOARD OF TRADE,
F. B. GRIFFIN, Secretary.

Resolutions.

Resolved, That we are opposed to that part of the Payne tariff bill that provides for the free entry into the United States of certain quantities of Philippine leaf tobacco and cigars, and we further protest against any change whatever in the present rate of duty on leaf tobacco as provided for in the Dingley bill.

Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of our Representatives and Senators, with the request that they use every honorable means to defeat that part of the Payne bill that provides for the free entry into this country of Philippine tobacco and cigars.

[FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 18, 1909.]

MIDDLETOWN, CONN., April 29, 1909.

HON. MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
Hartford, Conn.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned citizens of Middletown, Conn., being employed in the cigar industry, do vigorously protest against the free admittance of Philippine manufactured cigars in any quantity.

Since October, 1907, the cigar industry, owing to the general depression in business, has seriously suffered. We believe that if the cigar business received any additional impairment a good percentage of the cigar makers in this country would have to give up their trade, in which they served three long years' apprenticeship, and be forced to go into competition with the cheaper paid and less skilled laborers.

We protest against being pitted against oriental labor in our struggle for existence. We hold that no amount of legislation on the part of the Congress of the United States can or ever will lift the Filipinos to our standard.

We respectfully call your attention to the fact that while the Filipino lives in a country where clothing, shoes, and warm houses are unnecessary, we live in a climate which necessitates these protections for our bodies, and we have to pay American prices for them. Again, we can not live on 6 cents' worth of rice a day.

For these reasons we beg of you to use your voice and vote against the enactment of any bill providing for free trade in Philippine cigars.

Respectfully, yours,

Chas. Anderson, E. B. Convey, Charles Twenty, J. F. Richey, J. J. Convey, Chas. H. Smith, Charles P. Abbey, Stephen Spaw, Daniel Robert Convey, Bruno Daigle, Jas. Daly, Jas. W. Convey, William Fluhrer, L. L. May, John C. Graham, Frank E. Convey, Fredrick J. La Rouché, James A. Dunn, John E. Hill, Jack S. La Viallette, John J. Smithwick, Edmond Fitzgibbons, John T. Barry, Wm. O'Donnell, Humphrey O'Connor, John Cushing, John Anderson, Gus Boden.

NEW YORK, May 1, 1909.

HON. MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: In connection with E. J. Howard and A. J. Ensign, of East Hartford, I have been engaged for thirty years in packing and buying Connecticut tobacco.

The experience I have gained in all these years enables me to fully understand the difficulties the Connecticut grower is laboring under. Owing to a changing climate, Connecticut will only produce three wrapper crops during a period of ten years. The seven off years will produce only a binder crop, which, taking the seven years together, will hardly pay the cost of production. According to my calculation, the average receipts per acre during a cycle of ten years, yield about \$200 per acre. Against this result stands an outlay for fertilizers of \$80 to \$100, labor \$65, leaving a margin of \$35 to pay for interest on investment and taxes. This is exactly the position in which the Connecticut tobacco grower stands, and unless he has acreage enough to raise a variety of crops, which many tobacco farmers have not got, he simply works year in and year out for a bare living.

Why, then, endanger that existence still further by the free admission of 300,000,000 cigars, 3,000,000 pounds of filler, and 300,000 pounds of wrapper tobacco from the Philippines?

The cigars alone will reduce the domestic manufacture by just that many, and what is still worse, they may be covered with a Sumatra wrapper, for which the Philippine manufacturer pays 22 cents per pound duty, whilst American manufacturers have to pay \$1.85 per pound duty. There is absolutely no justice or equity in that proposition, and, after all, the only beneficiary in the matter would be the tobacco trust. They are ready to gobble up the whole free-entry material, dump it into this country, and sell through the hundreds of their stores to the consumer. As the illustrious Representative of the great State of Connecticut, the originator of the Monumental Bridge over the Connecticut River, I appeal to you to stand out for the best interest of the Connecticut tobacco grower when the Philippine clause of the new tariff comes up in the Senate.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Yours, very respectfully,

F. ANTHAUER,
214 Pearl Street, New York.

OLDS & WHIPPLE,
Hartford, Conn., March 31, 1909.

HON. MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your kind letter of March 22 duly received, also copy of the new tariff bill which you kindly mailed us. The tariff bill relating to tobacco is the one that interests us the most and the bill in which we are directly interested.

We have given this matter a great deal of careful thought, and we believe it to be for the best interests of all the tobacco-growing districts of the United States to have the tariff on tobacco remain as it is at the present time; and, also, this includes our relations with the Philippine Islands.

It hardly seems a fair proposition to the farmer in the United States who pays from \$1.50 to \$2 per day for ordinary farm labor to be compelled to sell his products on a par with the products of the Philippine Islands, produced where, we understand, the price paid for labor is from 8 cents to 12 cents per day.

We understand it is the wish of at least a portion of the Filipinos to have the tariff on tobacco remain the same as at present; that they do not wish any change made in the tariff with the United States. If this is true, and the farmers of the United States do not desire it, why should there be any change from the present tariff rate?

Personally we would prefer to have the tariff on all grades of tobacco and our relations with the Philippine Islands remain the same as at present. We think when the tariff legislation is settled that the tobacco business will resume its normal conditions in a shorter period if it is generally known that the tariff rates and conditions will all remain the same as in the past. If any changes are made, it will take a longer period, in our opinion, for the trade to adapt itself to those conditions, and we do not believe will result in the best good to all parties, both growers and dealers in leaf tobacco.

Yours, truly,

OLDS & WHIPPLE,
Per F. H. WHIPPLE.

THE KETCHIN & HAYES TOBACCO CORPORATION,
Tariffville, Conn., March 31, 1909.

Senator MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are pleased to have a chance to say our little mite regarding the bill presented by Mr. PAYNE, and particularly that portion touching free admission of Philippine tobacco to the United States we are very much opposed to.

We are very much opposed to admitting any tobacco from the Philippine Islands at less duty than from any other country.

We have spent a great deal of money in trying to grow a very superior tobacco in the Connecticut Valley, and we believe that which we have accomplished other States can accomplish. The great expense incurred by us in the line of tobacco experimentation should receive some reward. Until now we have received the moral support of the Government and, as our hopes are about to be fully realized, we find that support slipping from under our feet and we feel there is danger of again being dashed to earth on the tobacco question.

The situation from our point of view is this: Assuming that in a year or two the American Tobacco Company or some Dutch company will have every available spot on the Philippines covered with tobacco, and assuming that every pound of this tobacco will reach the United States free of duty, we shall then find a competitor who will bother us considerably if he does not absolutely put us out of business, and our reason for this assumption is the fine point of distinguishing between imported filler and wrapper tobaccos. The matter of determining the per cent of wrappers in a bale of fillers is indeed an art, and the relation is so close that it gives the inspector or customs-house officer an absolutely free hand. For vivid examples of this little game, we need look no further than Tampa, Fla.

Under conditions now existing in the Philippines we have no fear, but with cool labor backed by American capital and free admission of tobacco to the United States we should have cause to fear.

Thanking you for the opportunity of expressing our opinion, we are,
Most respectfully, yours,

KETCHIN & HAYES TOBACCO CORPORATION,
W. M. KETCHIN, Secretary and Treasurer.

SUFFIELD, CONN., March 30, 1909.

HON. M. G. BULKELEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Through your esteemed favor I received a copy of the proposed new tariff bill, which I looked over very carefully. As for my part I can not see where the Filipinos will derive any benefit from the limited importation of wrapper, filler, and cigars, as it would be possible for any large corporation to produce the entire importation, and you know a large corporation could deliver the goods at port ahead of the small individual producer. As for our part (the Connecticut Valley tobacco growers), the Government through the Department of Agriculture has expended many thousands of dollars in the last nine years in methods of growing and curing. A part of these experiments have been carried on under my personal supervision, having a contract with the department until 1910 without recompense. Just now we are beginning to reap the benefit of these experiments and it doesn't seem right to be forced into competition with cool labor when we are just commencing to creep. All we ask is to be left alone under the present Dingley rate.

Very respectfully, yours,

W. S. PINNEY.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
Hartford, April 5, 1909.

HON. MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In answer to your inquiry of March 22 ultimo as to my opinion regarding the tariff matter as affecting our Connecticut tobacco industry, I must say that I am most strenuously opposed to any reduction of the tariff on leaf tobacco or any measures or propositions that will have a tendency to destroy our main and almost only agricultural industry.

I believe that all Connecticut growers feel, as I do, the absolute necessity of maintaining our present condition in the leaf market, meager as it now is. We have been gradually forced by foreign competition to surrender more than 60 per cent of our home market to the product of slave labor, whose product in no way benefits the consumer or adds to the quality of the cigar. We are reduced to this absolute fact that the small farms in the Connecticut tobacco-growing districts can not exist if competition goes further or prices grow less. Our domestic competition, against which there can be nothing said or done, is all Connecticut can stand. The product known as "shade grown," produced under syndicate management or by companies or corporations aggregating large capital and their immense facilities for production of the popular and valuable Florida and Georgia leaf, are almost sufficient in themselves to destroy the Connecticut industry—and this is especially true of the smaller farmers—without the product of foreign sells.

Philippine tobacco coming to this country under a less handicap than at present can be placed in the same category as Sumatra. I do not consider it at all as experimental.

I believe that all growers in Connecticut are of this opinion; they all feel that, without the strongest protection, under the present peculiar circumstances, the small grower, at least, must abandon the growing of tobacco, though his farm may be inadequate for other branches of farming.

Yours, very truly,

EDW. B. KING,
Member of the General Assembly, January Session, 1909.

HARTFORD, CONN., April 12, 1909.

HON. MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of Local Union No. 42, of Hartford, Conn., a branch of the Cigar Makers' International Union of America, held Thursday, April 1, 1909, the undersigned committee was instructed to prepare a letter setting forth the views of the members of this union on the tobacco schedule in the proposed tariff act as submitted by the Ways and Means Committee to the Congress now in session, as wage-workers engaged in the manufacture of cigars, an industry ranking twelfth in importance, and also a large contributor toward the expense of the Government.

We view with apprehension and alarm the attitude of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting a tobacco schedule that provides for even a limited amount of tobacco and cigars to enter the home markets of our country from the islands of the Philippines on practically a free-trade basis, to compete, we believe, with an already over-crowded industry.

Several thousands of cigar makers are now out of work, and to add to this number through the admission of even 150,000,000 cigars per year from those islands is manifestly unfair to cigar makers and unjust to employers of labor in this, an overtaxed industry. The wages paid to us amount to nearly \$300,000 per year. Hartford factories producing but a small percentage of the total production of the country, the effect of this proposed measure to further encroach upon our home markets appears to our members to seriously lessen the opportunity to secure employment.

Believing the industry is threatened by this entering wedge to ultimate free trade with the Philippine Islands, we respectfully request that you give this letter your serious consideration and to protect the cigar makers and tobacco growers in preventing the unjust schedule from becoming a part of the general tariff laws of the United States, and believing we have made clear to you the effect the adoption of this schedule will have upon the trade at large, we hope and believe this schedule will not be adopted by Congress nor receive support from the Connecticut delegation in Congress.

Hoping to hear from you, we are,
Respectfully,

JOHN PRINTZ,
JOHN H. KILLIAN,
G. F. KNEEBUSCH,
J. S. POWELL,
J. C. KLEE,

Committee.

S. SOUTHEINER,

President Cigar Makers' Union No. 42, Hartford, Conn.

HARTFORD, CONN., April 5, 1909.

HON. MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I write to-day upon the subject of the tobacco schedule as reported by the Ways and Means Committee to the Congress of the United States.

As a workman engaged in the industry of cigar making, I view with apprehension and alarm the attitude of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting a tobacco schedule which provides for a limited amount of tobacco and cigars to enter the home markets of our country from the islands of the Philippines, on practically a free-trade basis, to compete seriously, I believe, with an already overcrowded industry.

Several thousands of our members are now out of work, and to add to this number by the admission of 150,000,000 more cigars per year from those islands does not seem to me to be fair treatment toward an already overtaxed industry.

In our own city of Hartford there are upward of 500 persons employed in the cigar factories, to say nothing of those employed in the tobacco-packing plants. There are dependent upon the output of the cigar factories between 1,800 and 2,000 people. The wages received amount to nearly \$300,000 per year.

Hartford factories producing but a small percentage of the total production of the country, and the workers viewing this measure, as they do, and believing their industry is threatened by this entering wedge to ultimate free trade with the Philippine Islands, I am impelled to write you and respectfully request that you give this matter your serious attention, and to protect the cigar makers and growers of leaf tobacco in preventing this unjust schedule from becoming a part of the general tariff laws of the United States.

Hoping I make clear to you as we feel about this question, I am,
Most sincerely, yours,

SOL. SOUTHEINER,
President Cigar Makers' Union, Hartford, Conn.

E. A. & W. F. FULLER,
Hartford, Conn., March 25, 1909.

HON. MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BULKELEY: Your esteemed favor of the 22d instant, also copy of the new tariff bill, is before me.

My view of that part referring to Philippine tobacco, in its immediate effect, is the difficulty of fairly and honestly apportioning the distribution of tobacco and cigars admitted duty free, i. e., what particular person or firm is to have the benefit of free entry in respect to the stated quantity of wrapper leaf, filler leaf, and cigars.

To my mind, this whole plan has back of it the tobacco trust, the American Cigar Company.

The opportunity for crooked work in connection with the bringing in of Sumatra leaf is something to be reckoned with.

This is an entering wedge, which in the no very distant future will furnish the present growers of Sumatra leaf a field to produce an almost unlimited quantity of wrapper leaf for admission free that now pays a duty of \$1.85 per pound.

Yours, very truly,

EDW. A. FULLER.

THE CONNECTICUT TOBACCO CORPORATION,
Tariffville, Conn., June 3, 1909.

HON. MORGAN G. BULKELEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Statistics show now that the tobacco trust controls more than 70 per cent of the tobacco business of this country. The annexation of Porto Rico gave them quite an impetus, and the bringing in from the Philippine Islands any amount of tobacco or cigars free of duty will fall directly into their hands and give them another step

forward. You can figure out that they have made this wonderful gain on the tobacco business of this country in the past few years, and in spite of all the fighting we can do they seem to continue to make such gains. Now, then, for Congress to go to work and open up a new field for their activities—one that will be so easily controlled by them—it does seem unfair. The strangest part of the whole thing to us is that while our Federal Government is spending a great deal of money apparently fighting the trust, they will then, with the other hand, apparently feed and open up such avenues for trust operations.

Yours, truly,

MARCUS L. FLOYD.

Showing attitude of tobacco growers of Pennsylvania, tobacco growers of Massachusetts, Leaf Tobacco Packers' Association of Ohio, and cigar manufacturers:

PENNSYLVANIA FARMERS OPPOSE THE FREE IMPORTATION OF TOBACCO FROM THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Finance Committee:

I, as president of the Lancaster (Pa.) Tobacco Growers' Association, again make my appearance in behalf of our society and fellow-farmers, to enter our protest against the removal of duty on Philippine tobacco. By the result of the Spanish war three great tobacco countries came into our possession—Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands. We made many concessions for them in many ways by the lowering of duties in their favor. We tobacco men suffered severely, not only with the lowering of duties on their products, but by the lowering of duties on Sumatra. Then we were raisers of wrapper goods, but the lowering of duty on Sumatra drove us completely out of that field. We then changed our modes, and are now producing fillers; in fact, the only field left open to us. By the lowering of duties on Cuba and Porto Rico we were again assailed in our standpoint, for from raising fillers we have no retreat. There is nothing left for us lower in the tobacco field. Now comes the wiping out of the duty on Philippine tobacco. This reduction affects the great States of Pennsylvania and Ohio more than any other States in the Union, for their chief crop is the raising of fillers. So is the crop of the Philippines. Give them a lower duty and our industry is ruined, and we are no small producers. Between the years 1860 and 1907, a period of forty-six years, our tobacco crop in Lancaster County has varied from 35,000 to 75,000 cases per annum, grown on from 14,000 to 18,000 acres, and has brought into our country \$80,000,000 in cash—a larger sum of money than was ever realized from tobacco in the same area of any country in the world, except Sumatra. Also, the ninth internal-revenue district, of which we are the chief, has in the last seven years paid to the Government in revenue \$17,377,343. We also manufactured in the year 1906, 801,399,420 cigars. This district is the banner cigar-manufacturing district in the United States. Is this industry not worth protecting? Verily, it is; and that is why I am sent here by my fellow-farmers to enter our solemn protest against the lowering of this duty. I know the Republican party, in its platform upon which his honor Judge Taft was elected to the Presidency, has promised a revision and a modification of the tariff; but we naturally supposed they were those things which in our infancy we could not manufacture in competition with foreign manufacturers which were long established, but now, since we have become established, we can manufacture under a reduced duty. We never for a moment supposed that it had reference to an industry where every advantage is on their side. We can not compete with the cheap labor and the long season of the Philippine Islands. We have also made a promise that trusts, especially the tobacco trust, shall be held in check. Suits by the Government are now pending for that purpose. Reducing the tax will give them the field in the Philippine Islands, and they will have the whip hand over Pennsylvania and Ohio. They can snap their fingers at us and say they can get fillers elsewhere. You see the condition of affairs in Kentucky. Tobacco can scarcely be raised there now at a profit. You lower this duty and thousands and thousands of my fellow-farmers will be in the same condition. I am sure my constituents had no idea when they gave to Judge Taft 16,000 majority that the reduction of duty would be in those things which compete with what we produce from the soil. As I said on a former occasion, we have always been protectionists, and are so now; but never before this tobacco industry was assailed had we anything to protect. Yet we stood shoulder to shoulder with the iron maker and the wool-grower to protect their products, knowing it would finally be a blessing to all. Yet how can this prove a blessing to anyone by ruining our industry, which is well established, to try to foster an industry which has just got a foothold? We have contributed much for their welfare, and will do more; but do not ask us to sacrifice that which we live by. The protective principles, which dominated everything pertaining to free trade at the last election, are paramount over all the tobacco-growing States, and tens of thousands of growers scattered over this great Union have not given up hope, but turn their eyes to this Congress and ask them for justice—first, last, and all the time. And in seeking this we are asking protection for millions of dollars expended in buildings which are suitable for no other industry but this. There is not a farm in our whole county that has not from \$3,000 to \$10,000 expended in shedding, which, as I said before, would be useless. We have not the flimsy shedding of the Tropics, but permanent buildings erected especially for this purpose.

Again, gentlemen, let me say, if you grant this removal of duty, what will prevent Sumatra from being smuggled into the Philippine Islands and passing it here duty free as Philippine tobacco? The present Army of the United States is not large enough to guard these islands to prevent it. Much more could be said in behalf of the cigar-tobacco industry, but you, gentlemen, certainly see the justice of our claim. If we thought as some think—that this reduction would not affect our industry—we would not be up in arms to prevent it. So, gentlemen, we leave this with you, trusting you may see your way clear to give the tiller of the soil the protection he asks for.

B. EZRA HERR,
M. L. GREIDER,
GEORGE HIBSEMAN.

Officers of Lancaster County (Pa.) Growers' Association.

APRIL, 1909.

AGAWAM, MASS., March 30, 1909.

HON. M. G. BULKELEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 26th received; in reply will state that I do not think that I can suggest anything to you on the Payne tariff bill that will be of any use to you, but will gladly give my opinion as I understand the bill: Philippine tobacco wrappers, 300,000 pounds

fillers, which include binders or seconds, in fact, all grades except wrappers, 3,000,000 pounds with the proviso that such bales or packages may include 15 per cent wrappers yearly, free. I think it is all wrong, and that if it passes that it will prove such a handicap to the tobacco growers of the Connecticut Valley that they will have to go out of the business, which will mean a great loss, as they are equipped with sheds, etc., for which they have been to great expense. It not only hits the Connecticut Valley, but all other parts of the country where tobacco is raised. Now, then, for my argument, which is: That Philippine tobacco will be of about the same quality in a few years as Sumatra, as the soil and climate is about the same, and that 300,000 pounds means just that much trade taken from us if it stops even there, which I doubt very much. And the 3,000,000 pounds of fillers, which means a large proportion seconds, would hit us hard, as a good share of our goods and all of Wisconsin's are seconds or binders.

Yours, truly,

A. E. BELDEN,
Agawam, Mass.

DAYTON, OHIO, April 28, 1909.

At a special meeting of the board of directors of the Ohio Leaf Tobacco Packers' Association, an association comprising in its membership all the representative packers of Ohio leaf tobacco, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a tariff bill in which a clause provides for the free entry of 300,000 pounds of wrapper-leaf tobacco, 1,500,000 pounds of filler-leaf tobacco, and 150,000,000 cigars from the Philippines, as found in paragraph 471d, page 189, of said tariff bill, as reported by Mr. ALDRICH on April 12, 1909; and

Whereas if such bill becomes a law, it will work a great injustice and cause untold injury to our tobacco industry, comprising as it does all the growers, packers, dealers, jobbers, and cigar manufacturers, both in this State and throughout the United States; and

Whereas the free importation of cigars in a limited quantity, as specified in said bill, simply works to provide employment for 2,000 Filipinos at a low rate of wages and takes away the livelihood of the same number of American citizens, whose cost of living demands and who receive fair wages for their work; and

Whereas said tobacco, which is proposed to be imported free, is raised by cheap Filipino labor, whose cost of living is so small that a very meager wage scale suffices for their support; and

Whereas the specifying of a "limited quantity" of either the raw or manufactured article will put into the hands of one or a few large operators the possibility of absolutely controlling the importation of this limited quantity at an abnormal margin of profit; and

Whereas the importation of a limited quantity will do more harm to the general trade in the United States than it will benefit the Filipinos; and

Whereas, along the present lines of duty established by the Dingley tariff bill, the tobacco trade and the producers of tobacco are all fairly satisfied, now that different interests have become adjusted to those rates: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, as a trade organization and being one of a number of similar organizations located throughout the tobacco-growing districts of the United States, whose purposes are to promote and foster the growing of leaf tobacco and the handling and manufacturing in all its branches and to look after the interests of tobacco raisers, tobacco packers, tobacco jobbers, cigar and tobacco manufacturers, and their employees, do hereby strenuously protest against the admitting free of duty of any tobacco or cigars whatsoever in the United States from the Philippine Islands; and be it further

Resolved, That 500 copies of this resolution, duly signed, be printed and distributed among the members of the association and kindred associations throughout the country, each to be forwarded to their respective Congressmen and Senators, with a personal request that they use their best efforts to defeat the passage of the proposed measure; and be it further

Resolved, That a special appeal be made to Senator DICK, of Ohio, who is a member of the Finance Committee, to use every endeavor to prevent the passage of the Philippine free clause in the Senate bill.

WALTER M. BRENNER, *President.*
C. H. SOLLIDAY, *Vice-President.*
W. J. LUKASWITZ, *Secretary-Treasurer.*
A. H. REEDER,
L. A. WHEELER,
S. M. KROHN,
CHAS. BILLMAN,
HENRY MEYER,
Directors.

CIGAR MANUFACTURERS PROTEST AGAINST THE FREE ENTRY OF TOBACCO AND CIGARS FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Finance Committee:

In this hearing we have the honor to directly represent the cigar manufacturers of one of the greatest cigar-manufacturing States, Pennsylvania alone manufactures approximately 2,000,000,000 cigars annually, which is about one-quarter of the total annual output of one of the greatest industries of our country, and which annually manufactures under normal trade conditions over 8,000,000,000 cigars, the total value of this product being about \$350,000,000, and for which we pay in wages alone over \$75,000,000 and contribute toward the maintenance of our Government an internal-revenue tax of over \$25,000,000 annually.

This great industry has been built up and is maintained under a protective tariff. Prior to 1863 the cigar-manufacturing industry of this country was practically nil. Nearly all the cigars consumed here were made in and imported from Germany. At that time, all told, less than 3,000 people were employed in the cigar-making trade in the United States. To-day we give employment to 125,000 skilled mechanics, and employ all told in and about our factories over 200,000 American citizens, representing 1,000,000 human beings who are dependent upon the cigar industry for a livelihood.

The cigar manufacturers have suffered greatly during the present period of industrial depression, and in many instances we have kept our workmen employed despite the fact that our stock rooms are crowded to the limit with cigars for which there is no market in sight.

The trade has already and is now suffering the effect of anticipated hostile tariff legislation. We have been promised adequate protection to the industries of our country, and we fail to see why the Congress should endeavor to avoid its pledges in this direction.

Remove the duty from the cigars imported from the Philippine Islands, and just to that extent you curtail the production of cigars in this country, displace American workmen, who under normal trade conditions are employed in the production of these cigars.

Owing to the enormous difference in the wages paid in this country and the Philippine Islands, and the difference in the cost of the raw material, light, fuel, rent, etc., the ability to successfully compete with the Philippine Islands on a free-trade basis in cigars is positively out of the question. The difference in wages alone amounts to \$1 or more per day, say nothing of the advantage they possess in the way of cheap raw materials and other favorable means of production.

We have shown that the cigar industry has grown to its present magnificent proportions and given employment to 200,000 people, with an annual disbursement to the wage-earner alone of \$75,000,000, and a revenue to the Government of \$25,000,000, under a protective tariff. We earnestly protest against legislation of which we are not only firmly convinced, but about which there can be no dispute, that it will have a disastrous effect on this great industry, and without any resultant good to the people of our country in general.

The cigar manufacturers of this country have invested upward of \$100,000,000, and expend annually for raw material alone \$75,000,000. We respectfully submit that legislation destructive to the best interests of this great industry merits your careful consideration. We can not compete on a free-trade basis even to a limited extent with the Philippine Islands. Upon this point the cigar manufacturers, the tobacco growers, and the leaf-tobacco dealers, and the working men and women employed in this industry are united in their opposition to the transfer, from the United States to the Philippines, of that industry from a generally prosperous business and fairly paid labor to the competition of the cheapest workers in the world.

A. B. HESS,
S. R. MOSS,
I. H. WEAVER,
Committee of Cigar Manufacturers.

Amount of revenue lost to the United States Government in the event of the passage of either the Payne bill or the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee dealing with the importation of tobacco and cigars from the Philippine Islands:

Tariff rate on wrappers, per pound.....	\$1.85
Tariff rate on fillers, per pound.....	.35
Lowest possible tariff on cigars, per thousand.....	50.00

Revenue lost to the Government by the bill proposed by the Senate Finance Committee:

300,000 pounds of wrappers, at \$1.85 per pound.....	\$555,000
1,500,000 pounds of fillers, at 35 cents per pound.....	525,000
150,000,000 cigars, at \$50 per thousand.....	7,500,000

8,580,000

The above is the amount of duty it is proposed to contribute to the Filipinos, or whatever interests that should import into the United States from the Philippine Islands, as proposed by the pending tariff bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Finance, or a direct contribution to the American Tobacco Company of \$8,580,000 a year.

Should the House bill be enacted into law, it would mean a further contribution of \$525,000, or a total of \$9,105,000 a year.

While no deduction has been made in the above figures for the 25 per cent reduction in the present rates, neither has any computation been made for the 25 per cent ad valorem on manufactured cigars and tobacco, which amount would be greater than the reduction on the manufactured article.

Submitted by the representatives of the Cigar Makers' International Union.

Mr. BULKELEY. I desire to offer one or two amendments to the amendment of the committee, which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. They will be read for information. An amendment is now pending and will be first acted upon.

Mr. BULKELEY. I will read them.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. They can be read at the desk, if the Senator prefers.

Mr. BULKELEY. I should like to have them read from the desk. Possibly they may meet the views of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendments will not be in order until the pending amendment is disposed of. The Senator from Connecticut gives notice of amendments that he proposes to offer, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 1 of the printed amendment, line 11, after the words "filler tobacco," insert the word "unstemmed" in parentheses; on page 2, line 1, strike out the words "five hundred thousand;" on page 2, line 2, strike out the words "one hundred and fifty" and insert the word "seventy."

Mr. BULKELEY. These amendments meet somewhat the criticism that I have been called upon to make in the course of my remarks, limiting to some extent the quantity that may be admitted into this country free of duty, cutting the number of cigars from 150,000,000 to 70,000,000, cutting the quantity of filler tobacco from 1,500,000 pounds to 1,000,000 pounds; and correcting wrapper tobacco so as to provide that it shall be unstemmed. Those cover the three amendments.

Mr. PENROSE. The amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut are in line with the wishes of the tobacco-growing sections of Pennsylvania, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the resolutions of the Lancaster Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, also the resolution of the Tobacco Growers' Association of Lancaster, Pa., and a communication from the president and officers of the Lancaster County (Pa.) Tobacco Growers' Association.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE LANCASTER LEAF TOBACCO BOARD OF TRADE,
Lancaster, Pa., April 19, 1909.

At a special meeting of the Lancaster Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade held this day the following resolution was passed unanimously:

Whereas there is now pending before the Senate of the United States a tariff revision measure, section 5 of which provides for the free entry into the United States of 3,000,000 pounds of filler tobacco, 300,000 pounds of wrapper tobacco, and 150,000,000 cigars free of duty from the Philippines; and

Whereas this number of cigars, together with the cigars which will be made from the above amount of tobacco, exceeds the number of cigars manufactured in the Philippines during the year 1907 and is equal to one-fiftieth of all cigars manufactured in the United States during 1907, we believe the passage of this measure would work untold injury to the tobacco growers, tobacco packers, dealers and jobbers, cigar manufacturers, cigar jobbers, bench workers, and the many thousands of people who, in one way or another, make their livelihood out of the tobacco industry; and

Whereas the free entry of this number of cigars and this amount of tobacco is equal to one-seventh of all tobacco grown in the State of Pennsylvania: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we most vehemently protest against the passage of this section of the proposed tariff revision bill, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Representatives in both Houses of Congress, urging them to use their best efforts to defeat the passage of the proposed measure.

I. H. WEAVER,
A. B. HESS,
M. ROSENTHAL,
C. EMORY LONG,
Committee.

LANCASTER, PA., December 14, 1908.

Hon. BOIES PENROSE,
United States Senate:

The Tobacco Growers' Association of Lancaster County, Pa., in session December 14, 1908, unanimously passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the tobacco growers of Lancaster County hereby protest against the introduction into this country of any tobacco and cigars from the Philippine Islands free of duty, and hereby request our United States Senators and the Congressman from this district to use every effort before the Ways and Means Committee to prevent the passage of a law that would be detrimental to the tobacco interests of Pennsylvania.

Attest:

B. EZRA HERR, President.
GEORGE HIBSHMAN, Secretary.

FARMERS OPPOSE THE FREE IMPORTATION OF TOBACCO FROM THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Finance Committee:

I, as president of the Lancaster (Pa.) Tobacco Growers' Association, once again make my appearance in behalf of our society and fellow-farmers to enter our protest against the removal of duty on Philippine tobacco. By the result of the Spanish War three great tobacco countries came into our possession—Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands. We made many concessions for them in many ways by the lowering of duties in their favor. We tobacco men suffered severely, not only with the lowering of duties on their products, but by the lowering of duties on Sumatra. Then we were raisers of wrapper goods, but the lowering of duty on Sumatra drove us completely out of that field. We then changed our modes and are now producing fillers; in fact, the only field left open to us. By the lowering of duties on Cuba and Porto Rico we were again assailed in our standpoint, for from raising fillers we have no retreat. There is nothing left for us lower in the tobacco field. Now comes the wiping out of the duty on Philippine tobacco. This reduction affects the great States of Pennsylvania and Ohio more than any other States in the Union, for their chief crop is the raising of fillers. So is the crop of the Philippines; give them a lower duty and our industry is ruined, and we are no small producers. Between the years 1860 and 1907, a period of forty-six years, our tobacco crop in Lancaster County has varied from 35,000 to 75,000 cases per annum grown on from 14,000 to 18,000 acres, and has brought into our country \$80,000,000 in cash, a larger sum of money than was ever realized from tobacco in the same area of any country in the world except Sumatra. Also the ninth internal-revenue district, of which we are the chief, has in the last seven years paid to the Government in revenue \$17,377,343. We also manufactured in the year 1906, 801,399,420 cigars. This district is the banner cigar manufacturing district in the United States. Is this industry not worth protecting? Verily it is, and that is why I am sent here by my fellow-farmers to enter our solemn protest against the lowering of this duty. I know the Republican party, in its platform upon which his honor Judge Taft was elected to the Presidency, has promised a revision and a modification of the tariff, but we naturally supposed they were those things which in our infancy we could not manufacture in competition with foreign manufacturers which were long established, but now, since we have become established, we can manufacture under a reduced duty. We never for a moment supposed that it had reference to an industry where every advantage is on their side. We can not compete with the cheap labor and the long season of the Philippine Islands. We have also made a promise that trusts, especially the tobacco trust, shall be held in check; suits by the Government are now pending for that purpose. Reducing the tax will give them the field in the Philippine Islands, and they will have the whip hand over Pennsylvania and Ohio. They can snap their fingers at us and say they can get fillers elsewhere. You see the condition of affairs in Kentucky. Tobacco can scarcely be raised there now at a profit. You lower this duty and thousands and thousands of my fellow-farmers will be in the same condition. I am sure my constituents had no idea when they gave to Judge Taft 16,000 majority that the reduction of duty would be in those things which compete with what we produce from the soil. As I said on a former occasion, we have always been protectionists, and are so now, but never before this tobacco industry was assailed had we anything to protect. Yet we stood shoulder to shoulder with the

iron maker and the woolgrower to protect their products, knowing it would finally be a blessing to all. Yet how can this prove a blessing to anyone by ruining our industry, which is well established, to try to foster an industry which has just got a foothold? We have contributed much for their welfare and will do more, but do not ask us to sacrifice that which we live by. The protective principles, which dominated everything pertaining to free trade at the last election, are paramount over all the tobacco-growing States, and 10,000 growers scattered over this great Union have not given up hope, but turn their eyes to this Congress and ask them for justice first, last, and all the time; and in seeking this we are asking protection for millions of dollars expended in buildings which are suitable for no other industry but this. There is not a farm in our whole county that has not from \$3,000 to \$10,000 expended in shedding, which, as I said before, would be useless. We have not the flimsy shedding of the Tropics, but permanent buildings erected especially for this purpose.

Again, gentlemen, let me say, if you grant this removal of duty, what will prevent Sumatra from being smuggled into the Philippine Islands and passing it here duty free as Philippine tobacco? The present Army of the United States is not large enough to guard these islands to prevent it. Much more could be said in behalf of the cigar-tobacco industry, but you, gentlemen, certainly see the justice of our claim. If we thought as some think—that this reduction would not affect our industry—we would not be up in arms to prevent it. So, gentlemen, we leave this with you, trusting you may see your way clear to give the tiller of the soil the protection he asks for.

B. EZRA HERR,
M. L. GREIDER,
GEORGE HIBSHMAN,

Officers of Lancaster (Pa.) Growers' Association.

APRIL, 1909.

Mr. ALDRICH. So far as the committee are concerned, they are willing to accept the amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut and to modify the committee amendment in that way. I ask that that modification be made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the modification.

The SECRETARY. On page 1 of the printed amendment, line 11, after the word "tobacco," insert the word "unstemmed" in parentheses; on page 2, line 1, after the words "one million" strike out the words "five hundred thousand;" on page 2, line 2, strike out the words "one hundred and fifty" and insert the word "seventy," so as to read: "seventy million cigars."

Mr. JONES. I have two communications from cigar makers which I should like to have printed in the RECORD. I think the amendment suggested by the Senator from Connecticut will be satisfactory to the organizations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communications will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION, No. 325,
Spokane, Wash., April 22, 1909.

Senator JONES.

DEAR SIR: I represent but a few hundred of the 40,000 cigar makers in our union, who come to you in the most serious difficulty of our existence of fifty years. The clause in the new tariff bill relating to the admission of cigars from the Philippines, free of duty, is a menace to our very existence. It takes years to learn our trade, and it usually bounds our career; and it is impossible to maintain the standard of American living in competition with the Chinamen and natives of a land where a few cents a day is sufficient to supply its people with all they are accustomed to.

I ask you, in all seriousness, to consider the welfare of your own people, among which our union stands forth as an organization whose aim is to better the condition of its people.

Yours, very truly,

W. A. MITCHELL, Financial Secretary.

SEATTLE, WASH., May 7, 1909.

Hon. W. L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to protest against allowing 150,000,000 cigars from Philippine Islands free from duty, because it will put me out of business. It costs more for tobacco at present than it does for cigars. Remember, my cigar makers can not live on \$8 per month. According to C. H. Hubbard's report, labor commissioner in the State of Washington, they get \$2.25 per day when they work.

Respectfully,

LAWRENCE MORGAN.

Mr. FLETCHER. I believe the amendments which have been offered to the substitute have been accepted by the committee, and the substitute as amended is now before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. FLETCHER. I supposed that that had been accepted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I do not understand that it has been accepted. After having their attention called to this subject last night, the committee had a meeting this morning and reduced the amount 5,000,000 below the 75,000,000 provided in my amendment.

I count myself fortunate, Mr. President, in having so strongly impressed the committee with the protest of the cigar makers of America. I am almost tempted, Mr. President, in view of the readiness with which the committee yielded in reducing the number of cigars to be imported from the Philippines free of duty by 80,000,000, to suggest that they give to the cigar makers

of this country the opportunity to manufacture 10,000,000 more of the cigars that shall go to supply the trade each year. That would mean the employment of quite a number of idle cigar makers. Possibly, if I modify my amendment offered last night at 75,000,000 to 60,000,000, it will be accepted. I think I will chance it, Mr. President, by offering it in that form.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin withdraws his former amendment and offers another amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the former amendment is withdrawn. The Secretary will report the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 2, of the amendment as modified, it is proposed to strike out "seventy million" and insert "sixty million," so as to read, "and cigars in excess of 60,000,000 cigars."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do this especially in the hope, Mr. President, that it will be accepted, or perhaps that the number will be reduced to fifty-five millions.

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

Mr. PILES. I should like to ask that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut be stated. I did not quite catch it.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The pending amendment, upon which the vote was about to be taken, is not the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment which the Senator from Connecticut offers—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is a modification of the amendment which was pending.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, in line 2 of the committee amendment, before the words "million cigars," it is proposed to strike out "seventy" and insert "sixty," so that, if amended, it will read:

And cigars in excess of 60,000,000 cigars.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to the amendment, which has just been stated.

Mr. PILES. What I asked to have stated was the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, which, I understand, provides for "70,000,000 cigars."

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee have modified their amendment, reducing the number of cigars from 150,000,000 to 70,000,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood that was the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BULKELEY].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], on behalf of the committee, has modified the amendment heretofore presented.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken upon this modification of the amendment I offered last night, I ask to have read a communication from the legislative representative of the Cigar Makers' International Union, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, June 12, 1909.

SENATOR R. M. LA FOLLETTE.

DEAR SIR: Relative to the proposed admission of 150,000,000 cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands, we beg to submit for your further consideration the following facts, which we believe proves conclusively that free trade in cigars with the Philippine Islands, even in a limited degree, would prove disastrous to our industry. One hundred and fifty million cigars represents the labor of about 2,500 cigar makers for a full year, and in view of the fact that there are already about 12,000 idle cigar makers in the United States, we are justly alarmed by the proposed legislation, which would unquestionably add another 2,500 to the large army of unemployed cigar makers, together with those dependent upon them.

The tobacco and cigar exports of the Philippine Islands under American occupation have reached a higher degree of prosperity during the years 1903 to 1907 than prevailed from 1895 to 1899, when they were still under Spanish rule, as the following figures from the special report of Secretary of War Taft show: For the five years referred to under Spain the annual average exports of cigars and tobacco amounted to \$2,114,240, for the five years reported under American occupation the annual average was \$2,129,194; thus disproving any contention that our occupancy of the islands has seriously impaired their tobacco and cigar export trade.

The report of the insular collector of internal revenue for 1908 shows that the total number of cigars manufactured in the Philippine Islands during 1907 was 197,000,000, and for 1908, 198,754,787. Of this number there were imported into the United States during the year 1907, 1,593,000, and during 1908, 1,365,000.

A bulletin of the Department of Labor shows that there are about 20,000 persons employed in the cigar industry in the Philippine Islands,

at an average of \$10.21 per month. The rate of wages for cigar makers, as near as we can learn, is 37.12 cents a day.

As noted above, there were imported into the United States from the Philippine Islands during 1907, 1,593,000 cigars, and during 1908, 1,365,000. In this connection we desire to show the confusing nature of the figures contained in a note on tariff revision, and Insular Bureau reports, as contained in the following memorandum:

The Notes on Tariff Revision, issued by the Ways and Means Committee, on page 227, under the caption "Importations," referring to leaf tobacco, furnishes the "general information" to the effect that the total importation of unmanufactured tobacco from the Philippines was 70,163 pounds, valued at \$4,584. On page 280, referring to the duty on cigars, the paragraph furnishing "general information" as to the importations does not show any importation from the Philippine Islands.

The publication Estimated Revenues, as issued by the Finance Committee of the Senate, on page 28, referring to paragraph 221 of the Senate bill, shows the importation of cigars from the Philippine Islands during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, to have been 3,141.89 pounds, valued at \$4,150.

Averaging 12 pounds to a thousand cigars, 3,141.89 pounds would equal 261,820 cigars; 3,141.89 pounds of tobacco, at \$4.50 per pound, minus 25 per cent reduction on account of Philippine importation and plus 25 per cent ad valorem (based on 261,820 cigars), will about equal \$11,352.74, which is noted on page 29 as the revenue under the present law.

The Insular Bureau reports the exportation of cigars to the United States in 1907 as 1,593,000, and in 1908 as 1,365,000, which figures agree with the importations of cigars from the Philippines to the United States, as stated on page 279 of the quarterly report for April-June, 1908, issued by the Insular Bureau. In the report named the Insular Bureau states the value of 1,593,000 cigars in 1907 as \$26,067, which valuation does not seem to agree with the valuation placed upon these cigars upon importation into the United States as noted on page 28 of the Senate Finance Committee's publication entitled "Estimated Revenues."

We further desire to call to your attention that our industry has greatly suffered by the free importation of cigars from Porto Rico. During the past two years there has been admitted into the United States from Porto Rico on an average of about 10,000,000 cigars a month, or an amount per year almost equal in number to that which it is proposed to admit free of duty from the Philippine Islands. This amount of cigars admitted free of duty from Porto Rico has already displaced about 2,000 American workmen, and we have borne this injustice with hardly any complaint on our part; but we feel that we are now compelled to earnestly yet respectfully protest against the further contemplated injustice, which will cause untold hardship on the already too large number of American citizens now out of employment, with no immediate prospects for obtaining the same, and the thousands of women and children dependent upon them for the necessities of life.

And, furthermore, in the event of the passage of that part of the pending tariff bill dealing with the importation of cigars from the Philippine Islands, the amount of revenue lost to the United States Government on 150,000,000 cigars, at \$50 per thousand, would be \$7,500,000.

The above is the amount that it is proposed to contribute to the Filipinos, or whatever interests that should import into the United States from the Philippine Islands the above amount of cigars, or a direct contribution to the American Tobacco Company of \$7,500,000 annually.

While no deduction has been made in the above figures for the 25 per cent reduction in the present rates, neither has any computation been made for the 25 per cent ad valorem on manufactured cigars, which would amount to a greater sum than the reduction in the present rates.

Submitted by the representative of the Cigar Makers' International Union.

J. CRONIN.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask to have read a communication from the cigar makers of Marinette, Wis., which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read the communication just presented by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The Secretary read as follows:

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 287,
Marinette, Wis., April 13, 1909.

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand the Ways and Means Committee of Congress has proposed a bill providing that 150,000,000 cigars shall be permitted to come from the Philippines free of duty in any one fiscal year. The cigar makers of Marinette protest against admitting any cigars from the island except at the regular import duty, as we believe it would be an injustice to the cigar industry of the United States. Hoping you will give this your earnest consideration and attention.

Yours, respectfully,

J. FITZHENRY, President.
A. E. SANDERS, Secretary.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a moment longer. I send to the desk two other communications out of a very large number which I have received from the cigar makers of Wisconsin and other States, and ask to have them read in this connection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 168,
Oshkosh, Wis., April 14, 1909.

Mr. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: I wish you would do all you can against that Philippine Island bill for admitting cigars into this country free from duty, for that would hurt the cigar industry a great deal in this country, for we can not compete with such cheap labor such as the Philippine cigar

makers are. They only receive about 28 cents a day. What would the American cigar makers do with such a cheap wage? Hoping to receive fair play, I remain,
Yours, truly,

J. GALLATIN, *Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 447,
Kenosha, Wis., April 14, 1909.

Hon. R. M. LA FOLLETTE.

DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents, we beg to request you to use your influence to defeat the bill introduced by the Ways and Means Committee to reduce the duty or let any cigars manufactured in the Philippine Islands in the United States free of duty from the rate fixed by the Dingley law, or any bill aiming to let cigars in free in any form. The bill, should it become a law, would practically destroy our trade, as the cigar makers on these islands earn about 37 cents per day. Our workmen can not possibly get along on less than they are now earning. Reduction of duty or free means reduction of wages and ruin to our trade. We protest against any change in duty, and beg of you to earn the commendation and gratitude of our members by standing like a stone wall against any change.

WM. SCHRADER, *President.*
CHAS. F. SCHMIDT,
Corresponding Secretary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. President, it seems to me that if anything were wanting to justify a vote of lack of confidence in the committee in charge of this bill or to justify a word in criticism for the neglect of a due and proper regard for a conscientious and honest endeavor at legislation here, the proceedings which have transpired this morning would fill any omission of that kind. The committee brought in here originally a proposition, said to come from the President, to be the result of his wisdom, in conjunction with other matters in the bill, to permit 150,000,000 cigars to come in from the Philippine Islands free of duty. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], in a due and orderly way, as was his legitimate right, and backed by the judgment, I suspect, of a good many more Senators in this assembly than might be supposed at first thought, moved to amend that proposition by reducing it to 75,000,000. The Committee on Finance took that up almost at midnight last night and have reported this morning, without any excuse or reason being given, a reduction from the first proposed amendment, from 150,000,000 cigars down to 70,000,000 cigars, just 5,000,000 decrease beneath the amount provided for in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

It seems to me that on a question of this sort, especially when it is involving our relations with the Philippines, we ought to be alone controlled by the highest sense of responsibility and duty. It seems to me this is too important a matter to juggle with and to play what looks to me—and I suspect it looks the same to others—to be a game of petty politics.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BURKETT. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, there is no mystery about this; there is no "petty politics" in it. As I said last night, the committee had not given this matter of cigars full consideration in the committee. We have since last night heard the views of a dozen Senators upon this subject, who believe that this amendment ought to be made. It is upon the insistence of Senators from the Pacific slope, of Senators from the center of the country, and of Senators in the eastern part of the country that we have made this change. There is no mystery about it; there is no politics about it; there is nothing about it except a desire on the part of the committee to do the right thing; and, above everything else, to pass this bill.

Mr. BURKETT. That looks, Mr. President, to me as if there was also another desire—to hang the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] up in the air somewhere with his amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no disposition of that kind, and no such—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It would not be possible for the committee to do that with me. The Senator from Nebraska need not worry about me.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance have no desire to leave the Senator from Nebraska or any other Senator in the air or anywhere else, except where he places himself.

Mr. BURKETT. Now, Mr. President, so much for that. Whatever may have been the reason for cutting this amendment so suddenly, since last night at midnight, down to just five million underneath the proposed amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, I leave the Senate and the country, so far as that is concerned, to judge of motives.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BURKETT. I do.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that before anyone proposed any amendment to this cigar proposition, I myself asked the committee to cut it down to the lowest possible notch. I realized that the President, having been in the Philippines, was more familiar with that country than any other man in the United States, in all probability, and I felt that something ought to be done for the Filipino people. At the same time I realized that the cigar manufacturers on the Pacific coast, especially in my home city, were everywhere opposed to letting in a very large number of Philippine cigars, and so I urged upon the committee the taking up of this proposition and of reducing to the lowest possible number the quantity of cigars which should come in free from that country. I am very much gratified at the action of the Senator from Wisconsin in this matter, and I am deeply gratified over the result of the action of the committee.

Mr. BURKETT. Now, Mr. President, I do not care for any more apologies for the action of the Committee on Finance—

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President—

Mr. BURKETT. Will the Senator from New York just wait until I get through? There are a number here who are always ready to spring up in defense of the Finance Committee whenever it needs it. But what I want to call attention to is this: I will say that I have shared, as I took occasion yesterday—

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BURKETT. Let the Senator wait until I get through, and then he can make all the speeches he desires.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. BURKETT. As I took occasion yesterday to say, when I was speaking upon the sugar question, there is but one thing that will make me vote to admit free of duty all these cigars, and that is our obligation and duty to the Philippine Islands. I look with a good deal of apprehension, I will say, and with a good deal of disfavor upon the proposition to admit 150,000,000 cigars free from the Philippine Islands. I have received letters while we have been in session here from cigarmakers in my own State, calling attention to the importance of this matter to them. I have written back and said to them and recited to them the seriousness of the condition that confronts the people of the Philippine Islands.

I have reminded them of the importance of our obligation on account of the responsibility that we have assumed with reference to the Philippine Islands, and I have made up my mind only after much reflection and hesitation to join with others in what it seemed to me a just thing to do in these respects with reference to the people of the Philippine Islands. I regret, as I have said, that it seemed to be the judgment of the committee that we should admit 150,000,000 cigars from the Philippine Islands free of duty, but that proposition was brought in by the committee and we were told that this whole amendment was the result of investigation and was in accordance with the judgment of the President of the United States; but when the Senator from Wisconsin introduced his amendment to reduce the number of cigars to be admitted free from the Philippines, after a very few minutes' consideration the committee reported to reduce the amount 5,000,000 below the number he proposed.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] says, of course, that they have considered the proposition since then. That only reinforces what I said in the beginning of our right to cast a vote of lack of confidence upon the work of this committee, if anything else were needed to justify us in this particular.

Mr. GALLINGER. Why does not the Senator introduce it?

Mr. BURKETT. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I have cast a good many votes of lack of confidence in the work of the committee. Propositions have been brought in time after time, and when attention has been called to them members of the committee, after the matter has been brought in, have risen to say that they have not investigated the matter. What right, I want to know, has the committee to report a bill or any part of a bill and ask us to legislate upon it and to vote upon it, if they have not given it enough attention and enough investigation to justify them in bringing it in here?

I have no manner of criticism of the committee if, after additional evidence and additional hearings, it is their wisdom that the number of cigars to be admitted free can safely be reduced, and that we would fulfill our obligations to the Philip-

pine Islands and to the Filipinos by reducing the number to 70,000,000; but, Mr. President, I submit that the manner and the method in which it has been done does justify the action of those of us who have, as I have said to the Senator from New Hampshire, on several occasions taken the opportunity of voting a lack of confidence in the action of this committee.

There have been too many times during the hearing of this bill that this same sort of thing has occurred. Whether it is petty politics, as it appears to be to me, or whether it is not, as the Senator from Rhode Island assures us, I am certain that the people who will observe this action, not only here, but throughout the country, will realize that it is an effort to get just a little under the Senator from Wisconsin in order that he and his amendments may be hung up in the air.

Now, sir, if in a single half hour session the Finance Committee can afford to change their judgment and reduce the number from 150,000,000 down to 70,000,000, it seems to me that it justifies me and everybody else who feels friendly disposed to the makers of cigars in this country to go 10,000,000 further in accordance with the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President, in my judgment, the highest compliments that have been paid to the Finance Committee are some of the bitter criticisms which have been cast upon it by some Members of this body. The fact that it changes its opinion once in a while upon some important schedule, after careful discussion and consideration, instead of inviting the condemnation or criticism of Senators, should invite their commendation and praise.

The importation of cigars and other Philippine products free of duty is a matter of very broad range and wide discussion. It is not new in the Congress of the United States. The obligations are so conflicting between our trust on the one hand toward this dependent archipelago, and our industries on the other, that it is not to be wondered at that Senators may differ, and honestly differ, as to what our exact duty may be.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. DICK. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. In connection with these harsh and, as I think, unmerited criticisms of the committee, the Senator is aware of the fact that after the Committee on Appropriations has spent weeks, and oftentimes months, in preparing an appropriation bill, when it is brought into the Senate scores of changes are made in the bill. Appropriations are reduced or increased as circumstances may require, and upon additional testimony that is presented, but nobody has ever risen in the Senate to criticize the Committee on Appropriations for making those changes. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that it is a tribute to the committee, rather than a matter that merits condemnation, that the committee is willing to make changes when the circumstances seem to demand it.

Mr. DICK. It would seem so to me, Mr. President, and, furthermore, it seems to me to disprove absolutely the claim that this committee, with arbitrary power, is forcing through every schedule as it wants it passed. I have been voting as loyally as I can with the committee. I do not agree entirely with all its conclusions or with all the presentations it makes; but, in the main, it is my judgment that we are working out a tariff bill which will satisfy the country, which will restore confidence, and which will bring back to the country the prosperity we so much need and desire.

But, Mr. President, one thing more I want to say, because I feel it. I think the country is to be congratulated, the Congress is to be congratulated, and the Senate is to be congratulated that we have so able a committee, headed by so able a chairman, as those who represent this body in the consideration of this great measure. This is not said for political reasons; it is not said to curry favor; it is my own estimate of an exact and just criticism, if such it may be termed, of the men who, in my judgment, as I have had opportunity to observe, have disposed of their obligations in a manner that ought to meet the approval of all Senators agreeing or disagreeing with their conclusions.

They have not been required, as has been stated here earlier in this debate, to hear everybody or to invite contentious opinions upon the schedules; but, day and night, in season and out of season, encroaching even upon the Sabbath day, if you please, always and ever they have been ready to hear all Senators and their constituents with reference to every matter involved in this great measure.

I have had some occasion to know that this is the truth. Ohio, studded from the Lakes to the Ohio River with a greater

diversity of interests, perhaps, than is true of any other State in the Union, has been represented here perhaps oftener than any other requesting such courtesy, and never has it been denied.

I give this assurance, if I may, that the people of Ohio are not unappreciative of what has been done for them nor ungrateful. Nor would it be becoming in me as their representative to longer submit without a protest to these unfair and unjust criticisms of this committee, which has done its work so faithfully and so well.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, in regard to this matter and the committee, the bitter attack now made upon it by the Senator from Nebraska seems to be the culmination of a criticism that has been running against the committee since it presented its tariff report to the Senate. The charge has been made as to the unfair constitution of the committee and the way it has been formed, and that charge has been repeated often to the Senate; and now the charge is made that it is playing petty politics in regard to this matter of the duty on Philippine cigars and in other ways.

As to the Philippine measure, while I do not know the personal views of the President, we all of us have read the declarations which he made both before he became President and since, growing out of his intimate knowledge of Philippine conditions, for the largest possible measure of free trade between the Philippine Islands and the United States. He has frequently declared such a measure most important for the welfare and uplift of the Philippine people and their loyalty to the United States.

I had no doubt, when this matter was presented by the Finance Committee, that it was substantially in agreement with the views entertained by the President, because they were the views he has so often expressed. Only the proposition of the Committee on Finance was less in what was granted to the Philippines than what the President had repeatedly said he thought would be good policy in the development of those islands and the creation of friendly relations between the Filipino people and the United States.

In regard to this particular proposition, just before the Senator from Wisconsin offered his amendment to reduce the cigars imported free from 150,000,000 to 75,000,000, the president of the Cigar Makers' Union of the United States interviewed me on the subject. He told me the views of the Cigar Makers' Union, the condition of its members as to nonemployment, and said that what they wanted was to reduce the number imported free to 75,000,000.

I want to say, if the Senator from Wisconsin had not offered the amendment to reduce the number of cigars imported free from the Philippines, I would have done so. The president of the union is a New Yorker, and there are more cigar makers in the State of New York than in any other State in the Union.

In regard to the committee having reduced it from 75,000,000 to 70,000,000, it was the demand of the Senator from Connecticut, who had been speaking here for several hours and who represents a great tobacco State, that the number should be reduced from 75,000,000 to 70,000,000. I want to say that I appealed to the committee personally, because of this presentation that had been made to me by the Cigar Makers' Union, to have the number reduced to the lowest possible figure, which would satisfy the Executive and the friends of the development of the Philippine Islands.

Now, sir, it has been charged that this committee has been unfairly formed, and one of the best posted of the correspondents of the great newspapers in the gallery, who are so keen and clear on all matters, said to me the other day, when I explained to him how the committee had been formed, that with his long experience here he had not thoroughly understood it, because he had not had occasion to look it up. I think it had better go into the RECORD, so that the country may know whether we are dominated by one-man power and by an automatic and self-constituted committee—just how the committees of the Senate are formed.

How are the committees of the Senate formed? This being a continuing body, we make new committees every two years, when one-third of the membership is changed. Then, sir, the officers of the caucus, elected the previous two years, cause a notice to be sent to all Senators on the Republican side asking them to meet in the marble room for the purpose of organization. When we meet there are 60 chairs. There are now 60 Republican members. Those chairs have no names upon them. There is no assignment of seats for Senators of prominence or long service. Everything is informal and free. Every man can take any seat he pleases, and if it so suits him he can take a

front seat, where he can be most conspicuous. There are no rules restricting any Senator as to what he shall propose or how long he shall speak. We are equals in the caucus.

Then, in the usual and ordinary way a motion is made for the organization of the caucus, and that is put to a vote by the oldest Senator in term of service, according to a rule which has prevailed in the Senate ever since its organization. When that is done a motion is made that the Chair shall appoint 11 or 13 Senators to constitute a committee on committees. That reaches the ideal that the uplift reformers have been claiming in their venomous attacks on the methods in the House. The attack upon the methods in the House has been that it is wrong for the Speaker to name the committees, and that they should be made by a committee of the House itself.

This committee on committees is appointed by the Chair. When it is complete, another caucus is called by due notice in writing to submit this committee on committees for the action of the Senators. The whole body thus assembled can reject, change, or adopt the report. If the caucus votes to accept the committee as reported, the committee goes to work. It addresses a letter to every Senator, asking him what he wishes in committee assignments; and it does its best, according to my experience, having gone five times through it, to gratify the wishes and ambitions of each Senator.

But when you come to the conditions existing at the beginning of this extra session, they were peculiar. Everybody knew that all the business of this session would come from one committee, and of the 50 Republican Senators, a large majority wished to get on that committee. The rules restrict its membership to 14, of whom 9 are Republicans. To select from this number of applicants 9 was a problem difficult for this committee on committees to solve. They accomplished the task and reported the result of their conclusions to the caucus, and it was a very full caucus. There was the opportunity again for any Senator to charge that the committee was unfairly made up; that the country, in its different parts, was not properly represented. There was one such protest in the caucus, but the Senator making the protest did not criticize the committee except to claim that his own State ought to be represented on it. He did not, however, make a motion or ask for a vote.

Therefore, the committee as suggested by the committee on committees received the vote of every single Republican Senator who was present in the caucus. But if any Senator was dissatisfied with the committee, he still had another opportunity, because that committee was reported to the full Senate, in order that the Senate might vote whether that committee should stand as the Committee on Finance or whether it should be changed in any particular. On that vote the committee was accepted by the Senate by the unanimous vote of Senators on both sides of the Chamber. So that the committee stands before us having been at least four times indorsed by the Republicans or the joint votes of both sides.

I understand the same process exactly is pursued by the minority Members of the Senate in the recommendations they make as to who of their number shall go upon committees.

My colleague and I represent a State that has a great variety of interests. I think the statistics show that New York is the largest manufacturing State in the Union and has more varied productions than any other State; and my colleague and I, representing those interests, both the employees and the employers, have not hesitated to go day by day to the committee in order to present the claims of these industries in New York for their consideration, and in many instances we have succeeded in placing before them views and testimony from people directly interested which have led to a modification in rates which the committee had reported to the Senate upon particular items in this bill. We have found the committee, even when disagreeing with our views, eminently open minded and courteous.

Now, as to the charge that this committee is discredited in this body, how are we to judge? How are we to know and how is the country to know whether this committee is discredited? Votes talk louder than speeches. We have been told here repeatedly that the people of the United States are hostile to this committee. We have been told here repeatedly that only the Senators who oppose the committee know what is the opinion of the people of the United States. We have been told here repeatedly that every Senator who supports this committee is marching headlong to political destruction, and he does not know it; the only people who know it are the critics of the committee. If that be so, then the Senate is the most extraordinary suicide club which has ever existed. There have been here—taking the wool schedule, which it was said was the

real test of popular feeling—practically 51 Senators supporting the committee and 8 Senators opposing the committee; 8 Senators only with salvation free and 51 going headlong and heedless to oblivion; 51 not knowing the sentiment of their own States and 51 ignorant of what the people of the country think and want.

When I look at the electoral college, which selected the President of the United States and you, sir, for the high offices which you adorn—both of you—I discover that the total electoral vote is 483; necessary for a choice, 242. Taking the wool schedule, upon which there was the greatest controversy, the Republican Senators voting to support the committee represented 294 electoral votes, or a majority of 52 of the electoral college, and yet the country has been repeatedly informed by several of the 8 Republican Senators who antagonize the committee that they have a knowledge of the wishes, the opinions, and the desires of the people which is not possessed by the Senators supporting the committee who represent a majority of 52 in the entire vote, Republican and Democratic, of the electoral college. If we take the highest vote cast against the committee on the most important schedules, they represented 55 in the electoral college, while the Senators supporting the committee represent 272.

Now, sir, this committee has had duties to perform greater than any that have fallen upon any other committee during my ten years in the Senate. I was not here during the consideration of the Dingley bill, but it strikes me that the framers of that measure had an easy task compared with the framers of this bill. The committees of the two Houses which prepared the Dingley bill met when a terrific industrial disaster had overwhelmed the country, and the people believed that it was due to the Democratic revenue measure which was then in force. The demand of the country upon that committee was to protect the industrial interests of the United States. The demand of the country upon the committee was that the action of that committee should be protective—protective everywhere; to give employment to labor and employment for capital. The difficulty that committee had to contend with was not to put rates up or down, but to restrain the eager desire of the whole community for rates so high as to be prohibitive in their practical application. The action of the committee in this easy process was sustained point by point by the concurring opinion of a distressed country.

But now we meet in the midst of great prosperity for the purpose of revising the schedules which have been eleven years in existence. The development of the country during that period has been such in many lines of industry as to require changes. I doubt very much—and I have many sources of information, and travel about the country almost as much as anyone—the strength of the demand originally which led the national convention to put that plank into the platform, and I believe, sir, that if that plank had not been in the platform Mr. Taft would not have lost a single electoral vote and that his phenomenal popular majority of over a million would have been just as great.

But it was put into the platform, and in obedience to that promise the Committee on Ways and Means met immediately after election, in the early part of November. They continued their work until March, and I think into April, and then the work with all the testimony which had been taken, filling 13 large volumes, with the discussions which had been given to it in the public press, came to the Senate, in a large measure perfected, and then the Finance Committee of the Senate had to undertake on their part to meet the requirements of the country, first for revenue and next for protection.

I have been a member of many committees, and the older Senators are familiar with the hard work of committees. They know that there are Members of this body whose names rarely appear in the RECORD, but who have their monuments in the statute books; many Senators who rarely appear in debate, do not appeal to popular prejudice or popular passion, who are working day and night with an energy, with an industry, and with an intelligence often impairing their health, giving their best time and mind to what they believe, though knowing they will get no individual credit for it, is for the best interests of the country.

Knowing as I do from intimate study of the action of this committee and of its results, I believe that no committee intrusted with so great a labor and so tremendous a responsibility has ever more faithfully, intelligently, and patriotically performed its work.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] offered his amendment last night, after listening to him—and, in fact, before I heard his speech—it was my full intention to vote for the amendment as presented

by him. I made up my mind to do this in deference to the wishes of the thousands of tobacco growers and cigar makers in the State of Pennsylvania, whose interests are jeopardized, as I think, by the proposition as it originally emanated from the committee.

I made up my mind to vote with the Senator from Wisconsin entirely without reference to the source from which the amendment emanated. I intend to vote on this proposition, as I will vote on every other proposition that comes before the Senate, in accordance with what I believe to be right; and I will vote for it as readily coming from the Senator from Wisconsin as if it came from the Senator from Rhode Island.

But in this instance, Mr. President, the developments of this morning seem to indicate that the Senator from Wisconsin resembles the Irishman who went into a shop and asked the price of a pair of suspenders. "The price is 15 cents." "Fifty cents!" said he. "I will give you 37." The shopkeeper, being an honest man, said: "I did not ask you 50 cents; I asked you 15 cents." "Fifteen cents!" says the Irishman. "Oh, I will give you 10 cents, then."

The Senator from Wisconsin offered an amendment last night which seemed to me to be fair and right, and simply because the proposition of the Senator from Connecticut was below his, and that that proposition has been accepted by the committee, he now proposes to go still lower; and I suppose if his amendment is adopted, he will endeavor to secure from the conference committee another amendment putting it down to fifty or forty million.

I thought for a little while I would be one of the men whom the Senator from Wisconsin, with his characteristic modesty, denominates his followers, but I can not follow him that far down.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate now or at any time with any apologies for or to answer any criticism upon the Committee on Finance or any of its members. This is not only in consonance with my feeling of obligations to the people of the United States and to the Senate and to my party, but it is in consonance with the course which I have followed throughout my public life. There are men whose condemnation is the highest commendation—whose disparagement is a decoration.

My duty here is in reference to this bill, and I desire to say to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT], whose vote and whose voice have from the start betrayed an entire want of confidence in the committee, that in the future, as in the past, the committee will take into consideration the questions which are presented to them by Senators and others, and that they will decide these questions from time to time according to what they believe to be the public interest, following the lines of policy which the party which we represent has adopted, and which the people of the United States have approved, and they will not be deflected a thousandth part of an inch from following their obligation and discharging their duties, as they look upon them, and this without reference as to how it shall affect one Senator or another Senator.

It matters not to us, from our standpoint of the public interest, what the opinion of any individual Senator may be. If any Senator sees fit for any cause to express a want of confidence in the committee, that is the position which he is entitled to take, and there has been no criticism on the part of any member of the committee of the views or the acts of any Senator, and there will not be.

I have had long experience in public life and in service upon many committees, and I want to say now, in justice to the Republican membership of the Committee on Finance, that I have never yet, in my long experience, been in cooperation with, and in conference with, men who have so clearly and positively appreciated their public obligations and who have so unflinchingly followed what they believed to be right as the members of that committee; and this applies to every one of them.

We have never presented matters here for the consideration of our associates or of the Senate that have not had the absolutely unanimous approval of the Republican members of that committee.

It is true that on one or two questions we have had an understanding that the members of the committee would have the right upon the floor to exercise their individual judgment and to express their individual opinions, but upon all the great questions that affect this tariff legislation the Republican members of the committee have been entirely unanimous; and the committee appreciate to the fullest extent the fact that their associates in this body, with a few exceptions, have stood behind them and given them their generous support and ap-

proval. We should be less than human if we did not fully appreciate that support.

We shall continue the same course in the future that we have adopted in the past, and whenever Senators come to us and say that we have made mistakes, errors in judgment, and convince us that changes ought to be made, they will be made, and be made promptly, without reference to criticism or denunciations on the part of any Senator or Senators.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, just a moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, during this entire debate the Senator from Rhode Island frequently refers to the Finance Committee. Of course those of us here perfectly understand that he means the majority of the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think perhaps I did not state clearly, as I should have stated, the fact that I was referring simply to the Republican members of the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. We all understand that here, but possibly when they are debating some other tariff bill some benighted Senator will do us the honor to review these proceedings. I therefore think it well enough once for all to say that except when the Senator from Rhode Island specially declares otherwise his references to the Finance Committee include only the Republican majority of that committee.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the matter of the action of the committee or to take any part in the discussion as to the particular action of the committee this morning. I am not seriously disturbed over the probability of the committee leaving the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin in the air, if it should desire to do so, and I have no idea that they desire to do so.

I merely wanted to say a word in view of the vote which I proposed to cast with reference to the Philippine tariff, both in this bill and the bill which will come later before the Senate. The broad subject which is involved here is our relationship to the Philippine people. I am not going into an extensive discussion of that relationship, or what it ought to be, further than to say that I propose to cast every vote that I do cast here with a view of loosening the bands that ties the Philippine people to the United States Government.

I am aware that when I speak that sentiment I express a view perhaps contrary to the view of the President of the United States, for whose opinion and for whose great service to those people I have a profound regard. Nevertheless, I have a firm conviction that the first duty of the people of the United States is to arrange and prepare those people for separate and independent government and for separate and independent sovereignty.

I do not believe that it is in accordance with the spirit of our Constitution or with the spirit of our institutions that we should continue a policy which must have for its ultimate effect the binding to us of a colonial possession and in a sense a people governed and controlled by colonial policies.

While I must therefore differ to some extent with my party and with the President in these matters, nevertheless, it is a conviction which I can not put aside for mere party policy. I regret that the committee has not seen fit to go further than it has. I regret that the committee has not seen fit to wipe out the clause in the sugar provision with reference to the tariff. I regret very much any step or any movement which would seem to bind these people closer to us, because I believe what they are entitled to and what the interests of the United States demand is a separate and independent sovereignty just as soon as we can give it to them.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry of the honorable Senator from Rhode Island in regard to the effect of this particular amendment.

I think it is generally conceded that the provisions in the bill which permits the introduction of sugar from the Philippine Islands to the extent of 300,000 tons free of duty will represent in duties thus lost to the Government about \$10,000,000. That is not the question I wish to ask the Senator. It is something leading up to it.

We have had this morning read from the desk a communication from those who are engaged in the manufacture of cigars, in which it is stated that the introduction of 150,000,000 cigars from the Philippine Islands free of duty will displace the revenue from a corresponding number of imports to an amount of \$7,500,000. With the number reduced to 70,000,000, if that amendment should be adopted the question I want to ask the Senator is this— [A pause.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator commenced to ask a question some time ago, but I lost sight of the question in his preliminary statement. If he will tell me the question, I will be very glad to answer it.

Mr. BACON. I was proceeding to state it when the Senator deliberately turned his back to talk with some members of the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. All right.

Mr. BACON. I was stating it, and let me say I was not stating it in a manner which the Senator could not have understood if he had paid attention.

Mr. ALDRICH. But the Senator's premises were so contrary to what I understood to be the fact—

Mr. BACON. That simply led up to the other question and was entirely independent of it, except in the relation which they might bear to each other. There was nothing in the first question which made it necessary that the Senator should understand in order that he should reply to the second.

I will repeat it, in response to the Senator's request. I stated the fact, prior to the time when the Senator withdrew his attention from me, that a communication had been read from the desk, sent to the Senator from Wisconsin by some parties engaged in cigar manufacturing, in which it was stated by them that upon a calculation made the estimated value of the duty upon 150,000,000 cigars would be \$7,500,000. With the proposed amendment reducing the number to 70,000,000 cigars, we might say, in round numbers, it would be half that or a little less than half. With that half the corresponding revenue or loss of revenue would be three and a quarter million dollars.

I desire to know of the Senator whether his committee, in fixing this limitation within which there should be a free importation of cigars from the Philippine Islands, estimated the amount of revenue which would be lost by that amount of free importation?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator's question involves so many things he will have to bear with me if he expects an answer. It will take a little time. It is a question which can not be answered categorically.

Mr. BACON. The Senator says there are so many "ifs." I will state it with one "if." Possibly that may be within my power of felicitous expression, I will not say in the power of the Senator to comprehend, because of course everybody knows he does comprehend, and when there is a failure of comprehension on his part the cause is undoubtedly mine. Therefore I will try to state it more simply.

If 70,000,000 cigars are imported free of duty from the Philippine Islands, what is the estimate of the committee as to the loss of revenue to the United States Government upon those 70,000,000 cigars thus freely imported? I hope that is sufficiently plainly expressed.

Mr. ALDRICH. That involves also the same number of "ifs" and "buts," and so forth. For instance, the statement which the Senator refers to shows that in 1908 there were 1,500,000 cigars imported into the United States from the Philippine Islands and the year before 1,300,000, in round numbers. It is an impossible supposition, but suppose that 70,000,000 cigars will ever be imported into the United States from the Philippine Islands, the Senator understands. I suppose, from the start that this is not a question of revenue. Does the Senator suppose that any Senator upon this side of the Chamber would suggest the free importation of cigars or anything else from a foreign country or from territory that was not a part of the territory of the United States? Does the Senator think that this is a question of dealing with the free importation of articles from territory which does not belong to the United States? The question is entirely aside from any of the considerations which he is suggesting.

I remember that years ago I was obliged, by bitter experience at the time, to conclude that a man never loses anything he never had. We may easily enough construct losses in all our individual experiences, to say nothing about losses to the Nation, of things that we never possessed. There is no loss of revenue in this case, because we never had it, and we never could have it to the extent which the Senator is talking about. This is simply and only a question as to how we intend to treat the Filipinos and the Philippine Islands, they now being in our possession, and no suggestion being made which has either the approval of the Congress or the approval of the country to surrender that territory to anybody else. It is whether we shall recognize our obligation to that people and whether we shall try, within proper limits, to give them aid and assistance. That is the whole question which is involved in these amendments.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I may be mistaken in my recollection, but if I am not, the Senator has changed his views in a few years on the question of the free importation of goods from the Philippine Islands.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have never changed my opinion upon that subject. So far as my personal views are concerned, I would go much further than any suggestion which is made in this bill.

Mr. BACON. I presume, after the statement of the Senator, I am undoubtedly mistaken in my recollection that he voted against the removal of duties on importations from the Philippine Islands. I presume that from the Senator's present statement I am incorrect in that recollection. I am not, however, incorrect in my recollection that a majority of the Senator's party in this Chamber did oppose it and defeat it. I supposed that, with the usual dominance of the Senator, he was with the majority in that instance, as he has been in almost all others since.

But, Mr. President, the Senator has replied with a good deal of feeling to a question which I asked for information. I asked it purely for information.

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will excuse me a moment I wanted to know whether or not the Finance Committee had investigated this matter and had come to any conclusion in regard to it. I presumed from the readiness with which the Senator replied to the suggestion as to the amount of revenue lost in the matter of sugar they had considered that and the Senator had the information to give us on that subject. Having considered the question with reference to sugar, I supposed they had also considered it with reference to cigars. I wanted to get information in reference to it, and I asked it with utmost good faith, believing that the Senator could give it.

So far as the question being a matter of discussion about the loss of something we never had, I do not think the Senator is entirely correct in that, for these reasons, if I do not in giving them too much complicate it by again illustrating by sugar and do not call down upon myself the severe criticism of the learned Senator:

There is a certain amount of sugar to be consumed in the United States. The production of sugar in this country is less than our consumption. Consequently the balance must be made up by importation, and if a certain amount of that importation is by artificial means induced to come from the Philippine Islands and is introduced free, it necessarily decreases the amount of the importations from other countries, which do not come in free, and therefore there must necessarily be a loss of revenue to the extent of every pound that comes in from the Philippine Islands free. Now, by way of illustration, I do not know that the illustration would hold in its entirety as controlling the question of the importation of cigars, but it certainly will throw some light upon it.

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, I will then yield with pleasure. There are, of course, very many more cigars consumed in the United States than are produced in the United States. The production is less than the consumption, and the possible production, you might say, is less than the consumption, for the reason that we do not manufacture to a sufficient extent or produce to a sufficient extent the class of tobacco that is made up into cigars.

There are a certain number of millions of cigars to be imported upon which we derive a very handsome revenue in the way of impost duties. If we provide for seventy million of that surplus to come from another country free, of course we decrease to that extent the number of cigars which are to be imported and upon which there would be a duty. Consequently it is not a question of the loss of something which we did not have.

I now yield with pleasure to the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. We import a certain amount of cigars from Cuba and not any particular amount from anywhere else. It is extremely doubtful in my mind whether we shall ever import under any circumstances any considerable amount of cigars from the Philippine Islands. We have imported a million and a half. I think that is the maximum in any one year.

I will say to the Senator, as far as the loss of revenue is concerned, if the cigars which we have ever imported from the Philippine Islands had not been admitted free the loss of revenue on them would have been \$712. The same rule which applies to Cuban cigars to a certain extent and Porto Rican cigars do not now apply to the Philippine cigars. Possibly there may a taste grow up in the United States for Philippine cigars. It never has up to this time. So far as that part of it is con-

cerned, I think we are now only in the dark as to what cigars, if any, will be imported into the United States.

But, as I said before, it is not a question of revenue. It is true that if we should import from the Philippine Islands 300,000 tons of sugar free of duty the country would lose the revenue from that 300,000 tons if it was imported from some country that was obliged to pay a duty, and the amount of that duty is a bonus unquestionably to the producers of sugar in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BACON. The same as if it were taken out of the Treasury?

Mr. ALDRICH. No, sir; because it never was in the Treasury.

Mr. BACON. It would be but for that.

Mr. ALDRICH. That might be. There might be a great many things go into the Treasury if it were not for circumstances.

Mr. BACON. It prevents that amount from going into the Treasury.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is entirely problematical whether there would be any large amount; but whether the amount is large or small, whatever it is, is a bonus to the sugar producers of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BACON. Of course.

Mr. ALDRICH. In other words, it is an encouragement to people who are under the United States flag and inhabiting territory belonging to the United States. That is all of the proposition.

Whether the aid or assistance or encouragement proposed goes too far or not every Senator must decide for himself; but I can not conceive of any Senator of the United States, with the obligations which we are under to that people, who would not only be willing, but anxious, to do everything possible to encourage those people to develop their industries, to put them on the road to self-government, which is what we are all after, I take it.

Now, that is the whole proposition. I can conceive that a Senator might think we were doing too much or too little, but I can not conceive any Member of the American Senate not feeling that we must do something, and do as much as possible, in that direction.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator by his remarks opens considerations that I did not intend to enter upon at all. The Senator and I were both in the Senate at the time the question came up as to whether we should deprive that people of the right to govern themselves and whether we should take possession of them and hold them as a conquered province. Upon one side of that question was the Senator from Rhode Island; upon the other side of it, whether my efforts were feeble or otherwise, was myself; and it will always be to me a source of personal gratification that by no word or vote of mine was that great wrong done to that people or was that great injury done to the United States.

I am not going into it now; we have thrashed it over in the Senate in the years past, and I am willing to stand on the record. I echo every word the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] this morning said on this subject. I think the words of the Senator from Rhode Island as to the desire of this people to put the Filipino people on their feet, that they might be forwarded in self-government, are not consistent with the vote which the Senator cast yesterday afternoon or last night—I have forgotten which.

Mr. ALDRICH. On what?

Mr. BACON. On the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], which simply committed ourselves to the proposition that we would do this in time. It is true it said not exceeding fifteen years; and, Mr. President, when those who profess to wish that the Filipinos shall enjoy an independent government put it in the indefinite, distant future, generations ahead, and they go forward to tighten the bonds which tie us to that country, professions of an intention to turn them loose do not amount to anything. There can be no Senator in the sound of my voice who does not know the fact that if we tie that country, whether by innumerable commercial bonds, innumerable bonds of interest with those in this country who will be influential to see that their interests are there protected and fostered and advanced, the day will never come when we will be rid of what I consider to be, so far as concerns the United States, a very body of death. So far as the interests of this country are concerned, it is a monumental injustice, perpetrated by a Government based upon free institutions, which tie us to a people every impulse of every man of which is for freedom and for independence.

But, Mr. President, I am not going to discuss that now. I did not rise for the purpose of starting anything of that kind; I was

impressed by the fact, Mr. President, that while we might permit that people to work out their own salvation, as they ought to do, we are in what I consider to be a false pretense, extending to them alleged benefits at a time when we are but forging all the stronger the manacles which shall enslave them forever.

It has been suggested to me, in response to the statement of the Senator, that the importations of cigars from the Philippines are so very small as to amount to nothing; if it be true that the small importations from that country do not give promise of any larger importation, why fix the limit at 70,000,000, or 60,000,000, or 50,000,000, unless it is expected that that limit is to be reached?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, for the same reason that we are extending this aid in every direction which presents the possibility or probability of use. It may be true, as I said, that the taste may grow up in this country for Philippine cigars or Philippine tobacco.

Mr. BACON. I want to say something in regard to that matter. I am glad the Senator mentioned it, because I was about to forget it.

I am not now addicted to the weed, except a very occasional indulgence; but the time was when I was a regular smoker, and I have smoked, to a considerable extent, Philippine cigars. I have smoked them in the islands, and I have smoked them when they have been sent to me from the islands. I want to say to the Senator that they are, according to my taste, a very desirable cigar—a cigar, I believe, that could be made extremely popular in this country if it should be generally introduced.

The question as to the amount which has been introduced in the past when a tariff existed is not an index as to what will be the amount imported when there is no tariff upon it. If the importation is not to be increased, then it is not going to give any such benefit to the Filipinos as the Senator promises; and if it is to be introduced, then it does come to the question of the displacement of an amount of importation from other countries where we would have import duties.

It was not with a view to any argument of this question that I made the inquiry of the honorable Senator, but in good faith I wanted to know if the Finance Committee, represented by its majority membership, when they brought in here an amendment limiting the amount of importations to 150,000,000 cigars, had considered the question, if the 150,000,000 cigars which are thus permitted free should be imported, what would be the loss of revenue to the Government? We are certainly entitled to that information.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. When it was reduced to 70,000,000, I wanted to know if the committee had considered it.

Mr. ALDRICH. It would be impossible for any man to make a mathematical calculation on a matter of speculation.

Mr. BACON. Certainly, not with accuracy.

Mr. ALDRICH. You can not do it with approximate accuracy; there are so many different conditions which affect the rate, for instance, which would be imposed on cigars—their value, their size. There is an infinite variety of conditions.

The Senator can make that mathematical calculation himself as well as I can. He knows what the duties are on cigars, I take it, and he knows that we must take a certain amount, but it is entirely a matter of calculation whether the number is one million or two million or fifty million or sixty million or seventy million. If there are seventy million of a certain character imported, one could state what the duty would be. But that is not the question involved here at all.

Mr. BACON. I think both questions are involved.

Mr. ALDRICH. All right; the Senator has a right to his own opinion. He is as good a mathematician as I am. He can calculate with equal facility with myself as to how many would be imported and what the duty would be if not admitted free.

Mr. BACON. I should like to say to the Senator that his reply to me is one which he could have made to any question for information which any Senator could have propounded to him in the progress of this debate as to probable revenue. Yet the Senator stood in his place right where he now sits and figured out, I think, to a 50-cent piece what was to be the revenue from this entire bill. He could have with great propriety turned to the Senate and said, "Why should I give you any such information? You are all good mathematicians; take a pencil and paper and figure it out for yourselves."

Mr. ALDRICH. In estimating the revenue I did not estimate any revenue from free importations.

Mr. BACON. No; I said the entire revenue under this bill; I did not say from free importations. I have been handed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] the statement which the Senator from Rhode Island made on the 14th of June, which

was yesterday. There the Senator made a precise statement as to sugar, and I can not understand how there can be any more difficulty in the matter of estimating regarding cigars than there is as to the matter regarding sugar. On page 3180 of the RECORD the Senator from Rhode Island is reported to have said yesterday:

Mr. President, this proposition is practically to pay the sugar producers of the Philippine Islands a bounty of about 1.63 cents per pound.

That, I am told by the Senator from Nevada, is \$10,000,000 annually on 300,000 tons. That is what I had understood. Of course, though, that is not the question now. We are not now on the sugar question; we are on the cigar question.

I want to say this, and very frankly: When the question of annexing foreign land, tropical land, was involved in the votes which we had in the Senate eleven years ago, I recollect saying that while I was not a protectionist, and I am not, that while I do not believe in the principle or in the practice, I was not in favor of going out and hunting up countries in the world for the purpose of having them come into competition with the productions of our own country and in competition with the industries of our own country. That view of it I have now. I do not believe in a protective tariff, nor do I believe in taking the Philippine Islands and encouraging industries there with the undoubted and necessary effect of bringing them into competition with industries in this country.

I think it is true the Senator has no anticipation of the introduction of any 70,000,000 cigars. Then this limitation ought not to be put at that rate. If it is true that there are to be only one or two million cigars imported, we ought to have a limitation, if any at all, which would be corresponding in amount.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the papers which have been read show the anticipations on the part of cigar makers that the amount will be greatly in excess of 150,000,000.

Mr. BACON. Then, Mr. President, why should the Senator, or why should the Senate—possibly they are synonymous terms, so far as the question of what shall be done in this bill is concerned—why should the Senate unduly alarm and disturb a large body of our citizenry by the fixing of a limitation which they think will be reached, and which, if reached, will be of great disadvantage to them at a time when the Senator says that there is no possibility that it will be reached or any prospect of it?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, it is very difficult for me at times to understand the reasoning of the Senator from Georgia. He is now expressing great alarm, which seems to affect him seriously, that there may be importations into the United States to the disadvantage of some workmen in the United States. That alarm has not been expressed heretofore on any of these schedules, so far as I have heard, either by his voice or by his vote.

Mr. BACON. The Senator is undoubtedly mistaken.

Mr. ALDRICH. Now, he picks out the wards of the United States, the people to whom we are under the greatest obligations, and suddenly becomes a protectionist.

Mr. HEYBURN. Not under obligations.

Mr. ALDRICH. Well, we have obligations to them. We have the greatest obligations. Suddenly the Senator from Georgia becomes a great protectionist—

Mr. BACON. No; the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. ALDRICH. And, with the greatest anxiety in his voice, he appeals to us to save the workmen of the United States from the competition of somebody. Now, I hope the Senator will, in the consideration of this bill, extend that sympathy to workmen employed in other industries in the United States, and by his voice and his vote try to save those workmen from competition in every direction.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator is entirely mistaken. I have not changed in any particular. I am still opposed to levying a tax on importations for the purpose of benefiting private industries, no matter who may be the beneficiaries under such a tax. At the same time, while I repeat that that is true, I am not so indifferent to those industries that I am in favor of going out to the islands of the sea for the purpose of fostering industries and bringing them into competition, unnecessarily, with our own.

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will pardon me a moment. I have not got through. I heard him through with great patience, and waited until he took his seat before I began to reply.

Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island says that I have shown indifference to the question of the laboring men in this country. The difference between the Senator and myself in that regard is this: We take a broader view of the interest

of the laboring men. This entire tariff legislation, although there are some pretenses to a more enlarged view, when properly analyzed is in the interest of a very small percentage of the laboring men of the United States. All these schedules, which are not deceptive delusions, are for men engaged in certain lines of industry, which constitute, in the number of those engaged, I think, possibly one-twentieth of the others engaged in the industries of the United States, certainly not over a tenth of those who are actually engaged in them, and all the other nine-tenths of those laboring men have to pay tribute in order that these men may have increased wages, and, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] said two or three days ago, that they may have a bill of fare equal to that furnished by the best hotel in Washington City.

Mr. President, some of us on this floor represent a large number of the laboring class, who contribute very much by their labors to the wealth of this country, who get not one dollar of benefit under this bill, but who have imposed upon them burdens, which they bear every hour of the day and of the night, in order that others may reap that which they have not sown. As the Senator from Montana said, he wants a high tariff on raw wool in order that the sheep herder of Montana shall have \$40 a month of wages, and board equal to that at the New Willard; wages which the legitimate profits of their business will not give them, and board which the legitimate profits of their business will not afford to them, but to secure which they must tax the men who labor in the cotton fields. They are the men, Mr. President, as well as millions of others in other employments, about whom we are concerned. We are concerned as to the whole country, but we absolutely protest against a policy which seeks to tax nine-tenths of the people in order that one-tenth may have that which the legitimate rewards of their labor will not give to them.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. The arguments and theories of the Senator from Georgia belong to past and forgotten ages.

Mr. BACON. Well, the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think not. Now, let us see. There is not a protectionist or a man who defends the protective policy in the United States, or anywhere else that I know of, who does not defend it as a national policy. If the policy of protection does not give wages to all of the laboring people of the United States engaged in all of the industries in every vocation, then it is indefensible.

Mr. BACON. Then, it is without defense, if the Senator from Rhode Island depends upon that defense of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I say, without hesitation, that every wage-earner in the United States gets the advantage; that it is a national policy; that it raises the general scale of wages; that it enables our people to live in a better and more comfortable way. That is what the doctrine of protection is. It is not for the people who are engaged in any specific industry.

Does the Senator think that a boiler maker or a man who is running an engine in a protected manufactory will get greater wages than the man who is running an engine across the street in some other enterprise that is not protected? Certainly we have never advanced any such doctrine as that. We hold no such doctrine as that. The Senator from Georgia is setting up a man of straw which nobody on this side has ever claimed existed. We have no such idea about it at all.

We ask the Senator from Georgia to join us in the protective policy for the benefit of the men who are working in the cotton fields in his State, for the benefit of the men who are raising cotton in his own State, in order that they may have this higher scale of wages which the protective policy makes possible in the United States. We ask him to join with us in the protective policy—he, of course, politely declines—because it enables the people of Georgia, as well as the people of my State, to live more comfortably and more in consonance with our ideas of the way that civilized people ought to live.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island is too well informed a man for me to give him credit for sincerity when he says that the protective-tariff system is a benefit to the man who produces cotton, the man who labors in the field producing cotton, or the man who employs labor producing cotton. I will tell the Senator how the protective tariff benefits the man who raises cotton. The Senator from Rhode Island knows the fact that the protective tariff does not affect the price of cotton. The price of cotton is fixed in the free markets of the world, and no duty which could be put upon cotton would advance the price of cotton. As I have said in this Chamber,

if you were to put \$10 a pound upon cotton, it would not increase the price of cotton in this country a fraction of a hundredth part of a mill.

Of course, Mr. President, those who are engaged in the production of any article must have their wages measured by the value of the article which they produce and by the profit which may be made in its production. While it is true that the protective tariff does not in the slightest degree enhance the wages of a man engaged in the production of cotton, or the profits of the man who employs the laborer engaged in the production of cotton, it is also true that the so-called "benefits" that the protective tariff confers upon the man engaged in the production of cotton are the benefits of tremendous and burdensome taxation upon every article which he has to use in the production of that cotton.

It is even now grown to be considered to be a tremendous favor, if the small amount of revenue, which is to be derived from fertilizers, is to be remitted in his favor. Senators are not willing even that there should be the small concession of free bagging and ties; but upon every piece of harness, upon every piece of machinery, upon every trace chain, upon every vehicle and tool and implement, upon everything which is used outside of what he can make upon the farm in the way of food, there is an immense tax, which the farmers have to pay, and on account of which they receive no reciprocal benefit whatever. On account of this tariff tax the cotton farmer must pay two prices for all these things. And this is not only true of the cotton growers, but in greater or less degree of all others in the United States engaged in agriculture.

Mr. President, I want to say one word in regard to what the Senator from Rhode Island says about his State. Whenever you impose a protective-tariff system under which the direct benefits go to those who are engaged in manufacturing, and where it is a matter merely of theory as to whether or not anybody else gets any reciprocal or resulting indirect benefits, if it is true under these conditions that there is in one part of the country great concentration of manufacturing enterprises and a comparatively small amount of it in the other parts of the country, the necessary result of it is that in the country at large, and from the people at large, there is a tremendous revenue gathered for the benefit of those engaged in manufacturing, and all of it poured into the particular section where this manufacturing interest is concentrated.

Mr. President, take these schedules or the schedules of any protective tariff, and figure out honestly and sincerely what benefits the agricultural classes get under it and what benefits the manufacturing classes get under it, and then, when you have arrived at the conclusion, which is inevitable, that the manufacturing classes get immeasurably the greater benefit—when you go a step further and show that while they get the greater benefit, they are so concentrated in one particular section that they get almost the entire benefit, and the agricultural classes, spread over the country, bearing the burdens, getting no benefit, it is no wonder, Mr. President, that New England is solid for the protective tariff. I should like to know how much of agricultural interest there is in New England. Almost her entire industries are the protected industries of the country. It is true, as the Senator says, that it is not limited to the man who is engaged in making a boiler, upon which there is a protective tariff, but that it extends to another across the street making something else; but it unfortunately happens that that other something else is also protected, and the man who is not protected, and can not in the nature of things be protected, has to be taxed to pay them both.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BACON. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. I would say to the Senator that the people of New England, a large portion of whom are employed in the so-called "protected industries," consume between five and six million barrels of western flour each year, and every bushel of corn, of barley, and of oats, and every pound of beef that they consume comes from the farmers of the West.

Mr. BACON. Oh, yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, I submit to the Senator that the farmers, after all, are getting a good deal of benefit out of the fact that the operatives in the mills of New England are being kept employed. I will say to the Senator that the consumption of flour in the six New England States, under a tariff law that destroyed to a large extent our industries, was reduced one-half, and the farmer suffered to that extent because of the legislation of the Senator's party a few years ago.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island spoke of an antiquated argument. I should like to know if there is one more hoary with age and one that would be gray, if it were not baldheaded, than the argument just suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire as to the market furnished by the manufacturing industries to agricultural products. Of course I understand that the Senator will not—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will answer it, I should be very happy to hear his answer. If he thinks that the people of New England, consuming the products of the western farmer, are not doing something toward benefiting the western farmer, I should like to know the logic of the Senator on that point.

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, while this hoary-headed argument is advanced with so much confidence, I should like to know what would become of the products of the manufacturing classes if the agriculturists were not there to take them and use them?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it is a reciprocal matter.

Mr. BACON. Of course it is, Mr. President, so far as that is concerned; but the difference is that the farmer sells his product to the manufacturer at its real value, while he is compelled to buy the products of the manufacturer at artificial, high prices, and there are ten agriculturists to where there is one manufacturer.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is mistaken about that. If he means merely manufacturers, that is true; but if he means employees, it is not quite correct.

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, I have not got the statistics before me now, and I do not speak with accuracy, but of course we all know that very much the larger proportion is in favor of the agricultural classes as opposed to the manufacturing classes, even including their employees.

But, Mr. President, I had no expectation of doing anything more when I rose than to ask information from the Senator from Rhode Island. I am sorry I can not get it. I should like to know very much if the 150,000,000 or 70,000,000 cigars which are to be imported from the Philippine Islands—whether or not the Finance Committee, or the majority members of it, have made any estimate as to the amount of revenue which would be represented—I will put it in this way for the Senator—by a corresponding importation from some country where there is a duty imposed?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, perhaps it will inform the Senator if I say that the duty on cigars is four dollars and a half and 25 per cent ad valorem; and perhaps he may be able to tell us what that would be on a thousand Philippine cigars. I am not able to do so at present. It depends entirely upon how much they weigh and various other things in connection with them.

I do not intend to be led into a discussion of the general question of protection, but I will say to the Senator from Georgia that it can be established beyond the slightest doubt that the people engaged in agricultural pursuits in the United States are the principal beneficiaries of the protective policy. It is proximity to profitable markets which is the basis of the protective system.

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, that is something, of course, that requires a good deal of argument on both sides, and would occupy more time than could be now properly devoted to it. It certainly does not apply to those engaged in the production of cotton, which keeps the balance of trade in this country and has kept it for forty years, and without which it would have been against us most if not all the time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. I have finished. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I merely wish to state, Mr. President, that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has inquired of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] what amount of duty would be lost to the Treasury of the United States by permitting the free importation of 70,000,000 of Filipino cigars. The Senator from Rhode Island was unable to give an estimate, or, at all events, did not give an estimate. The Senator from Rhode Island was able to give an accurate estimate of the amount that would be lost to the Treasury of the United States by the bounty on their sugar to the Filipino producers. I quote from his language of yesterday at page 3180 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, this proposition is practically to pay the sugar producers of the Philippine Islands a bounty of about 1.68 cents per pound.

One and sixty-eight one-hundredths cents per pound means a little less than \$35 a ton, and that rate on 300,000 tons would be

\$10,000,000 in bounty, as the Senator from Rhode Island states, to the Philippine producers. That amount is lost to our National Treasury as the duty paid upon the importations of foreign sugar and is turned over to the Philippine producers.

With reference to cigars, an equally accurate estimate can be made by the Senator from Rhode Island. The duty upon cigars is \$4.50 per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem. The table which the Senator from Rhode Island has prepared states that the total ad valorem duty on cigars is 151 per cent. The action, then, of the committee proposes to take this duty out of the National Treasury and to turn it over as a bounty to the Filipino producers of cigars. Certainly four dollars and a half per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem would amount at least to 5 cents on each cigar, for 100 cigars must weigh approximately a pound; so that 5 cents on 70,000,000 cigars would be three and a half million of dollars lost to the National Treasury and paid over as a bounty to the Filipino producers.

TO WHOM WILL THE BOUNTY BE PAID.

Now, I wish to remark regarding the Filipino producers that this bounty is not paid to the humble worker who makes the cigars, but it is paid to the great combination in the Philippine Islands that has practically the control of the cigar industry there, just as the Bocks have the control of the cigar industry in Cuba. Those who have been to the Philippine Islands will recall the fact that there is an immense building in the city of Manila, the largest and most valuable building there, devoted entirely to the business of the great tobacco combination and trust organized under the Spanish law, which had a monopoly practically of the tobacco business before our occupation, and which has continued it since. So that the action proposed by the committee means that \$10,000,000 of sugar duties will be taken from the Federal Treasury and turned over, not to the workers upon the sugar plantations, but to the big planters owning large tracts of land, and probably to the sugar trust itself, which will ultimately monopolize the cultivation and production of sugar in the Philippines if it shall prove profitable, as they are now doing in Cuba. It will also take three and a half million of dollars out of the National Treasury, which otherwise would go there as duties upon 70,000,000 of cigars, and pay that over, not to the workers, but to this great tobacco combination. I ask how much of it will filter through the hands of these great combinations and into the pockets of the Filipino workmen, the common men, the peasants, whom these bounties are intended to benefit and whose education and advancement and prosperity it is intended to promote?

I call attention to the fact that in cigars and sugar alone we are to give annual bounties of over \$13,000,000 to these great interests. Would it not be better, instead of doing that, to consider direct aid to the Philippine Commission itself, either in the shape of a bond issue or of a direct appropriation, that will enable them to go right down to the class of people whom it is intended to benefit, and train them in agricultural and industrial pursuits, and let them receive the benefit of this bounty, instead of the favored interests?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will yield in just a moment. I call attention to the fact that this bounty is not for one year; it is for twenty years; it is for all time if those islands remain in our perpetual occupation; and during twenty years the total sum taken from the Federal Treasury and paid to special interests will amount to \$300,000,000, or approximately that; and that by direct aid—involving only a tithe of that expenditure, only a few million dollars annually, and expended wisely by the Philippine Commission itself—in the advancement of the agricultural methods of the common people themselves would do more to train those people, to give them an education, and to train them in habits of industry and improved methods of production, than to turn this money over to the great combinations and the employers of these people, who are simply serfs attached to the soil.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to ask the Senator, if he has the knowledge—and I think he has—have the Filipinos advanced since the conquest intellectually or in a material sense? If so, how much does the Senator think they have advanced?

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is very difficult for me to say, from the casual observation I had there during a six weeks' or a two months' experience; but I should say, from my observation and from what I heard whilst there, that the Filipino children are quite apt at learning; that they are quite apt in learning the English language; and that they are quite apt in acquiring new methods. There is a disposition among them, I must

say, to avoid labor, as there is amongst white people in that hot climate; and whenever they get a little education, the disposition is to drift away from manual labor into clerical and other pursuits.

Mr. HEYBURN. Will the Senator permit me further?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. Had they advanced in material prosperity as a people at the time the Senator had an opportunity to observe them?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should judge they had not improved much materially from what I saw at the time and from what I heard and from the representations which we have received since from the commission.

Mr. HEYBURN. Will the Senator permit me to inquire whether or not, in his judgment, this bill would benefit the Filipinos?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not think it would benefit the masses of people themselves; I think that it would promote these great interests; I think they would absorb the profit; and I think the masses of the people would get very little of this proposed bounty.

Mr. HEYBURN. Would they be injured by the provisions of this bill in their material prosperity?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Injured only in one way. I should say that if we stimulate production in those islands by giving them the prices of this country, prices double the world's prices, and accustom them to such prices, then, if we should conclude to let them go, they would have to drop down to the world's prices, and no man can measure the industrial collapse that would be caused in those islands by the change. For instance, in this country they will get 4 cents a pound for their sugar under this arrangement. At Hongkong they can only get 2 cents. When we should part with them, they would be compelled to fall back to the Hongkong price, the price which sustains Java and which sustains other sugar-producing countries. The Senator can understand that the collapse would be a very serious one.

Mr. HEYBURN. Would this larger use of money tend in any way to elevate the grade or character of the lives of those people?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I can not understand how it would. I am inclined to think that if you give the great interests that are employed in production there \$15,000,000 or so annually out of the National Treasury as a subsidy it will be reflected perhaps in a partial increase in the prosperity of the masses of the people; but I have no doubt that the mass of this money will be absorbed by the great employers themselves, and that little of it will accrue to the benefit of the people. I am talking now about the comparative efficiency of the aid given to those islands. If we have in view a philanthropic purpose there of aiding the people themselves, so that ultimately they will become prosperous and self-supporting, the thing to do is to aid them directly.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment, I was in some doubt whether the Senator's plea was on behalf of the Filipinos or the American Government, and I wanted to ascertain, if I could, whether or not it would elevate or depress the standard of the civilization of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is impossible for me to say that the increased expenditure of bounty of nearly \$15,000,000 to the producers of sugar and to the great combinations that control the tobacco there will not to some degree benefit the employees of those great industries. I would not deny that. But I say the degree is entirely inconsequential when you compare the largeness of the bounty with the results obtained, and I contend if we are disposed to enter upon a philanthropic work of giving these people \$15,000,000 annually in order to increase the prosperity of the masses of the people, there is a much more effective and a much more economical way.

I should be glad to avoid it myself; I should be glad to entirely administer the Philippines with their own revenues; but we know now that those islands are comparatively poverty stricken; that they are almost worthless; that the total exports do not exceed \$32,000,000 annually; that the total revenue is only \$17,000,000, a sum hardly adequate to support the municipal administration of the District of Columbia. The whole revenue, insular and municipal, amounts to only \$17,000,000. At the rate of \$5 a head, if you propose to educate 2,000,000 children in those islands, it would take \$10,000,000 annually, two-thirds of the entire revenue.

You have entered upon an impossible task in endeavoring to train those people in a common language and to train them in industrial pursuits with the small revenue of those islands, and

you will have to abandon the task or else you will have to increase the amount of money with which it is to be done.

Now, those alternatives being before you, I contend that this sugar and tobacco bounty is the most expensive and costly and ineffective way of giving aid to the Filipino people.

Mr. DANIEL. Before the Senator from Nevada sits down I should like to ask him if there is any idea of this tobacco coming here paying revenue taxes to the Government?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Here?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not know how that is.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understand, it will be free from the tariff tax. How about the revenue tax?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not know. The Senator will have to inquire of some one else.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], in his very able remarks on the Philippine Islands, reminds me a little of the man who was going into the egg business. He had a hundred hens, counted on a hundred eggs every day, and had his wealth all figured out. So with the Senator from Nevada. He has all this sugar and tobacco coming from the Philippines each year and the natives growing rich. Just like the egg man. The Senator, in referring to the fact that the islands will send 300,000 tons of sugar and 70,000,000 cigars here annually, knows from a personal visit to those islands that that is practically impossible, and that it could not be made possible within the next fifteen or twenty years.

The tobacco of that country will never come into competition with the tobacco of this country; and I say that because I have a knowledge of tobacco, having had experience when I was a young man in buying leaf tobacco. When the tobacco was submitted, as the Senator knows, to the party that visited the Philippine Islands, it was found to be of an inferior quality. It is fit scarcely for a filler and for a very few wrappers, and the character of the cigars made is such that they will never be smoked in any large quantities by the people of this country.

If I were representing here a constituency such as that, say from Connecticut, I would welcome the coming in of leaf tobacco from the Philippine Islands. Why? Because it would make a market for our wrapper.

The Senator knows, as well as any man can possibly know from a personal visit, that with the appliances for growing and producing sugar there, which are most unprogressive, as he has admitted, the islands can not in the next fifteen years produce sugar enough to ever send over the amount we provide in this bill.

I wish to say just this, while I am on my feet. I do not want to take the time of the Senate, because so much of it is being wasted that I am ashamed even to rise in my seat. The country is clamoring for us to stop talking. It is praying for us to act. I desire to emphasize this all I can. I intend to vote for everything to come in from the Philippine Islands as I would from Arizona or Alaska. They either belong to us, they are either a part of us, or they are not. I believe they are a part of us, and anything they have to sell they have the same right to send to this country as Alaska or any other Territory has. That will be the reason for my vote upon all these propositions.

We have large cigar-manufacturing establishments in my city, my home place. We make the noted stogie that is known the world over, and I am not afraid to go to my people and show them that we are not injuring the cigar maker because we are admitting these cigars from the Philippine Islands, because I believe they have just the same right to come into competition with the cigars of my city as the cigars from any other State in this Union have. Consequently, I make this statement, so that it may be known when I vote that I am not doing it to injure any industry or to put any man out of employment, but because I believe those people have the same right that the people of any other Territory have.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I wish to record my dissent both from the proposition of the Senator from Wisconsin and from the reduction in the amount of cigars to be admitted free from the Philippine Islands, to which the committee has now given its assent.

I regret that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] should have for so long a period changed the discussion of this question into a question of the committee, and I reject his suggestion that a vote which does not agree with the conclusions of the committee is a vote of want of confidence.

I do not doubt, sir, that the committee reached the conclusion which they have announced this morning upon the most painstaking and sincere consideration. Personally, I do not agree with that conclusion. There are many cigar makers in

my own State who have expressed to me the same opinions which have been contained in the letters and memorials read from the desk deprecating any interference with the prosperity of the cigar-making trade in the United States.

I would not injure the cigar makers of New York or of any other State, but, in my opinion, sir, they are mistaken in supposing that the passage of the pending measure in its full and original proportions would be any real injury to them. It appears by the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the year 1908 that there has been a large and steady increase in the production of cigars in the United States since the year 1898. That increase has been, notwithstanding the introduction of cigars from Porto Rico, without the payment of duty.

Bear with me, sir, while I read the figures which show the increase. There were produced in the United States of cigars in 1898, 4,915,000,000; in 1899, 5,531,000,000; in 1900, 6,176,000,000; in 1901, 6,914,000,000; in 1902, 6,907,000,000; in 1903, 7,308,000,000; in 1904, 7,376,000,000; in 1905, 7,551,000,000; in 1906, 8,137,000,000; in 1907, 8,376,000,000.

I do not believe, sir, that the prosperity and growth of the United States have yet come to an end. Our population will continue to increase; our wealth will continue to increase; our purchasing power will continue to increase, and this steady, natural, normal growth will continue.

What this measure in its full and original form proposed to do was to permit the tobacco raisers of the Philippine Islands to send to the United States a quantity of cigars which at its maximum could never equal the actual and regular increase in the consumption of cigars in this country for one single year.

Mr. President, there can be from this measure, even after the long course of years has brought it to the fullest development that is possible, no injury to the cigar makers of the United States. The utmost that it can do would be to take over to the Filipinos a part of the possible increase in the cigar business that is to come in the future.

Mr. President, we have some duties to the Filipinos. I am sure no Member of this body really desires to bring about a separation between the Philippine Islands and the United States by making our administration of the government of those islands a failure, by making the guardianship of the United States the cause of injury rather than of benefit, the cause of disaster and poverty rather than of prosperity and growth.

The die is cast, Mr. President, upon which we have the responsibility for the Philippine Islands. No action of ours can reverse it. The good faith, the good name, the honor of the American people are all pledged to lead the people of the islands on by paths of growing prosperity and capacity for government to the point where they will be capable of supporting and governing themselves.

We can not fulfill that high duty by giving them money, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] would have us do. Gifts of money tend to reduce the independence of individual character. We can not fulfill that duty by making the islands unsuccessful in business, by retarding and confining their industry. We can fulfill it only by giving to them the opportunities to grow in habits of industry, to grow in the building up of national pride and national power, to grow in the accumulation of property and the diffusion of wealth, lying at the foundation of civilization. We can fulfill that duty only by making the people of the Philippines at once prosperous and intelligent.

Mr. President, we are now proposing in this measure to provide that all the products of the United States shall be admitted into the Philippine Islands free of duty. We are proposing to take to ourselves the benefit of the free introduction of our products into that gateway of the trade of the Orient. We had already proposed that in return for that benefit to ourselves we should admit their products free of duty, but with a limitation upon their great products of sugar and tobacco at such a point that, in the judgment of the Members of the House of Representatives, no injury whatever would be done to the American sugar and tobacco producers. We are now proposing to cut in two, and more than cut in two, the remnant that the original measure allowed to be introduced from the Philippines into the United States free of duty in return for the introduction of all our products into the Philippines free of duty.

Why, Mr. President, do we not go on and say to the Filipinos, "You shall take all of our products free of duty, and we will take none of yours without imposing upon them a duty." Ah, sir, we have the power. By the fortune of war the supreme, the irresistible power of this great Nation has been set over the weak and distracted people of the Philippines. But the possession of power carries with it an obligation that rises

above all considerations of trade, all considerations of particular and of selfish interests—an obligation that we must recognize. If we do not, dishonor is the name of America. Terrible and arbitrary power that we exercise over these poor people, and they are helpless! They must accept our words.

I for one, sir, am not willing to vote for a bill which, in my judgment, secures this great and powerful Nation an undue advantage over the weak people of the Philippine Islands; and I am against the reduction, whether the Senator from Wisconsin or all the committees of the Senate approve it; and I shall vote against it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I ask the Senator from New York whether his proposal for training the Philippine people in self-government also involves ultimate independence, and, if so, when, in his judgment, that can be attained?

Mr. ROOT. I will cheerfully answer the Senator from Nevada. My proposal to train the people of the Philippine Islands to the capacity for self-government involves the expectation and the belief that the time will come when they will be able to assume relations to the United States quite similar to those that now exist between Cuba and the United States, probably not precisely identical, because the conditions must necessarily differ, but that the people of the Philippine Islands shall assume toward the United States such a relation that they will exercise the privilege and the right of self-government under the protecting care of the Government of the United States.

It may be that at some day in the far distant future they will be able to maintain themselves without that care, but I think that that period must be regarded as too far in the future to be made the subject of consideration or discussion now.

As to the question when, I do not think, sir, it will be possible for the people of the Philippine Islands to reach such capacity for self-government as to make them able to go alone, even with the protection of the United States, during the life of the present generation or until a new generation and, perhaps, more than one new generation, has been trained up under the influences of education and with observation of the practice of constitutional governments which they now have before them in those islands.

Mr. President, nations in their development move slowly. The rules to be applied to them are not those which we apply to human life. It is impossible to develop a people from the civilization of one century to the civilization of future centuries in a few months or a few years. Self-government does not come by nature. It is a matter of development of character, and the development of character among a people is slow and laborious.

I believe, sir, that we have now upon us a duty we can not escape, but must perform, and that we shall be engaged in the performance of that duty, doubtless with many protests and many expressions of dissatisfaction, but with a fine, faithful, and loyal purpose on the part of the American people, after the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from New York shall have passed off the scene of action. I do not look to its accomplishment during the lives of any who are within the hearing of my voice, but it will be accomplished, and I am not one of those, sir, who think that my country will be the worse for the performance of this great act of unselfish altruism, which befits the mission of liberty and justice to the poor and the weak of the earth that is a part of our heritage from our fathers.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I will further ask the Senator from New York whether within the last twenty years or more, in the contention which has taken place amongst the great and powerful nations of the world for the Asiatic trade, he knows of an instance where any power obtaining territory, port concessions, or other favors or concessions of that character, has sought to exercise its power in such a way as to exclude from the territory controlled by it the accustomed trade of other nations. Is this effort made by us for a reciprocal arrangement with our own dependency, which we hold in trust for the Filipino people, to secure a favored arrangement for ourselves, which permits our imports into the Philippine Islands free, and to cut out the trade with other nations with those islands, now constituting over three-fourths of the Philippine imports, justified at a time when the United States is demanding that the policy of the open door should be maintained in China, and that no nation, whatever readjustment it may make with China, whatever status it may obtain in any port, whatever control it may acquire over any territory there, shall grant such a readjustment or secure such control in a way to interfere with the open door to all nations? I ask the Senator whether the policy which we propose to inaugurate there is consistent with the pretensions of our country in China?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I have never heard any one question the right of any government to determine itself what the

tariff dues should be upon imports into its own territory. That, sir, is not the open-door question. The "open door" is a phrase that is used as an equivalent for the proposition that no country should undertake to secure advantages in trade in the territory of any other country to the exclusion or detriment of still other nations. Its immediate application was to the Empire of China, in which a number of countries were securing concessions and establishing spheres of influence. It was apprehended a few years ago that those countries would seek in the concessions and within the spheres of influence to secure preferential advantages to the exclusion of other countries. It was against that that the open-door policy was directed, and not for a moment against the right, the privilege, the propriety of any country, or every country, fixing its own tariff dues around its own territories as it saw fit.

We have never questioned and, so far as I know, no one has ever questioned, the right of China to impose tariff duties at all her ports. Indeed this country is under a treaty with China which will naturally and necessarily lead to an increase of the duties of China at all her ports. But, sir, what we objected to, and what the countries of the western world agreed to and what the countries of the West and the East have now agreed to, is that no other country should secure over any part of the territory of China a preference which would close the door to her neighbors.

Mr. President, it follows that, whether wise or unwise, the establishment, as between the United States and the Philippine Islands, of a tariff arrangement stands on the same basis as the establishment between the United States and Porto Rico of a tariff arrangement. It is upon the same basis as the establishment between the United States and Hawaii of a tariff arrangement. We determine for ourselves what shall be the tariff duties upon the admission of goods to our territory, and we do not question the right of every other country in the world to determine for itself what shall be the tariff dues upon the admission of goods to its territory.

Mr. NEWLANDS obtained the floor.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator from Nevada to allow a vote to be taken on this proposition. If we shall proceed to discuss and consider every phase of every international question which may be involved with any country in the world, we shall not pass the bill this year. I hope the Senator from Nevada will allow a vote to be taken upon this proposition.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I prefer to reply now to the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. Root]. I shall be, of course, mindful of the desire of the Senator from Rhode Island for an early vote upon the amendment.

As I understand the Senator from New York, he proposes that the policy of the United States toward the Philippine Islands shall involve ultimate independence, though that independence may be under a protectorate and the time is indeterminate. He therefore realizes that the Philippine Islands are to be regarded not as the possessions of the United States, but as a separate entity temporarily under our control, under a great trust declared by us, that our occupation is simply for the benefit of the Filipino people and not for our own advantage. Our position, therefore, with reference to the islands is not that of absolute sovereignty over and ownership of a Territory to be held for all time as a part of the United States, but it is the position of temporary occupation under a trust to the people entitled to independence, whose independence is absolutely assured by the pledged faith of our own Nation.

In that view the Philippine Islands constitute a part of the Orient entitled ultimately to independent national life, and the question I presented is, Whether we can intrude ourselves into the Orient and, under the plea of philanthropy, take possession of numerous islands there, and then impose upon them the policy of the closed door to the trade of other nations while we are insisting that the open door shall be maintained in the neighboring country of China.

What has been our contention in China? Our contention has been that whatever control the great nations should obtain in China, whether by concession of privilege or concession of territory, the power of that nation should not be exercised in such a way as to close the door to other nations, but that equal trade privileges should be maintained to all the nations of the world; that while China might impose a tariff, that tariff should be equal to all; not a tariff which would give concessions to Germany because of the power of Germany there, or concessions to England because of the power of England there, or concessions to Japan because of the power of Japan there.

So conscious has Japan been of the nature of this pledge demanded by Mr. Hay of the open door, that when she entered upon a war intended to check the aggressions of Russia, and

took possession of Korea and of Manchuria, she declared her purpose, in accordance with Mr. Hay's manifesto, to recognize the integrity and the independence of Korea, and to maintain the open door in Korea and Manchuria to all the nations of the world. Japan was entering upon an era of conquest as a means of national preservation. We in our movements in the Philippine Islands were entering simply upon an era of benevolence—of international philanthropy. How can we claim that Japan should keep the faith as to Korea and Manchuria, which she has won by the force of her arms, by the expenditure of enormous sums of money, when we propose to break the faith in the Philippine Islands?

What is the position of the trade of the Philippine Islands to-day? She has about \$32,000,000 exports and about \$32,000,000 imports. From what countries do those imports come? Eight million dollars from England, something less from Germany, something less from the United States, and the rest of the importations from Japan, China, and other countries. It is proposed by this arrangement to give the United States the right to put its importations into the Philippine markets without the payment of the 20 or the 25 per cent duty imposed by the Philippine Islands upon importations from every other country. The purpose is to absolutely monopolize for this country the importations in the Philippines; to exclude the importations of England, Germany, France, Japan, and China; to cut off even her importations in the Orient from her neighboring people. And we do this at the same time that we are demanding of all these nations, England, Germany, France, and Japan, that in all their negotiations and in all their acquired concessions, and in all their gaining of spheres of influence in China, they shall, whatever may be their expenditures, either in blood or in treasure, preserve the open door and maintain equal trade facilities in all the ports of China to all the nations of the world.

So, I ask, what consistency is there in this policy of greed in attempting to exclude and cut off and annihilate the trade of other nations with the Philippine Islands, whilst in China we are demanding the open door, and whilst, on the part of Japan, we are insisting upon the observance of faith regarding the Manchurian country, which she has absolutely won by force of arms, just as thoroughly won as we have won the Philippines? We are intruders in the Orient. Japan is a part of the Orient, yet we demand of her a policy regarding Manchuria and China which we ourselves refuse to pursue in the Philippines.

WHAT IS OUR DUTY TOWARD THE PHILIPPINES?

The Senator from New York has commented upon the great duty which we have to discharge to the Philippine Islands; that we stand before the world facing all history as to the performance of the assurance we have given of our philanthropic and humane intentions. I would not abate one jot of the performance of that duty. I only differ as to the method in which that duty shall be performed. I would much prefer if we could simply administer those islands upon their own revenues. But we have something in view beyond the mere administration of the islands. We have in view the termination as quickly as possible of our occupation there. What does that involve? Not simply the mere administration of the government of the islands, but the instruction of their people in a common language, in improved industrial and agricultural methods, in the principles of self-government, and in the capacity to stand alone.

In that work I would utilize the Philippine revenues, and I would not call upon the Government of the United States for a dollar if the work could be performed with the Philippine revenues. But all our illusions have vanished regarding those islands. We realize that they are not the source of wealth, and though beautiful to the eye they never can have any great productive capacity. We realize that all nature is against them. The cholera is there, the Asiatic cholera, destructive of man; the surran and rinderpest, so destructive to animals; the hurricane and the typhoon, destructive of property and life.

We all realize that the Philippine Islands to-day are taxed to their utmost capacity, that only \$17,000,000 can be raised, and that that amount of money for the insular government, for the municipal government, is not adequate, is hardly adequate to meet the requirements of administration, much less the great humane, educational, and philanthropic work which we have in view.

If we are to carry out our pledges to the world it has got to cost us something. We have assumed the rôle of international philanthropy, and philanthropy always costs something. What has it cost us already? Nearly \$600,000,000 in war and military occupation there. What is it costing to-day in military

expense? One-fourth of the annual expense of our army and navy is attributable to our occupation of the Philippines, a sum aggregating nearly \$50,000,000 annually. That is what it has cost us—\$600,000,000 in the past, \$50,000,000 annually in the future. Is it not about time that we were bringing this great trust to an end, not by abandonment of it, but by working vigorously and energetically toward the goal of accomplishment? Is it working vigorously and energetically in giving these people a common language when we put only 500,000 of their children in their schools and leave 1,500,000 out of school? Are we training them in habits of industry, in improved methods of agriculture, when we fail to give them in all their provinces industrial schools and agricultural schools which can improve their methods of industry and of agriculture? Will it not be money saved to accomplish all this work of philanthropy in twenty years, instead of stringing it out over one hundred years?

Are we to continue this plan of philanthropic work over one hundred years, costing the United States in military and naval expenditures \$50,000,000 annually and with the prospect of a war in the end costing us a billion dollars? Are we to continue this for a hundred years when by putting a little fire and a little energy into this philanthropic work we can accomplish it in twenty? Are we to continue for one hundred years to teach the Filipino people a common language, or shall we accomplish it in ten, fifteen, or twenty years? Do we not all recognize that the work is to be done with the children and not with the adults, and that the thorough training of 2,000,000 children for ten years will mean that in the next generation the majority of the people of those islands will be speaking the English language, and that they will then have a common language through which they can convey to each other their ideas upon government, upon economics, upon administration, upon morals?

Now, I protest against an ineffective way of doing this. The Senator from New York says I would make gifts to the Filipino people that would demoralize them. I would not make gifts to the Filipino people. I would avoid a bounty of \$15,000,000 annually to favored interests in the Philippine Islands, to the great planters, to the sugar trust which in the future will monopolize the production there, to the great tobacco organization which is now there and which will monopolize the tobacco industry in those islands, and I would devote a tithe only, a small proportion of it, to the advancement of the Filipino people, and I would put it in the hands of the Philippine Commission and give them the power to expend it in a way that would best advance the educational and industrial development of the Philippine Islands.

I wish to bear witness to the rare judgment and disinterestedness and efficiency with which the Philippine Commission is discharging its difficult duties. Their work there is a credit to the United States. Our work here is not. Instead of appropriating this \$15,000,000 annually to favored interests, a part of which only will filter down to the masses of the people and give them perhaps a slightly increased prosperity in a slightly increased way, I would apply only a portion of it to the Filipino government itself, not for gifts to the people, not for the purpose of debauching them, not for the purpose of demoralizing them, but for the purpose of enabling the Philippine Commission to carry out the philanthropic work which we have inaugurated, and which we must always keep in view, not the simple administration of the islands, but the instruction of the people in a common language, the development of industrial and agricultural training, the development of the capacity to stand alone.

Mr. President, I am proposing no gift to the Filipino people. I am not to-day proposing any gift to the Filipino people. I say that if they can not get along with their revenues, if the United States can not discharge its great obligation to those people and to civilization out of the revenues now afforded by the taxation of that country, then we must either abandon our trust and leave the islands or we must put up some money; and I suggest that that shall be done in an efficient way, not in a way that will debauch and demoralize.

THE PHILIPPINES DIFFERENT FROM PORTO RICO.

The Senator from New York says that their relations are somewhat similar to those of Porto Rico. Porto Rico is a part of the United States. We are exercising no trust regarding Porto Rico. We realize the fact that for all time Porto Rico is a part of the United States. It will soon receive a territorial government. It may sometime be admitted to statehood. I hope the time will come when Cuba, by voluntary act, will apply for political union with this country, instead of the maintenance of a mere commercial union; that she will see the large advantage of political union with this country, which

will also involve the advantage of commercial union; and I hope to see Cuba and Porto Rico one of these days, first as Territories and then united as a single State, in the Union.

Our policy regarding Porto Rico, therefore, is entirely different from that which we should pursue toward the Philippine Islands. Our occupation there is temporary. The Senator from New York admits that it is temporary. And what policy are we to pursue under this bill? We are to pursue the policy of accustoming those people not to the world's prices for their products, but to the favored prices that exist in the United States, the subsidized prices, prices double the world's prices. We propose to stimulate sugar production there by giving them not the \$40 a ton which they get in the Hongkong market, but the \$75 a ton which they get in the American market.

We propose to stimulate production not by giving them the power by improved methods to meet the low prices which they now receive for their products in China, Japan, and in the Orient generally, but by giving them the subsidized prices maintained in this country by a tariff amounting on sugar to nearly 100 per cent and on tobacco to 151 per cent. When our temporary occupation ends, as he admits it will end, and the Philippines have a separate autonomy, absolutely distinct from us, with their own government, their own fiscal system, their own revenue system, I ask the Senator from New York whether, under those conditions, those islands can sink to the acceptance of the world's prices without an utter collapse of their industries?

True humanity dictates that we should not accustom them to the subsidized prices of this country, to these props to their industries, which later will be withdrawn; but to teach them by improved methods of industrial training and agricultural development to meet the world's prices; to be able to accept in Hongkong the price of \$40 a ton for sugar, instead of seeking the favored price in the United States of \$75 a ton; to be able to accept the price that Bremen gives and London gives in the sugar market. Then the Philippines will be able to maintain their autonomy; but if you once give them autonomy—an autonomy based upon the subsidized prices of this country—and then cut the cord that binds them to this country, they will be a derelict in the ocean and will go to wreck.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARTER in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a moment. I offered the amendment last evening in the utmost good faith. I said when I offered it that it did not accord with my own views and that it did not represent the opinions of the cigar makers of this country. They would have preferred, as I stated last night, that no cigars from the Philippine Islands be admitted free of duty. When the Committee on Finance conceded the reduction I proposed, and even extended it somewhat, I felt that possibly the Senate might be willing to make a still further reduction. Because I regard it unjust to the workmen employed in this line of manufacture that they be asked to bear the burden of concessions made to the Filipinos, I sought to get a still further reduction from the Senate by the amendment which I offered, and which is now pending.

I grant, Mr. President, that when these islands passed into our possession we incurred certain obligations with respect to the Filipinos. While we retain possession we are bound to maintain peace and order and do within the limits of reason what we can to educate, improve, and elevate those whom the fortunes of war gave into our custody for the time being. But, sir, I deny that the plan offered by the committee as an amendment to this tariff bill, taken as a whole, is fair to the Filipinos.

Almost the entire day yesterday was spent upon a discussion of this amendment in so far as it relates to sugar. I do not know whether Senators followed closely the debate upon the provisions respecting sugar.

The vote upon the amendments offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] in support of his contention was very small; and yet, Mr. President, when all of that debate is reviewed and all of the arguments submitted by the Senator from Kansas in support of his amendments fully considered, I am confident that many Senators will feel that they did not give to his arguments and to the facts submitted by him and by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] the weight and consideration to which they were entitled.

If we are to deal fairly by the Philippines, we should not, Mr. President, so adjust our tariff relations with those islands that they will be compelled to sell the sugar which they produce to the sugar trust, and forced to buy the refined sugar

which they consume from the sugar trust. If we are to enact legislation for the benefit of these islands rather than the sugar trust, then we will reject this entire proposition which has come from the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, coming back to the amendment before the Senate, I stand here to deny the right of this Government to single out men in any particular industry, and make them carry the burden of the so-called "liberality" and "generosity" and "benevolence" which the country should bear as a whole in helping the people of the Philippine Islands. The producers of tobacco in Connecticut, the tobacco farmers of Wisconsin, and all the other States; the manufacturers of cigars and the men employed in our cigar factories, should not be called upon to divide their wages and their profits in order to improve the condition of the people in the Philippine Islands.

I have wondered, Mr. President, whether if those Filipinos instead of weaving mats were weaving by better processes cotton cloth, we would find the Committee on Finance ready to admit into this country the product of their looms free of duty. Every million of cigars that comes to our custom-house manufactured by Filipino labor at 37 cents a day will take away from the cigar manufacturer and the men employed in his factory labor to produce that million cigars. Fixing it at 60,000,000 or 70,000,000 or 150,000,000, means, unless it is a fraud upon the Philippine Islands, the importation into this country of that number of cigars. Mr. President, wherever the line is drawn, it means that the cigar maker of this country is to lose the labor that enters into every cigar imported free of duty under this provision.

There are 2,500 cigar makers walking the streets of the cities of this country without employment, and their families have nothing to sustain them excepting out of the accumulated earnings of those unemployed men. It is right and proper to consider the Filipino, but it is our first duty, Mr. President, to consider the American wage-earner.

I ask the adoption of this amendment at the lowest point at which it is possible to get the united support of enough votes to write it into this bill, and upon the amendment as I have offered it, fixing the limit at 60,000,000, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President, while the Senator from Wisconsin has been speaking, I have received a telegram, which I desire to have read from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

DAYTON, OHIO, June 15, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The tobacco growers, packers, dealers, and cigar manufacturers and workmen are united in beseeching you to vote against the free importation of any cigars or leaf tobacco from the Philippine Islands, and respectfully refer you to the protest of the leaf-tobacco boards of trade, as well as the Chamber of Commerce of Dayton, Ohio.

THE OHIO LEAF TOBACCO PACKERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President, I will not detain the Senate by discussing the protests referred to nor by their reading, but request that they be printed in the RECORD. They are the resolutions of the Ohio Leaf Tobacco Packers' Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The resolutions referred to are as follows:

THE OHIO LEAF TOBACCO PACKERS' ASSOCIATION,
Dayton, Ohio, April 29, 1909.

At a special meeting of the board of directors of the Ohio Leaf Tobacco Packers' Association, an association comprising in its membership all the representative packers of Ohio leaf tobacco, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a tariff bill, in which a clause provides for the free entry of 300,000 pounds of wrapper leaf tobacco, 1,500,000 pounds of filler leaf tobacco, and 150,000,000 cigars from the Philippines, as found in Article 471d, page 189, of said tariff bill as reported by Mr. ALDRICH on April 12, 1909; and

Whereas if such bill becomes a law it will work a great injustice and cause untold injury to our tobacco industry, comprising as it does all the growers, packers, dealers, jobbers, and cigar manufacturers, both in this State and throughout the United States; and

Whereas the free importation of cigars in a limited quantity, as specified in said bill, simply works to provide employment for 2,000 Filipinos at a low rate of wages, and takes away the livelihood of the same number of American citizens, whose cost of living demands and who receive fair wages for their work; and

Whereas said tobacco which is proposed to be imported free is raised by cheap Filipino labor, whose cost of living is so small that a very meager wage scale suffices for their support; and

Whereas the specifying of a "limited quantity" of either the raw or manufactured article will put into the hands of one or a few large operators the possibility of absolutely controlling the importation of this limited quantity at an abnormal margin of profit; and

Whereas the importation of a limited quantity will do more harm to the general trade in the United States than it will benefit the Filipinos; and

Whereas along the present lines of duty established by the Dingley tariff bill the tobacco trade and the producers of tobacco are all fairly

satisfied now that different interests have become adjusted to those rates: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, as a trade organization and being one of a number of similar organizations located throughout the tobacco-growing districts of the United States, whose purposes are to promote and foster the growing of leaf tobacco and the handling and manufacturing in all its branches, and to look after the interests of tobacco raisers, tobacco packers, tobacco jobbers, cigar and tobacco manufacturers and their employees, do hereby strenuously protest against the admitting free of duty of any tobacco or cigars whatsoever into the United States from the Philippine Islands; and be it further

Resolved, That 500 copies of this resolution, duly signed, be printed and distributed among the members of the association and kindred associations throughout the country, each to be forwarded to their respective Congressmen and Senators, with a personal request that they use their best efforts to defeat the passage of the proposed measure; and be it further

Resolved, That a special appeal be made to Senator Dick, of Ohio, who is a member of the Finance Committee, to use every endeavor to prevent the passage of the Philippine free clause in the Senate bill.

WALTER M. BRENNER, *President*.
C. H. SOLLIDAY, *Vice-President*.
WM. J. LUKASWITZ, *Secretary-Treasurer*.
C. S. BILLMAN,
A. H. REEDER,
L. A. WHEELER,
S. M. KROHN,
HENRY MEYERS,
Directors.

Mr. DICK. I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD a protest from the Dayton Chamber of Commerce against the adoption of this provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DAYTON, OHIO, May 8, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are attaching hereto a copy of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce, in convention assembled, Tuesday, May 4, 1909, protesting against the clause in the proposed new tariff bill, permitting the importation of wrapper and filler tobacco and cigars from the Philippines into the United States free of duty, when above a certain amount. The resolutions are self-explanatory, and we trust that you will lend your support to our interests in this very important matter.

Yours, very truly,

DAYTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. B. MOORE, *Secretary*.

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States a tariff bill containing a clause which if adopted by Congress will permit of the importing into the United States from the Philippine Islands free of duty of 300,000 pounds of wrapper tobacco, 1,500,000 pounds of filler tobacco, and 150,000,000 cigars; and

Whereas the raising of tobacco and the manufacturing of cigars comprise one of our largest industries, requiring vast amounts of capital and employing large quantities of labor; and

Whereas we believe that the free importation from the Philippine Islands of the above-named amount of tobacco and cigars will come in direct competition with these products of our city and the surrounding territory, and will tend to largely reduce the crop value to our farmers, and will also take away the employment of a large number of the employees of our tobacco packing house, cigar factories, and their allied industries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Dayton, through the special committee appointed for this purpose at a regular monthly meeting held in the city of Dayton on May 4, 1909, do hereby strenuously protest against the admitting free of duty of any tobacco or cigars whatsoever into the United States from the Philippine Islands; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Congressmen from this State with a request that they use their best efforts to defeat the passage of the proposed measure.

THE DAYTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
LEOPOLD RANER, *President*.
W. B. MOORE, *Secretary*.

Mr. DICK. I make the further request, Mr. President, that resolutions of the Cigar Makers' Union, No. 17, of Cleveland, Ohio, together with other protests I have received from large numbers of cigar makers' unions and manufacturers throughout the State of Ohio, be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolutions will be printed in the RECORD at the request of the Senator from Ohio.

The resolutions referred to are as follows:

CIGAR MAKERS' UNION No. 17,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Hon. CHARLES DICK.

DEAR SIR: In behalf of the Cigar Makers' International Union, an organization composed of 47,000 members, we earnestly protest against free trade in cigars with the Philippine Islands, even to a limited extent, which at this time would be extremely disastrous to the trade, which is already badly demoralized by the continued depression in trade. The government statistics show that there has been no material improvement in the manufacture of cigars since the depression started in October, 1907.

These reliable government statistics are reinforced and made doubly sure, as to the condition of trade, by the amounts we expend for out-of-work benefits.

During the year 1908 we expended \$101,483.50, while in 1903, a year normal in trade conditions, we only expended \$15,558, and in 1907 we expended \$19,497.50 for out-of-work benefit purposes.

The condition of trade and the cigar industry is in a most precarious condition, and at a point where it can not with safety be charged with any additional burdens.

I hold and assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that the importation of cigars from the Philippine Islands free of duty, even in limited numbers, will have a disastrous effect upon the already overwrought and seriously menaced trade.

When the Porto Rican Islands were annexed and their products admitted free, it was claimed that, owing to the limited number of cigar makers and the alleged inferior quality of the tobacco, that we here would not experience any injurious effects. The result has been that American enterprise and capital at once commenced to exploit the cheap labor and cheaply grown tobacco in the islands to an extent that the importations of cigars from Porto Rico have now become a serious menace to the wages and well-being of the cigar makers and manufacturers of the mainland.

The American Tobacco Company, with its unlimited capital and resources, immediately seized the opportunity to avail itself of the cheap labor of the Porto Ricans and at once commenced the manufacture of cigars in the Porto Rican Islands, with the consequent decrease of the number of American cigar makers here.

Our advices indicate that the Porto Ricans are now, generally speaking, fully employed, while, as stated in the foregoing, thousands of our members and thousands of American cigar makers are walking the streets in idleness. Including union and nonunion, there are fully 12,000 cigar makers now idle in the United States. The same conditions concerning cheap labor, cost of living, light, clothing, apply with even greater force in the Philippine Islands.

To admit 150,000,000 cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands will come in direct competition with the American product and have a disastrous effect in the nature of cutting prices, far more so than the operation of any sweat shops or other hostile influences in our own country.

We know that under Spanish rule the cigar industry in the Philippine Islands developed to a very high degree, and assert that those capable of being pressed into the business of cigar making are still there, and if given an opportunity, such as proposed by the pending legislation, they will come in direct competition with the American cigar makers and crowd just that many more into the now dangerously large army of unemployed, who are bordering on starvation and vainly asking for an opportunity to earn a livelihood at their chosen occupation.

In the name of humanity, in the name of the best interests and welfare of our own people, as loyal American citizens, we protest against free trade in cigars with the Philippine Islands.

A bulletin of the Department of Labor shows that there were employed, all told, in the cigar industry of the Philippine Islands about 20,000 people, at an average of \$10.21 per month. The rate of wages for cigar makers, as near as I can learn, is 37½ cents per day, while the government census of 1900 shows that the average wage of the workers of this country is about \$400 per year, or about \$1.36 per day.

A good cigar can be bought in Manila for 1 cent apiece, or from \$5 to \$10 per thousand. The home-produced cigar sells for 5 cents, 10 cents, 15 cents apiece, or from \$20 to \$60 per thousand generally, and from that up for especially high grades.

Under the proposed legislation cigars could be laid down at San Francisco for from \$8.50 to \$13.50 per thousand.

We protest against being pitted against oriental labor in our struggle for existence. We hold that no amount of legislation on the part of the Congress of the United States can or ever will lift this people to our standard; and that the act proposed, and against which we respectfully protest, will have a tendency to, and will, drag us down nearer their level.

About one-half of the cigar factories in the Philippine Islands are said to be controlled by Chinese manufacturers, and with the number of Chinese now in the islands, will monopolize the cigar trade, as they did prior to the exclusion act in San Francisco.

Prior to the passage of this Chinese-exclusion act, in 1882, the cigar factories of San Francisco employed about 40 American citizens and over 6,500 Chinamen.

The bill proposed means that the Chinese-exclusion act, so far as it relates to the cigar industry, will be nullified completely by establishing free trade.

Mr. Edward Rosenberg, an American citizen, while in Manila, in a letter dated August 1, 1903, says: "Considering the very small wages paid the Filipino workers, the poor and scanty food they necessarily live on, they are, next to the Chinese, the cheapest and best workers of the Orient. They live in light shacks, built of bamboo, and covered with leaves; cost of building, from \$30 to \$70. The number of Chinese living on the island I estimate to be between 100,000 and 150,000."

We would like to know how a man living in a northern climate, who needs from 7 to 8 tons of coal per year and needs warm clothing and lives in a house for which he must pay a large rent, is going to compete on a free-trade basis with people living under such conditions.

If the Filipinos should ever cease to be subjects and become American citizens in every particular, with the right to organize for their own protection, with factory laws similar to those prevailing in the States of Illinois, New York, Massachusetts, etc., for the protection of women and children against unscrupulous exploitation, then it will be the time to talk about the changing of the tariff.

Manila alone has 31 cigar and cigarette factories, also about 48 others run by Chinese, which, if they get free trade, will also become exporters, and in the event of free trade they can export to the United States enormous quantities of cigars.

At the hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means January 27, 1905, Secretary Taft, in the testimony submitted, in speaking of the fears of the cigar makers when a similar bill was under consideration, as to the effect of the proposed legislation, said: "There may be some justification for the apprehension of the cigar makers that this measure would injure them. I admit that a perfection-shaped cigar, which the cigar makers of this country receive \$34 per thousand for making, is made in the Philippine Islands for \$6 per thousand."

An act that will tend to build up the cigar industry of the Philippine Islands at the expense of a like industry and the citizens employed therein in our own country proper is neither wise nor just legislation. Knowing that we are positively right in this matter, we, in defense, vigorously, yet respectfully, protest against its enactment.

Yours, very respectfully,

W. J. CANNON, *Secretary*.

WASHINGTON, June 12, 1909.

DEAR SIR: Relative to the proposed admission of 150,000,000 cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands, we beg to submit for your further consideration the following facts, which we believe proves conclusively that free trade in cigars with the Philippine Islands, even in a limited degree, would prove disastrous to our industry. One hundred and fifty million cigars represents the labor of about 2,500 cigar makers for a full year, and in view of the fact that there are already about 12,000 idle cigar makers in the United States, we are justly alarmed by the proposed legislation, which would unquestionably add another 2,500 to the large army of unemployed cigar makers, together with those dependent upon them.

The tobacco and cigar exports of the Philippine Islands under American occupation has reached a higher degree of prosperity during the years 1903 to 1907 than prevailed from 1895 to 1899, when they were still under Spanish rule, as the following figures from the special report of Secretary of War Taft show for the five years referred to under Spain the annual average exports of cigars and tobacco amounted to \$2,114,240. For the five years reported under American occupation the annual average was \$2,129,194, thus disproving any contention that our occupancy of the islands has seriously impaired their tobacco and cigar export trade.

The report of the Insular collector of internal revenue for 1908 shows total number of cigars manufactured in the Philippine Islands during 1907 was 197,000,000, and for 1908, 198,754,787. Of this number there were imported into the United States during the year 1907, 1,593,000, and during 1908, 1,365,000.

A bulletin of the Department of Labor shows that there are about 20,000 persons employed in the cigar industry in the Philippine Islands, at an average of \$10.21 per month. The rate of wages for cigar makers, as near as we can learn, is 37.12 cents a day.

As noted above, there were imported into the United States from the Philippine Islands during 1907, 1,593,000 cigars, and during 1908, 1,365,000. In this connection we desire to show the confusing nature of the figures contained in a note on tariff revision and Insular Bureau reports as contained in the following memorandum:

The Notes on Tariff Revision, issued by the Ways and Means Committee, on page 227, under the caption "Importations," referring to leaf tobacco, furnishes the "general information" to the effect that the total importation of unmanufactured tobacco from the Philippines was 70,163 pounds, valued at \$4,584. On page 280, referring to the duty on cigars, paragraph furnishing "general information" as to the importations does not show any importation from the Philippine Islands.

The publication Estimated Revenues, as issued by the Finance Committee of the Senate, on page 28, referring to paragraph 221 of the Senate bill, shows the importation of cigars from the Philippine Islands during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, to have been 3,141.89 pounds, valued at \$4,150.

Averaging 12 pounds to a thousand cigars, 3,141.89 pounds would equal 261,820 cigars. Three thousand one hundred and forty-one and eighty-nine one-hundredths pounds of tobacco, at \$4.50 per pound, minus 25 per cent reduction on account of Philippine importation and plus 25 per cent ad valorem (based on 261,820 cigars), will about equal \$11,352.74, which is noted on page 29 as the revenue under the present law.

The Insular Bureau reports the exportation of cigars to the United States in 1907 as 1,593,000, and in 1908 as 1,365,000, which figures agree with the importations of cigars from the Philippines to the United States as stated on page 279 of the quarterly report for April-June, 1908, issued by the Insular Bureau. In the report named the Insular Bureau states the value of 1,593,000 cigars in 1907 as \$26,067, which valuation does not seem to agree with the valuation placed upon these cigars upon importation into the United States, as noted on page 28 of the Senate Finance Committee's publication entitled "Estimated Revenues."

We further desire to call to your attention that our industry greatly suffered by the free importation of cigars from Porto Rico. During the past two years there has been admitted into the United States from Porto Rico on an average of about 10,000,000 cigars a month, or an amount per year almost equal in number to that which it is proposed to admit free of duty from the Philippine Islands. This amount of cigars admitted free of duty from Porto Rico has already displaced about 2,000 American workmen, and we have borne this injustice with hardly any complaint on our part, but we feel that we are now compelled to earnestly, yet respectfully, protest against the further contemplated injustice, which will cause untold hardship on the already too large number of American citizens now out of employment, with no immediate prospects for obtaining the same, and the thousands of women and children dependent upon them for the necessities of life.

And, furthermore, in the event of the passage of that part of the pending tariff bill dealing with the importation of cigars from the Philippine Islands, the amount of revenue lost to the United States Government on 150,000,000 cigars at \$50 per thousand would be \$7,500,000.

The above is the amount that it is proposed to contribute to the Filipinos, or whatever interests that should import into the United States from the Philippine Islands, the above amount of cigars, or a direct contribution to the American Tobacco Company of \$7,500,000 annually.

While no deduction has been made in the above figures for the 25 per cent reduction in the present rates, neither has any computation been made for the 25 per cent ad valorem on manufactured cigars, which would amount to a greater sum than the reduction in the present rates.

Submitted by a representative of the Cigar Makers' International Union.

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 4,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 22, 1909.

HON. CHARLES DICK.

DEAR SIR: Cigar Makers' Union No. 4, comprising in its membership of 700 wage-earning citizens, fathers of families, whose desire it is to continually improve their own conditions, at a regular meeting unanimously adopted a resolution whereby they earnestly request you to vote against the bill allowing 150,000,000 cigars to come from the Philippines free of duty in any one fiscal year. Hoping that you will grant us the above request, I remain

Yours, respectfully,

JOSEPH RAPP, Secretary.

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 75,
Columbus, Ohio, May 20, 1909.

Senator CHARLES DICK.

DEAR SIR: Cigar Makers' Union No. 75, of this city, again requests that you vote against the free admission of cigars from the Philippine Islands. There are thousands in our craft out of employment at present, and the admission free of duty of 150,000,000 cigars free of duty would add thousands more to the list.

Yours, fraternally,

JULIUS EBE,
Financial Secretary.

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 75,
Columbus, Ohio, April 21, 1909.

Senator DICK.

DEAR SIR: Cigar Makers' Union No. 75, of this city, emphatically protests against the admission to this country, free of duty, of cigars manufactured in the Philippine Islands, and respectfully requests that you assist in the defeat of the measure.

Respectfully, yours,

JULIUS EBE,
Financial Secretary.

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 313,
Lima, Ohio, May 10, 1909.

HON. CHARLES DICK.

DEAR SIR: We call your attention to the tariff bill in regard to letting into the United States 150,000,000 cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands. Owing to the dull times our industry is at present suffering from an overproduction, and many of our people out of employment, and it would be impossible for the manufacturers to compete against those people. I have been requested to call your attention to the condition of the cigar industry by many of the unemployed. Sincerely trusting you favor our request,

Yours, truly,

W. F. BATTY,
Financial Secretary.

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 123,
Hamilton, Ohio, April 14, 1909.

MR. CHARLES DICK,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Cigar Makers' Union No. 123 protests against the bill providing that 150,000,000 cigars shall be permitted to come from the Philippines free of duty in any one fiscal year. Hoping that you will vote against the bill.

Yours, respectfully,

[SEAL.]

A. P. LOMBARD,
Corresponding Secretary.

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 123,
Hamilton, Ohio, April 26, 1909.

MR. CHARLES DICK,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your esteemed favor of the 21st at hand, and in reply will state the reasons why Cigar Makers' Union No. 123 protests so vigorously in there are so many thousands of cigar makers out of work in this country now. And if there would be 150,000,000 cigars coming free of duty it would mean so many more out of work. And we think that the home industry should be protected. Because one-half of the cigar factories in the Philippine Islands are controlled by Chinese, and it is impossible for an American citizen to live on a Chinaman's wages. Now for the sake of humanity cast your vote against cigars coming to this country free of duty from the Philippines.

And besides the cigars are not made under healthy conditions. Now, if there is anything else you want to know will gladly furnish it, and will be glad to hear from you.

I remain,

Yours, respectfully,

[SEAL.]

A. P. LOMBARD,
Corresponding Secretary.

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 115,
Canton, Ohio, April 20, 1909.

HON. CHARLES DICK,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the cigar makers of Canton, Ohio, do hereby earnestly protest against any change of duty on cigars from the Philippine Islands.

Yours, fraternally,

ALBERT KELLER, Secretary.

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 79,
Sandusky, Ohio, April 6, 1909.

HON. CHARLES DICK,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Cigar Makers' Union No. 79, of Sandusky, Ohio, protest against the proposed bill, that 150,000,000 cigars be permitted to come from the Philippine Islands free of duty, in any one fiscal year.

Yours, respectfully,

FRANK J. MILLER,
Financial Secretary.

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 48,
Toledo, Ohio, April 5, 1909.

HON. CHARLES DICK,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand that the Committee on Ways and Means of the Congress has proposed a bill providing that 150,000,000 cigars shall be permitted to come from the Philippines free of duty in any one fiscal year. This union is strictly opposed to such a measure, and request that you use your voice and vote against the importation of any cigars free of duty, because it would be a direct injury to our craft.

Yours, fraternally,

ARTHUR SCHETTER,
Financial Secretary.

FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 6854,
Zanesville, Ohio, May 23, 1909.

Senator CHARLES DICK,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: Federal Labor Union, No. 6854, of Zanesville, at a regular meeting held May 20, 1909, by motion voiced its most emphatic protest against the clause in the new tariff bill regarding the importation of free cigars from the Philippines and the section providing that no label be placed on the boxes or packages of cigars or tobacco save the United States revenue stamps and the name of factory. We believe both these sections are harmful to organized labor, and call upon our Representatives and Senators to use their utmost endeavors to defeat those clauses.

Trusting this may receive your careful attention, I remain,

Truly, yours,

[SEAL.]

J. W. BARRETT, *Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 173,
Zanesville, Ohio, April 19, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This union directs me to acquaint you with our opinions and to offer our protests against the placing of cigars imported from the Philippines on the free list. We believe this uncalled for and in direct opposition to the best interests of American workmen as a whole. We also are opposed to any restrictions of what a manufacturer sees fit to place on his products other than what is necessary for the maintenance of our internal revenue. We are informed that there are clauses in the tariff bill now before Congress that can be used against the use of union labels, and especially against the tobacco workers' union label.

Trusting we see these questions in the light of public good, we are,

Fraternally, yours,

[SEAL.]

CIGAR MAKERS' UNION No. 173,
CHAS. O. DOZER, *Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 173,
Zanesville, Ohio, May 14, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The members of this union again appeal to you to prevent, if possible, the placing of cigars imported from the Philippine Islands on the free list, and especially the provision which limits the amount to 150,000,000. We feel that such free list is wholly uncalled for and can not benefit anyone, either from the standpoint of the cigar manufacturers or their employees of our country.

Trusting you will give every possible effort toward the establishment of a fair rate of duty, we are,

Very truly, yours,

[SEAL.]

CHARLES O. DOZER, *Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 96,
Akron, Ohio, May 11, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,

DEAR SIR: Cigar makers and manufacturers of Akron, at a joint meeting held Monday, May 10, request you to do all in your power to stop the free duties on cigars from Philippines, as it would be a great injustice to American workmen.

Yours, respectfully,

CHRIS. FREUEMANN, *Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 360,
Delaware, Ohio, May 17, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the cigar makers of Delaware, Ohio, held May 17, for the purpose of discussing the Philippine bill in regard to the importation of 150,000,000 cigars free of duty, it was resolved that we would ask your aid to defeat the bill. It would hurt all of the men that work for a living at the cigar trade, and would in time force them to try and make a living at something else.

D. T. GRIFFIN, *President.*
H. DAUERHEIM, *Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 249,
Findlay, Ohio, May 10, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At our regular meeting yesterday I was instructed to write you and have you vote against the Philippine bill having cigars shipped in this country free of duty, as it means a great harm to the cigar makers of this country and manufacturers. Hoping you will vote against free duty and use your influence against passing the bill. We have 27 members here; all are against passage of the bill.

Trusting you will consider before voting, we remain,

Yours, truly,

HENRY SCHELLING, *President.*
PHILIP SETZLER, *Financial Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 86,
Mansfield, Ohio, May 10, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Philippine bill, in reference to the importation of 150,000,000 cigars free of duty, is now before your honorable body. The members of cigar makers' union and manufacturers of Mansfield, Ohio, earnestly petition, urge, and request you to vote and use your utmost influence against the passage of the Philippine bill.

Yours, very respectfully,

G. B. DORMAN, *Secretary.*
VALENTINE THOMA,
ED ERDENBERGER, *Officers.*

WILLIAM EPKE,
JACOB THOMA,
CHARLES GIMBEL,
ERNST MINK,
J. A. BICKEL,
CHARLES SPAMER,
A. ERDENBERGER,
Cigar Manufacturers.

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 86,
Mansfield, Ohio, June 3, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of recent date received, and in reply will say in regard to free trade with the Philippine Islands, even to a limited extent, at this time would be extremely disastrous to the trade, which is already badly demoralized by the continued depression in trade. The government statistics show that there has been no material improvement in the manufacture of cigars since the depression started in October, 1907. To admit 150,000,000 cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands will come in direct competition with the American product, the American cigar makers, and crowd just that many more into the now dangerously large army of unemployed, who are bordering on starvation and vainly asking for an opportunity to earn a livelihood at their chosen occupation.

Yours, very respectfully,

G. B. DORMAN, *Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 176,
Newark, Ohio, May 10, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 176, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Resolved, That this organization, in meeting assembled, do hereby earnestly protest again admitting any cigars from the Philippine Islands, except at the regular import duty: And be it further

"Resolved, That we humbly petition our Senator to use his influence to carry out the wish of this organization and thereby confer a favor upon the members thereof."

Respectfully submitted.

E. D. EVERTS, *Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' LOCAL UNION No. 416,
Norwalk, Ohio, May 25, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to yours of the 19th. The reason the above union opposes the free importation of cigars from the Philippines is: The cigar makers of this country can not compete with the cheap labor of the islands, which are mostly Chinese and Filipinos, and if cigars come in free from there most of them would come to the Pacific coast. The cigar industry on the coast now is very small, and cigars free from the Philippines, we are afraid, would put what factories are on the Pacific coast out of business. Trusting this is the information you wish, I remain,

Yours, truly,

L. C. COLSON, *Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' UNION No. 45,
Springfield, Ohio, May 17, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Cigar Makers' Union No. 45, of Springfield, Ohio, and the manufacturers protest against the passage of the Philippine bill, admitting 150,000,000 cigars free of duty, and we would ask you to vote and work against the passage of the bill.

Thanking you for past favors,

I am, respectfully, yours,

[SEAL.]

L. E. HORLACKER,
Corresponding Secretary.

CIGAR MAKERS' UNION No. 416,
Norwalk, Ohio, May 12, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Cigar Makers' Union No. 416, of Norwalk, Ohio, protest against admitting cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands.

Yours, truly,

L. C. COLSON, *Secretary.*

CIGAR MAKERS' UNION No. 152,
Youngstown, Ohio, May 15, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The cigar makers of Youngstown, Ohio, protest against the importation of 150,000,000 cigars from the Philippine Islands free of duty.

I have no doubt that you have cognizance of the reasons why we should protest against such importation, therefore I will not go to details.

Hoping you will favor us by voting against such injurious legislation.

Yours, truly,

E. WILLIAMS, *Secretary.*

THE UNION CIGAR MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Cincinnati, April 12, 1909.

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Union Cigar Manufacturers' Association, of Cincinnati, the following resolution was passed:

"Resolved, That this association enter its solemn protest to that section of the Payne tariff bill, now before your honorable body, that will permit any further increase—admitting cigars free of duty—to this country from the Philippine Islands."

It is palpable that this section of the bill, if enacted in its present form, will incur further hardship on the manufacturers of this country, as well as to their employees.

Respectfully submitted.

JULIUS ADLER, *President.*
O. E. SCHULTZ, *Secretary.*

THE FRITZ BROTHERS COMPANY,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 8, 1909.

HON. CHARLES DICK,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to refer to the feature of the Payne tariff bill which relates to the free admission into the United States of 150,000,000 cigars per year, and we respectfully enter a strong protest to this proposed feature.

The total export of cigars from the Philippines in 1906 were 93,000,000; in 1907, 116,000,000; and in 1908, 118,000,000, and the Payne bill in its present form not only provides for the free admission into the United States of the entire cigar output of the islands, but even provides for a substantial increase in same.

It is a known fact that the labor employed in the manufacture of these Philippine cigars is not a fair competition to our American labor, and the cigars will be sold in this country at a much lower price than it is possible to manufacture a like article here. Every Philippine cigar imported into this country will positively replace an American cigar. The burdens already shouldered by the cigar industry in this country are great enough without this additional one.

The passage of this bill will absolutely and positively throw out of employment many additional operatives, and in addition to this, capital which is invested in this industry will be directly affected. We therefore protest most strongly to the passage of this clause in the bill, and petition you to use your best influence to that effect. Thanking you in advance, we remain,

Very respectfully,

THE FRITZ BROS. CO.

L. NEWBURGER & BRO.,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 8, 1909.

HON. CHARLES DICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have gone over carefully the new tariff schedule applying to free admission of 150,000,000 cigars from the Philippine Islands, and respectfully solicit your effort in defeating this, as it would work untold hardship to our industry. We have no doubt you are familiar with the great number of people employed in the cigar manufacturing interests in this State, and if the schedule should pass in its present form it would affect us considerably, as every one of these Philippine cigars would mean the cutting off of just so many domestic made.

We are confident you can readily see the justice of our claim, and beg to thank you in advance for your assistance in having it stricken out or at least greatly modified.

Assuring you of our appreciation of your effort, and thanking you in advance for your prompt consideration of our request, we remain,

Yours, truly,

L. NEWBURGER & BRO.

THE MIAMI VALLEY LEAF TOBACCO COMPANY,
Dayton, Ohio, April 12, 1909.

Senator CHARLES DICK,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: We beg to call your attention to that portion of the new tariff bill embodied in section 2, pages Nos. 176 and 177, and referring especially to the free admission into this country of 300,000 pounds of wrapper-leaf tobacco, 3,000,000 pounds of filler-leaf tobacco, and cigars not in excess of 150,000,000.

We consider this a very dangerous provision to our trade. The State of Ohio produces about 33 per cent of the cigar leaf filler tobacco of the United States, and this provides for the free entry of filler tobacco equal to very close to 10 per cent of the Ohio crop per annum. There is no doubt but what the trade can stand this percentage if things are to be taken on the face, but, first, the trade considers this but the entering wedge for free tobacco from the Philippines in unlimited quantities, and it certainly appears to us that it would be a much better proposition to make a concession over the regular rates on leaf tobacco in unlimited quantities, even were that concession to be 50 per cent of the present rates, rather than admit a limited amount free. The admission of 150,000,000 cigars free of duty will put out of employment 2,000 American cigar manufacturing employees at American wages and put 2,000 Filipinos to work at Philippine wages, and the importer will get most of the benefit, as he will be protected by a limited importation.

Now comes the important point I wish to call your attention to: Who is going to import this limited amount of tobacco and cigars that is to be admitted from the Philippines? Is there not a very grave danger that the so-called "cigar trust" will have in quick time after the passage of the bill the full amount of this tobacco bought, ready to ship to this country; and if they think well of it and intend to do it, what individual dealer in this country will have a chance to import any of it? It looks to us like this grant of free duty on a limited quantity of tobacco and cigars from the Philippines will turn out as a present of cheap tobacco to the said tobacco trust. Even if this does not so occur, how is this limited importation to be apportioned and regulated? Are there any other instances in any tariff bill where a limited amount of any article has been admitted free? Can such a law be justly operated?

I understand that this filler tobacco can be bought in the Philippines to-day ready for shipment at 5 cents per pound actual weight, whereas the similar grades of Ohio tobacco are to-day bringing in the merchantable form about 20 cents actual weight wholesale.

One other small point: Referring back to page 60, Schedule F, you will note it makes a distinction between stemmed and unstemmed tobacco, while section 2, on page 176, does not make this distinction, as it should. May we ask you to look over this proposition carefully and see if we are not right?

Very truly,

A. H. REEDER.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, would the Senator object at this point to another protest being made in connection with those he has already submitted?

Mr. DICK. Certainly not.

Mr. CLAPP. Then I desire to enter a protest on behalf of several thousand cigar makers of this Republic who are out of employment and who have not even the means to communicate their protests in a formal manner to the Senate.

Mr. DICK. The Senator voices my own sentiments, Mr. President, in his protest. I want to be as generous in dealing with the Filipinos as anyone, but I can not bring myself to believe that by any vote of mine I ought to menace any American industry or deprive a single toiler in our country of a day's wage.

I wish that all the people engaged in this great industry in this country and in my State might feel as free from alarm as the Senator from West Virginia and others who have voiced the opinion here that the importation under this provision of tobacco and cigars into this country would be infinitesimal in amount.

The arguments against the proposed tariff law are uniform and are based on the damage to American cigar makers who will be thrown out of work by the introduction of foreign cigars and the fear that this provision is but an entering wedge for unlimited free trade with the Philippine Islands in tobacco and cigars.

My information, based upon the experience we have had in Porto Rico, is that the use of tobacco from these islands is a matter of acquired taste. The consumption of Porto Rican cigars has been constantly on the increase, until to-day it is estimated that 10,000,000 Porto Rican cigars are used in this country every month, or the equivalent of 120,000,000 annually. Army officers who have served in the Philippines tell me that after a while the use of Filipino tobacco comes to be a matter of preference with them; and my judgment is that as we come to use them more, and the use of them is somewhat stimulated by the low price, they will very largely displace the use of American tobacco and American cigars in our own country.

If, as contended, no harm will come to the American industry and no real good to the Filipino, since none will be exported from the Philippine Islands and none sold here, then there is no real merit in the tobacco feature of this proposition.

I am not so much opposed to the sugar amendment. That is a developing industry, and men largely engaged in it tell us that the importation of 300,000 tons will not seriously affect that business; but we are face to face with another condition so far as the manufacture of cigars is concerned. Twelve thousand idle cigar makers are petitioning Congress for relief. The resolutions presented here last night were more than a protest; they were an appeal to protect them against the encroachment of cheap labor and the competition of the oriental producer. While we are here shaping up a bill which seeks to protect American industries, and particularly the American laborer, no appeal coming from the toilers shall go without fair consideration; and if I can conscientiously do so, I shall vote to sustain their request.

Nor is my vote against the recommendation of the committee to be counted as indicating a lack of confidence. I appreciate perfectly the embarrassing attitude in which it must stand. This legislation is recommended by the President of the United States. I am satisfied that the sentimental opinion of the country favors it. We have heard so much about our little "brown brother," about our responsibility, and our duty to the Philippines that we sometimes forget the old adage, "Charity begins at home," which might be applied quite as well with reference to other affairs.

First of all, Mr. President, it seems to me our duty is to our own, and next to others. The toilers of our own country are entitled to our first consideration. Our charity for others should come afterwards. I can not bring myself, I repeat, to vote for any provision in this bill which threatens an American industry or a single day's toil to any laborer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], upon which he has demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the amendment stated, so that we may know just what we are voting upon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will again be stated.

THE SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out "seventy" and insert "sixty," so as to read:

And cigars in excess of 60,000,000 cigars.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I desire to announce my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER].

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON],

who is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CRAWFORD (when Mr. GAMBLE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GAMBLE] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY].

Mr. BURROWS (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] is paired with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MCLAURIN].

Mr. STONE. I inquire whether the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

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

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ELKINS (after having voted in the negative). At the time I voted I did not observe that the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] was absent from the Chamber. I am paired with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. FRYE. I inquire if the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. FRYE. I am paired with that Senator, but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MONEY. My colleague [Mr. MCLAURIN] has just been called from the Chamber. He is unavoidably absent, and is paired with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. BACON (after having voted in the affirmative). At the time I cast my vote I had forgotten that I had agreed to pair on this question with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE]. I understand, however, that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] has not voted. I therefore transfer my pair with the Senator from Indiana to the Senator from Virginia, and will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. SCOTT. I desire to announce, on behalf of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], that he is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. If the Senator from Wisconsin were here, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	Cummins	Hughes	Owen
Borah	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter
Bristow	Dolliver	La Follette	Simmons
Brown	Fletcher	McEnery	Smith, S. C.
Burkett	Foster	Money	Taliaferro
Clapp	Frazier	Newlands	Tillman
Clay	Gore	Overman	

NAYS—38.

Aldrich	Crawford	Heyburn	Piles
Bourne	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brandeege	Depew	Jones	Scott
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Warner
Burrows	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore
Carter	Gallinger	Page	
Crane	Guggenheim	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—26.

Bailey	Culberson	McLaurin	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Curtis	Martin	Smith, Mich.
Beveridge	Daniel	Oliver	Stephenson
Bradley	Dixon	Penrose	Stone
Chamberlain	Elkins	Rayner	Taylor
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Shively	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to the amendment of the Committee on Finance was rejected.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to offer an amendment to the pending substitute and have it read. My amendment will leave the Philippine Islands to enjoy and retain the concession of 25 per cent which they already enjoy. In other words, the act of March 8, 1902, would still remain in force in reference to all importations from the Philippine Islands. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read to the Senate.

The SECRETARY. Amend the substitute amendment on page 1,

line 5, by striking out the colon after the word "countries" and adding the words "except as provided by existing law now in force," and striking out the remainder of the substitute, so that it will read:

471d. There shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands the rates of duty which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries, except as provided by existing law now in force.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. President, it is my purpose to submit some remarks upon the amendment. Understanding that the Senator from Oklahoma has the preference at this hour, I suppose I am compelled to yield to him.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, do I understand that the committee desires to have a vote, or that it can be taken at this time?

Mr. ALDRICH. What is that?

Mr. FOSTER. It can not, because I want to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised of the desire of the Senator from Louisiana to address the Senate before a vote is taken.

Mr. OWEN. Before beginning my remarks, I would ask, there being no objection, that I be not expected or required to read the various tables which I shall use as illustrative of my comments on this bill or any matter which is not essential to the statement I desire to submit to the Senate in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to insert certain tables in the Record without reading, the same to be considered a part of his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the request?

Mr. CLAPP. It strikes me, while there may not be any objection to it at this time, it is better to preserve the order that when a speaker reaches anything which he desires to have printed, he call the attention of the Senate to the fact that he desires to insert it without reading.

Mr. GALLINGER. We might want something read.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes. It would establish rather a bad precedent, I think.

Mr. CULLOM. We had better adhere to the rule.

Mr. OWEN. I have no objection whatever to the rule. It will be entirely agreeable to me. The Senate, I am sure, will not care to have them read in extenso, as it would take some hours, perhaps, to read them.

Mr. CLAPP. It is a mere matter of form, I think.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, no consideration would induce me to propose or contend for a tariff reduction which would seriously harm any American industry whose existence is justified by the natural resources of our country.

Upon my oath as a Senator of the United States, I feel charged with a solemn responsibility of defending the welfare of the people of the United States, including as vigorously and as distinctly the interests of the people of Maine, of Rhode Island, or of California as the interests of the people of Oklahoma. I shall discharge that duty as an American in a broad and liberal spirit, with patience, with tolerance, and perfect fairness.

By that sense of duty I have felt impelled to submit to the Senate the reasons which make it impossible for me to support H. R. 1438. I can not agree to the passage of this bill without the registration of a solemn protest against it. I plainly see the evil results upon the people of the United States, which have followed the McKinley bill and the Dingley bill, and which must follow the passage of a worse measure.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful that what I shall say will not deter the managers of this bill in the Senate in the least from their predetermined course, but I deem it my duty to place upon the records of the Senate and of the United States the reasons which justify my protest and from which future students may perhaps find something of value in determining this question, when they shall consider it with intellectual and moral integrity and not in a spirit of trade, of barter, or of easy compliance with the demand of special interests, whose lobbyists swarm the corridors of this Capitol.

Mr. President, mere denunciation of a bill, or of the managers of the bill, I regard as serving no good purpose unless proof is offered which shall be convincing to thoughtful and honest men that the condemnation is thoroughly justified.

In pointing out the injurious effects of what I shall demonstrate to be a monopoly-protecting tariff upon our entire people, including every class of consumers, every class of producers, every class of manufacturers or distributors or merchants except the masters of monopoly, I shall do so dispassionately, with a composed temper and with an earnest desire to offer reasons, at least, to those now trusted by our people with power

why they should not persist in a policy full of injury and harm to the Republic.

I shall be compelled in this discussion to point out the logical consequences of a monopoly-protecting tariff; its effect, its dangerous effect, in piling up stupendous wealth on the one side in the hands of its favorites, and in causing great wretchedness and poverty on the other side among the weaker and more defenseless classes of our people.

When I point out the unavoidable effect of extreme poverty as the necessary complement of unlimited wealth in the hands of the few, accumulated under the shelter of law, I wish it distinctly understood that the dark picture of human misery which the truth compels me to portray breathes from me no spirit of pessimism, because I am full of hope. I recognize the immediate dawn of better things and an early remedy. The increasing intelligence of our people already begins to understand the causes of these conditions and to formulate the natural and reasonable remedy for their correction. The spirit of benevolence and of patriotism which characterizes the great body of our people and, I rejoice to say, moves a multitude of the beneficiaries of our unwise system gives promise for an early correction of the injurious consequences which naturally follow a prohibitive tariff, with its necessary brood of successful monopolies, by the reduction of that tariff; if not now, through the party in power, then by the unwearied Democracy that has been faithfully pointing out its evils for twenty-five years. I shall endeavor to point out some of the injurious consequences of the tariff-engendered monopolies and their crushing effect upon human life; but in doing so I shall not be understood as a pessimist, because I am precisely the contrary.

OPTIMIST.

Mr. President, I am an optimist; because I feel that the Anglo-Saxon race and the Teutonic blood represented in this country by millions of men of the northern races of Europe and Great Britain and the adopted sons of other great nations in our land have an unquenchable love of liberty, of justice, and of compassion, and will correct every evil of our great Government; because our forefathers distinguished themselves by a love of liberty that dared death in every form to establish it and maintain it in the bosom of this Republic; because our immediate forefathers not only loved liberty, but they practiced that form of government which made liberty a working force in the administration of this Government from the days when the town meeting in New England, in Massachusetts, Mr. President, in Connecticut, and in Rhode Island instructed their representatives according to the will of a free people. In those good old days when the Representative was not a machine-made politician, but was a Representative in the highest and best sense—of representing directly the opinions and the commercial interests of the common people who sent him.

I am an optimist because of my perfect confidence in the great body of the American people, whose stability, patriotism, and common sense will control this country and direct it along sound paths of good government; because I see in many directions the gradual restoration of the right and power of the people to select their public servants directly, and directly require them to carry out their will. I rejoice to see the establishment of the initiative and referendum in Maine and in Oregon and in other States, as well as in Oklahoma, and the establishment of the direct primary in so many of our States.

I rejoice to see the people instructing their legislatures in the selection of Senators, and while I did not receive any report from the Senator from Michigan, as chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States I had the honor to submit during the last Congress for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, I have felt justified in being an optimist because I was able to point out 24 States in the Union that had requested from their legislative assemblage this restoration to the people of their ancient right of rule.

Now, Mr. President, I am an optimist, notwithstanding the hostile attitude of the leaders now in control of the Senate, because already there are 29 States, including Michigan, the State of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in which the election of Senators is controlled by the direct voice of the people.^a It will only be a few short years when 46 of the States will be controlled in this manner; and

^a Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. Of these California, Nevada, Idaho, and Michigan came in this year—1909.

when that day comes, no Senator in this Chamber will be so callous as to mock the pledges made to the people in national platforms.

I am an optimist, Mr. President, because of the magnificent growth of our Republic under the blessings of liberty.

From 5,000,000 people in 1800 we have over eighty-five millions in 1907. From five billions of wealth in 1800 we have a hundred and twenty-five billion in 1909. From a weak nation we have become potentially the greatest nation in the world; but above all, Mr. President, has been our increase in the means of intelligence.

Forests are now converted into paper with lightning speed. Volumes innumerable, filled with learning upon every subject, are crowding into the pathway of knowledge; but chief of all the modern newspapers, filled with learning, wit, and humor, illustrated with splendid descriptions and photographs of everything "in the heavens above, the earth beneath, and the waters under the earth," are thrust into the hands of the wayfaring man for a price incredibly small, so that he who runs may read and instantly learn what is transpiring in regard to everything of human interest at home and abroad, so that every citizen may know at breakfast every fact transpiring on earth that he cares to know, from the diplomatic questions of foreign courts to the wonderful home run of Casey on the Chicago ball grounds, from the market quotations of London and New York to the astonishing description of the last wild beast slain on the eastern coast of Africa by one of our very distinguished fellow-citizens.

While it is true that thirty-five thousand millions of dollars of the proceeds of human labor in the United States have passed into the hands of various corporations, and a very large part of all of the net proceeds of American labor have been improperly acquired by monopoly; and while 7,000,000 women have been driven from out the peaceful shelter of the American home into commercial rivalry with men; and while 5,000,000 children in like manner are being driven under the commercial whip to sacrifice their youth, in large part, to the demand of Mammon; and while there are many millions of men who regard life with great anxiety, constantly in fear of the drastic power of extreme poverty and lack of employment, still I see that the American workmen, in the factories of our land, have exhibited a net output per capita of over twelve hundred dollars, from which the legitimate demand on him for the support of an American family can be met and still leave a large surplus earning.

The American people have shown that they are far more than abundantly capable of sustaining themselves and making the most substantial contribution to the wealth of the Republic and of the world and still leave themselves reasonable leisure.

And, finally, Mr. President, I am an optimist because I believe that the American people—who love liberty, who believe in self-government, who believe in mercy and in charity as well as in industry and providence—will see to it that this Government is so conducted by their representatives that in the future there shall be a *more equitable distribution of the proceeds of human labor*; that we shall change the present policy, whose inevitable tendency is the useless, the vulgar, and insane enrichment of the few at the expense of the misery and sorrow and of the physical and spiritual degeneration of millions of men, women, and children who are now submerged by the devices of commercialism gone mad.

The bill should not pass.

BECAUSE IT IS CONTRARY TO THE WILL OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

Mr. President, the American people were promised by both parties a reduction of the tariff, and had a right to expect substantial reduction. The representatives of one-half of the people, assembled at Denver, emphasized this matter most vigorously in the Democratic platform in the following language:

We welcome the belated promise of *tariff reform* now offered by the Republican party.

This platform declared:

The people can not safely intrust the execution of this important work to a party which is so *deeply obligated to the highly protected interests as is the Republican party.*

This platform states:

We call attention to the significant fact that the promised relief was *postponed until after the coming election*—an election to succeed in which the Republican party must have the *same support from the beneficiaries of the high protective tariff as it has always heretofore received from them*; and to the further fact that during years of uninterrupted power no action whatever has been taken by the Republican Congress to correct the admittedly existing tariff iniquities.

This platform further declared:

We favor immediate revision of the *tariff by the reduction of import duties.* * * *

The party to which I have the honor to belong has, since 1876, demanded a proper reform of the inequalities, injustices, and false pretenses of a tariff controlled by selfish interests at the expense of the American people.

It never has, Mr. President, at any time contemplated so reducing the tariff as to injuriously affect any legitimate industry whatever. On the contrary, while it has pointed vigorously to the fraud and false pretenses of the monopoly protecting tariff, it always has been mindful of the rights of capital legitimately employed in manufacture, and equally mindful of labor employed in industries established under the shelter of our tariff system.

In 1884 the Democratic national platform said:

Many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of reform must be subjected in the execution to this plain dictate of justice; *all taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government.* The necessary reduction of taxation can and must be effected *without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country.*

The practice of writing these schedules at prohibitive rates and preventing competition and engendering monopoly has been fiercely condemned by the Democracy as "robbery of the great majority for the benefit of the few" (1892). It has demanded a constitutional tariff drawn for the purpose of revenue, but has not condemned the unavoidable incidental protection which any tariff for revenue, or for revenue only, unavoidably affords, and which will always be found sufficient for the incidental protection of legitimate industry.

The reason why protection AS PRACTICED has been denounced as "robbery" is because such schedules have been drawn not for constitutional revenue purposes, but to shelter monopoly and permit monopoly to wrongfully tax the people under the color of a pretended revenue law.

The party to which I have the honor to belong, therefore (1908), welcomed the promise of tariff reform offered by the Republican party in 1908 on the basis of "the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad," for the obvious reason that a tariff so drawn would necessarily be a tariff for revenue with only such incidental protection as justice and common sense requires.

It was this kind of tariff law drawn in 1846, with which both parties were well satisfied in 1856. If this law were now so drawn, the contention between the two great parties on this issue would necessarily cease. [For party platforms compared see Exhibit 11.]

The party leaders of both great parties declared the purpose of reducing the tariff downward. No manner of explanation or evasion can alter the substantial truth that it was the expressed will of the American people making itself felt through both party platforms and through both party leaders that there should be a substantial reduction of tariff duties.

The Republican platform of 1908 declares "*unequivocally*"—a remarkable word in a platform, and suggests the purpose of equivocation—"for revision of the tariff by *special* session of the Congress *immediately* following the inauguration of the next President," and says:

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

The platform also says that it is the Republican policy—

To preserve *without excessive duties* the security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-workers of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system.

Excessive duties are here condemned by the leaders of the Republican party, and in 1904 the Republican platform declared:

The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

Even in the majority report of the House committee, page 2, section 1, they declared:

While duties should be protective, they should be adjusted as nearly as possible to represent the difference in cost of production at home and abroad.

IT VIOLATES THE REPUBLICAN PLEDGES.

The rates of the bill submitted by the Finance Committee average higher than the Dingley bill and are not a reduction at all.

The chairman of the Committee on Finance ostentatiously sets forth 379 items on which reductions are made.

These reductions, as will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 5 and by Exhibit 12, I here submit, are items of no national importance. Two hundred and seventy-four of these items involve articles whose imports are less than \$25,000, or severally less than one-thirtieth part of 1 penny gross imports per capita. The table which I submit gives the items in excess where the imports of such articles amounted to over \$25,000, and the table discloses the fact that the total imports excepting lumber was extremely small, and that the pretended reductions are of no importance, while the increases are of substantial importance.

Mr. President, this bill should not pass, because it violates the pledges of the Republican party and of the Republican leader during the last campaign. The party platform, I have shown above, is unequivocal. Its reasonable and natural interpretation is plain. The Senator from Indiana on May 25 set forth at great length the declarations of the President of the United States, quoting him as pledging the American people—

Genuine and honest revision * * * substantially a *revision downward*, though there will probably be a few exceptions—

As delivered by the President September 24, 1908.

No wonder the Republican Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] demands to know what this special session was called for, if it was merely to rewrite the Dingley bill.

No wonder the Republican Senators from Iowa, Indiana, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Wisconsin and other States *vehemently protest* against this betrayal of the party pledge. The Senator from Massachusetts will explain in vain to the American people that it was not the purpose of the party to have a substantial revision downward, as the President said, September 24, 1908, at Milwaukee.

The President in his inaugural address reiterated his construction of the purposes of the party, as was strongly pointed out by the Senator from Indiana, and stated in the most positive manner:

It is imperatively necessary, therefore, that a tariff bill be drawn in *good faith* in accordance with *promises made before the election* by the party in power.

And on December 17 last the President is quoted as having said before the Ohio Society:

Better no revision at all, better that the new bill should fail, unless we have an honest and thorough revision on the basis laid down and the principles outlined in the party platform.

The Republican platform declared in 1904 for a tariff law merely "equal to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad," and in 1908 likewise declared for—

Such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad.

And yet the leaders of that party, neither in the House nor in the Senate, have concerned themselves to compile "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad," although they have submitted many volumes of thousands of pages of confused miscellany, a small portion under oath, a large portion not under oath, with no safeguard whatever, and coming from selfish interests seeking the privilege of monopoly over the American people.

When I, as a Senator of the United States, representing the people of the United States, from Maine to California, and entitled by the honor and dignity of my position to a proper answer, demand to know "why the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad" had not been compiled as a basis for the drafting of this statute, the Senator from New Hampshire rises in his place and solemnly advises me that my inquiry is "absurd." [Turning to the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GALLINGER.] He will find his remarks on page 2134 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The suggestion is made by other Republican leaders that the information can not be obtained, and when I myself offer over 446 items which had been compiled ten years ago by Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, they show themselves acquainted with the matter, confess that this information can be obtained, and plead that the report is not up to date.

The Senator from Rhode Island, chairman of the Committee on Finance, rises in his place and, with a fine sense of humor excited by my request and inquiry why the difference in cost of production had not been compiled, advises me with amused satire that he will have a clerk compile for me a list of publications relating to the tariff, but will be unable to furnish me with the intelligence to digest them.

I shall not question the intelligence of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, nor shall I reply to him in kind. I appeal from him to the American people, who will not hold him

guiltless for his callous and reprehensible conduct in this matter.

Mr. President, I keenly regret to feel impelled to comment in this manner upon the conduct of public business in the Senate. Not only has the chairman of the Committee on Finance not furnished the Senate "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad;" not only has he not made a proper report to the Senate in regard to this matter; not only has he replied with satirical indifference to a respectful demand for proper information which he was charged with the duty of obtaining, but he has withheld information upon this point obtained by our Department of State, through the German Government, for the express purpose of our enlightenment. He has done, Mr. President, what is infinitely more reprehensible; he has refused to the Senator of Virginia and to the other Democratic members of the Senate Finance Committee the privilege of having the same information as he himself has enjoyed by virtue of being an officer of this body; and when, Mr. President, his attention is called to this unjust and unconstitutional conduct, he justifies it by quoting from an evil precedent of Democratic origin and seemed to think he had fully answered for this breach of duty.

Mr. President, a bad Democratic precedent is no more respectable to me than a bad precedent from any other source.

The conduct of the chairman of the Committee on Finance in holding secret meetings with regard to this public matter and in giving repeated confidential audiences to the agents of monopoly, whose advice is influencing the various paragraphs of this bill in their own interests against the interests of the American people, is a bad precedent either to set or to follow, and puts the management of the Senate of the United States under the suspicion of a want of frankness and of a want of sincerity in drawing these schedules. It is of the highest national importance that the Senate of the United States and every Member of it should not only be above suspicion, but, as far as possible, beyond danger of being deceived or misled.

This evil precedent has already borne bad fruit, and the chairman of the Committee on Finance has been induced to put into this bill and to retain in this bill many so-called "jokers"—that is, words and phrases, innocent in appearance, with far-reaching consequences, favorable to the beneficiary and unfavorable to the people. These devices have already been pointed out on the floor, and I shall not pause to enumerate them. No court of justice, and no high official of government charged with a sacred trust should permit himself to conduct "star-chamber proceedings," because it is almost sure to bring upon himself the odium of suspicion and public hostility as a Member of the United States Senate.

I enter my emphatic protest against this conduct of the public business as a precedent. It should not be permitted to stand as a precedent.

The poor excuse that the Democratic Members were lately furnished with the assistance of two statisticians does not in the least degree excuse this grossly improper method of conducting the public business. These experts were not furnished until it was too late to use their services advantageously for the proper digest and amendment of this bill.

For over a year the Republican Members have given it out that they were preparing this bill, and yet with all this time they have never yet furnished either the House or Senate with "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad" of the items in the paragraphs of the Dingley bill, which they were honor bound to do by the platform of 1904 and by the platform of 1908, which required the redrawing of these paragraphs on this precise basis.

They can furnish no explanation of this astonishing and shocking neglect of duty, except perhaps the explanation offered by the Senator from South Carolina, who humorously apologized for them—

That they could not be expected to furnish a rope with which to hang themselves.

Is it possible, Mr. President, that men of nobility and character, that Senators trusted by the people with such power, have knowingly refused to compile "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad" on the items of the Dingley bill for our present guidance because they intended to break faith with the American people and did not dare to make the truth manifest by compiling this damning evidence of their betrayal of their party pledges?

Whatever the purpose, Mr. President, the responsible authorities of the Senate in charge of this bill have furnished everything else except the evidence in point, and have obscured the issues both in the Senate and House by many volumes of undi-

gested and undigestible matter, as well calculated to confuse the mind of an intelligent and laborious legislator as the huge volumes of testimony bundled before the petit jury in the criminal cases, for the purpose of befogging the issue and assuring a miscarriage of justice.

In answer to my resolute demand for this information, the managers of the Senate, presenting and sustaining this bill, undertook to ridicule and discourage the inquiry. The chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. ALDRICH] indulges in satire, evasion, and suggests a lack of intelligence in the inquiry. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] declares the inquiry absurd. The Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] suggests that Senators can not expect to be fed with an intellectual spoon, and so forth. And this is the utterly contemptible and pusillanimous manner in which party pledges are redeemed. This is the answer made to a respectful inquiry, why this information is not furnished as to "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad," and why this bill is not written in the light of this evidence, as the party pledged itself to do to the American people.

Mr. President, the Republican leaders in charge of this bill occupy a position absolutely and utterly indefensible. They have boldly and openly violated the pledges of the party and have sacrificed the interests of the American people to benefit those selfish interests which are using these high schedules for the purpose of sheltering monopoly.

Mr. President, I can not help but believe that the Republican leaders, acting through the subtle influence of machine politics, have been led into a support of these high schedules without fully realizing that they are violating their party pledges, which confines them to the difference of the cost of production at home and abroad, but having made the error, defend it from false pride of opinion.

They have been, not perhaps quite hypnotized, but overwhelmed with the "power of suggestion" enveloping them and creating the atmosphere and controlling environment established by a swarm of attorneys, special pleaders, and fascinating representatives of the high-tariff beneficiaries.

They seem to have entirely lost sight of the principle of protection taught by their forefathers and defended by their own platform. This bill ought not to pass

BECAUSE IT VIOLATES THE TRUE PRINCIPLE OF LEGITIMATE PROTECTION, WHICH DOES NOT ENGENDER OR DEFEND MONOPOLY.

This bill ought not to pass, because it violates the principle of protection from beginning to end.

Mr. President, if there is one thing that ought to be more thoroughly understood than another in this country it is—

The principle of legitimate protection.

There is not the slightest doubt about what it means from the days of Alexander Hamilton to this good day. The meaning of protection is absolutely clear to all students of economy, and that is a duty under a constitutional revenue tariff, so levied as to equal "the difference in cost of production at home and abroad," and thus enable the American manufacturer to meet on equal terms the competition of the foreign manufacturer, who enjoys cheaper labor or more favorable conditions, but not to establish monopoly by prohibitive duties.

Alexander Hamilton, in his famous report on the encouragement of manufacturers, gives the reasons for this policy. It was accepted by Washington, by Jefferson, by Madison, by Andrew Jackson, and various Democratic leaders down to the days of Samuel J. Tilden and Grover Cleveland, and has not been denied, as far as I am informed, by any great Democratic leader.

The Democratic platform of 1884 vigorously declared that in reducing the tariff the reduction—

Must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country.

And the Republican platform of 1904 says:

The measure of protection should always, at least, equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

And this doctrine is repeated again in the tariff of 1908 in the following words:

The true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad.

The Republican platform of 1908, however, adds the words:

Together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

This latter is not the doctrine of protection. It is the political wedge of monopoly. It is the latest political device of those who have been fraudulently building up monopoly under color of the doctrine of protection.

The Democrats have sincerely and justly declared "Republican protection" a fraud and the shelter of monopoly. The Republicans have unjustly and deceitfully declared the Democratic tariff for revenue to be free trade.

I shall undertake, Mr. President, to show that the tariff under the doctrine for revenue would be three times as high as a tariff drawn purely for purposes of protection under the principles laid down in the Republican platform of equaling the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, if it were honestly drawn.

The Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue is not free trade or anything which approximates it. It is a tariff high enough to abundantly afford every protection to any American industry which it has an honest right to ask, as I shall immediately show.

The Democratic doctrine has been the correct one; that is, a tariff as low as economical government will permit, and not so low as to injure any legitimate industry established under our tariff system, contending that a tariff for revenue properly drawn will meet by incidental protection every legitimate demand.

I shall not pause to discuss the difference between the two parties. I shall content myself with showing that this bill does not conform to the principle of legitimate protection, absolute or incidental, laid down by either party, but under the pretense of protecting American labor and American capital legitimately employed it is written in such a manner as to utterly ignore the principles of protection as taught by the Republicans themselves. This will be perfectly obvious to any man who will take the schedules submitted under the head of "Estimated revenues of this bill," of April 12, 1909, showing the rates proposed by this present bill and the comparison of the rates with the Dingley bill.

THE DIFFERENCE IN THE COST OF PRODUCTION AT HOME AND ABROAD.

The cost of production depends on materials and labor.

Materials are as cheap in the markets of the world to the American as to the European, except as we tax import of raw material by our own statute. Our policy, with few exceptions, is to admit raw material free, so that the question of the relative cost of materials is of very small relative importance.

Our manufacturers get free raw materials for their export business by refund of duties paid.

Many materials are cheaper in the United States than they are abroad, except where controlled by our unrestrained monopolies.

LABOR COST.

Labor cost in wages in the protected industries, measured by efficiency and the purchasing power of wages paid to labor, is approximately the same in the United States as in Europe, except where the American wage-earner is highly organized.

1. I shall undertake to show that this is true by showing that the money paid American labor in protected industries is approximately on an average but little more than that paid in Europe.

2. That the American workman is twice as efficient, and because of efficiency is entitled to twice the wage of the European workman, and that the difference in labor cost compared to the value of the product is in favor of the American manufacturer.

3. I shall undertake to show that \$150 of wages in the United States buys only what a hundred dollars buys in Europe in manufactured goods, and for this reason the American manufacturer does not pay his labor as much in proportion to work done as the European manufacturer.

4. I shall undertake to show, finally, that the total percentage of wages to the gross product of all American manufacturers is only 17.8 per cent of the gross value of the product, and, therefore, that the difference in the cost of production in the United States and abroad must be on an average less than this percentage. If labor abroad cost half as much as in the United States, as the high protectionists pretend, then the difference in cost of production necessary to be provided for by a purely protective tariff would be less than the average of 10 per cent, while a revenue tariff would be between 30 and 40 per cent.

I shall undertake to show the bad effect of a prohibitive tariff on wages, on commerce, on distribution of wealth, and in corrupting of public and private life.

3. Effect of prohibitive tariff.

ON WAGES.

(a) Has lowered wages relative to product.

(b) Has lowered wages in protected industries compared to unprotected industries.

(c) Has lowered purchasing power of wages.

(d) Has established monopoly, and, consequently,

1. Has prevented or obstructed the organization of labor.
2. Restricted output and diminished demand for labor.
3. Has substituted foreign pauper labor for American labor.
4. Has required ruinous hours.
5. Subjected labor to bad housing, bad water, insanitary conditions.
6. Has increased mortality of labor.
7. Has destroyed political liberty of its labor in large measure.
8. Has impaired labor's commercial independence.
9. Has appropriated all the net proceeds of labor and accumulated it in the hands of the few.

ON COMMERCE.

(a) Has weakened our imports and exports.

(b) Has diminished the output of smaller factories, depending for material on monopolies.

(c) Has raised prices in United States 50 per cent above the prices abroad, thus diminishing consumption.

1. This means a ruinous tax on the man or woman with fixed income. A man with income of \$1,500 has one-third of income confiscated by monopolies' high prices.

This affects all men with fixed income. The clerk, the servant, the government employee, the pensioner, the man receiving fixed return from investment, yields one-third of it all to monopoly.

ON DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

1. It has piled up enormous wealth in few hands, which now grows with accumulating force, absorbing all natural opportunities of life. The oil fields, coal, ore, timber, transportation, and transmission services, municipal franchises, real estate, water powers, with the inevitable result, if not checked, of commercial mastery and commercial slavery and destruction of political independence.

2. It has corrupted our public life, our elections, our cities, our courts, legislatures, and executive officers, and our private citizens.

FIRST. RELATIVE LABOR COST.

Mr. President, I wish to point out the relative labor cost, because in considering this matter as a student, I have faithfully undertaken to do so. What I shall say will be as a student of this matter and not as a mere controversialist—and I defy the Committee on Finance to challenge the accuracy of the figures which I submit to the Senate—the labor cost of material is the first great factor that ought to be considered by the Senate. The percentage which labor bears to various products, as shown by our statistical tables, is carefully set forth in Exhibit 1, taken from volumes 7-10 on manufactures of our federal census.

It is true that the Census Bureau neglected to work out the percentages of labor cost, but that is a mathematical problem easy of solution, to which I have given industrious attention. I call the attention of the Senate to these percentages, which are of vital importance if this bill is to be written in a spirit of integrity. From this table it appears that labor's share of the gross product in the food industries was 5.7 per cent; in textiles, 19.5 per cent; in iron and steel, 22.10 per cent; lumber, 27.4 per cent; leather industries, 16.5 per cent; in paper and printing, 21.6 per cent; in liquors and beverages, 8.9 per cent; in chemicals and allied products, 8 per cent; clay, glass, and stone products, 37.1 per cent; in metals and metal products, 12.7 per cent; tobacco products, 18.9 per cent; for vehicles for land transportation, 34.4 per cent; in shipbuilding, 35.2 per cent; in miscellaneous industries, 19.9 per cent.

The average of wages paid to labor, compared with the gross product in the 14 great industries, therefore, is only 19.7 per cent of the gross product. And yet the leaders bring in this bill with the average three times as high as the total labor cost, and ask us, representing the people of the United States, to accept it without a murmur and without a protest. They have neglected to point out the difference of the cost of production at home and abroad. I have undertaken to do so, and to put upon the records of the Senate a lasting memorial of what this cost is, that they shall not leave this matter without explanation to the people of the United States. It shall be recorded and it is recorded by the tables which I shall immediately submit.

Mr. President, before I submit these tables, however, I wish to call attention to the report of Carroll D. Wright. I have suggested heretofore to the managers of this bill that they might consult the tables of Carroll D. Wright with advantage. He

offers 446 different articles, with the total labor cost measured to the cent in each and every one of them, taking this information from the United States, from Germany, from Belgium, from England, and he verifies in these particular instances the accuracy of our general tables taken from the Census Bureau.

Obviously, the difference in the percentage which the wages of labor abroad would bear to manufactured products in like great industries will be somewhat similar to the percentage in this country. Wages are somewhat cheaper abroad in the protected industries than they are in this country, and if the average wage was only half abroad what it is at home, the difference in the cost of wages at home and abroad would not exceed 10 per cent ad valorem on the gross products of labor in all of our 14 great groups of manufacturing industries; but when it is remembered that American labor is twice as productive in this country as it is abroad, even this 10 per cent disappears. Notwithstanding this important and vital fact, the representatives of high protection continually declaim that a 50 per cent tariff is almost solely and exclusively in the interest of the American laborer and for the protection of the American manufacturer from bankruptcy.

THE LOWER WAGES IN EUROPE OFFSET BY GREATER EFFICIENCY OF AMERICAN LABOR.

James G. Blaine once said:

That the actual labor cost of the American product is less because the effectiveness of American labor was superior to that of the workman of any other nation on earth.

Prof. William G. Clark, indorsed as an authority by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], in the Engineering Magazine for May, 1904, submits a table, which he bases on official data, showing the comparative productivity of American labor for the year 1900, as follows, to wit:

American, average annual output.....	\$2,450
Canadian, average annual output.....	1,455
Australian, average annual output.....	900
French, average annual output.....	640
England, average annual output.....	556
German, average annual output.....	460

I do not assert that these figures are strictly correct, but believe it will be generally conceded that the American workman has at least twice the efficiency of the European workman, because of the use of superior machinery, modern appliances, and more effective invention.

PER CENT OF WAGES TO VALUE OF PRODUCT NOT CONSIDERED IN TARIFF RATES OF PENDING BILL.

The percentage which labor receives upon the gross product in the textiles industry, for example, as compiled by our own census on manufactures, is only 19.5 per cent; and yet when the woolen schedule, for example, is examined, the present bill puts yarn, 143 per cent (par. 373); knit fabrics, 141 per cent (par. 374); plushes and other pile fabrics, 141 per cent; wool advanced in any manner beyond scouring, 140 per cent; woolen cloths or worsted, 134 per cent (par. 374); blankets, 107 per cent; flannels for underwear, 143 per cent; dress goods, coat linings, and so forth, 105 per cent (par. 376); felts, not woven, 95 per cent; wearing apparel, clothes, dolman, jackets, ulsters, and so forth, for ladies and children, 80 per cent; hats of wool, 92 per cent; shawls, 92 per cent; woolen carpets, 114 per cent (par. 389).

Grossly violating the principle of protection, even from the Republican standpoint, and even in cotton cloth, which is particularly needed by our poorest people, cotton carpets are taxed 50 per cent (par. 389); cotton cloth 42 per cent, and as high as 61 per cent for different kinds of cotton cloth; cotton handkerchiefs, 55 per cent; cotton sleeve linings, 58 per cent.

Mr. President, the cost of labor in transforming wool and cotton into cloth is small. It does not exceed an average of 25 per cent, and in England it is slightly more than in the United States, because the labor there is not so efficient as in the United States; and the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad as far as the labor cost in cotton and woolen cloth is concerned is almost a negligible quantity.

It will not do, Mr. President, to attempt to deceive anyone by pretending that the difference in cost of production of items on this bill at home and abroad is not available, or that it would take years to compile it, as the managers of this bill have asserted on the floor of the Senate during this debate. It is available, and it has been collected on many sample products.

I had the honor to submit to the Senate, during the present session, the report of Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, of 1898, who carefully examined into this question of costs, giving the precise amounts of costs in 446 instances. And in regard to woolen goods he shows that No. 1 woolen yarn can be

made at a labor cost of 5.44 per cent of the finished product (S. Doc. 20, 55th Cong., 3d sess., p. 84); that woolen yarn No. 2 could be made with a labor cost of 4.74 per cent of the finished product; that woolen yarn No. 3 could be made for 7.11 per cent of the finished product; that woolen yarn No. 4 could be made for 6.49 per cent of the finished product; that woolen yarn No. 5 could be made at a cost of 7.71 per cent of the finished product; that woolen yarn No. 6 could be made at a labor cost of 9.29 per cent of the finished product; and including the entire cost of labor in transformation materials, which are shown in No. 426, that woolen cloth in the United States, 55 inches wide, 24 ounces to the yard, can be made at a labor cost of 16.44 per cent of the finished product.

But the Committee on Finance approve a rate of 143 per cent on woolen yarn.

Mr. President, if I should point out all of such inequalities between the cost of production at home and abroad and the rates fixed by this bill, with its 4,000 items, it would require a volume and many days of time. I therefore content myself with a complete demonstration of the general character of this bill in its indifference to the principles of protection as laid down in the Republican platform, and will then proceed with other considerations.

I take a few items from Carroll D. Wright's report, giving the cost of labor in transforming wool into blankets in the United States, compiled by him under the instructions of the Senate ten years ago, and of woolen cloth.

He explains that this work was obtained directly from the manufacturers by the Department of Labor, using "experts from the department, detailed for that purpose."

He shows the total cost of labor in blankets, cloth, and woolen yarns to be from 5 per cent to 30 per cent.

[From report of Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, 1898, by experts on cost, in answer to Senate resolution.]

Woolen goods.

No. 390.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.

White; best grade; all wool; warp, 16 cut; filling, 10 cut; 46 threads of warp and 38 picks of filling per inch; size, 72x80 inches; weight, 6 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.145	15.56
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.787	84.44
Total cost.....	.932	100.00

No. 391.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.

White; navy; all wool; warp, 7½ cut; filling, 6½ cut; 24 threads of warp and 24 picks of filling per inch; size, 58x78 inches; weight, 3½ pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0978	15.28
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.5422	84.72
Total cost.....	.6400	100.00

No. 392.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.

White; medium grade; all wool; same general description as product No. 390, but made of cheaper quality wool.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.13	18.57
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.57	81.43
Total cost.....	.70	100.00

No. 393.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.

All wool; warp, 11 cut; filling, 9 cut; 23½ threads of warp and 27 picks of filling per inch; size, 58x76 inches; weight, 2 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.1417	31.40
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.3096	68.60
Total cost.....	.4513	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 394.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; best grade; cotton warp and wool filling; warp, No. 16; filling, 10 cut; 52 threads of warp and 42 picks of filling per inch; size, 60x72 inches; weight, 5 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.125	15.76
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.668	84.24
Total cost.....	.793	100.00

No. 395.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; mixed cotton and wool; warp, 10 cut; filling, 10 cut; 36 threads of warp and 36 picks of filling per inch; size, 60x72 inches; weight, 5 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.135	16.71
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.673	83.29
Total cost.....	.808	100.00

No. 392.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; medium grade; all wool; same general description as product No. 390, but made of cheaper quality wool.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.13	18.57
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.57	81.43
Total cost.....	.70	100.00

No. 393.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
All wool; warps, 11 cut; filling, 9 cut; 23½ threads of warp and 27 picks of filling per inch; size 58x76 inches; weight, 2 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.1417	31.40
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.3096	68.60
Total cost.....	.4513	100.00

No. 394.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; best grade; cotton warp and wool filling; warp No. 16; filling, 10 cut; 52 threads of warp and 42 picks of filling per inch; size, 60x72 inches; weight, 5 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.125	15.76
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.668	84.24
Total cost.....	.793	100.00

No. 400.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
Horse; medium grade; all wool; warp and filling, both 5-cut; 22 threads of warp and 22 picks of filling per inch; size, 84x90 inches; weight, 7 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0650	19.07
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.3607	80.93
Total cost.....	.4457	100.00

No. 401.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
Horse; plaid; all wool; warp and filling, both 4½-cut; 21½ threads of warp and 17 picks of filling per inch; size, 78x80 inches; weight, 5 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.1000	21.42
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.3669	78.58
Total cost.....	.4669	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 402.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
Horse; low grade; mixed wool and cotton; warp and filling, both 4-cut; 20 threads of warp and 20 picks of filling per inch; size, 84x90 inches; weight, 7 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0550	32.09
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.1164	67.91
Total cost.....	.1714	100.00

No. 403.—Blankets: United States; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
Horse; blue; cotton warp and wool filling; warp, No. 10; filling, 4-cut; 32½ threads of warp and 48 picks of filling per inch; size, 84x90 inches; weight, 7 pounds.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0714	24.43
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.2209	75.57
Total cost.....	.2923	100.00

No. 404.—Blankets: Belgium; 1897; unit, 1 pound.
White; all wool; medium quality.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0525	14.99
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.2977	85.01
Total cost.....	.3502	100.00

No. 405.—Cloth: United States; March, 1898; unit, 1 yard.
Beaver; 54 inches wide; weight, 29 ounces per yard; warp yarn, No. 16 colored cotton; weft yarn, ¾ of 2½ run and ¼ of 1 run shoddy; 85 ends of warp and 62 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.240	28.20
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	6.11	71.80
Total cost.....	.851	100.00

No. 406.—Cloth: United States; March, 1898; unit, 1 yard.
Cassimere; 54 inches wide; weight, 20½ ounces per yard; warp yarn, 2½ run; weft yarn, 2½ run; 50 ends of warp and 36 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.20	23.81
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.64	76.19
Total cost.....	.84	100.00

No. 407.—Cloth: United States; March, 1898; unit, 1 yard.
Cassimere; 54 inches wide; weight, 22 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 2 run; weft yarn, 2½ run; 50 ends of warp and 36 picks of filling per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.2100	23.80
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.6725	76.20
Total cost.....	.8825	100.00

No. 408.—Cloth: United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cassimere; 54 inches wide; weight, 26 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 4-run; weft yarn, 5-run; 75 ends of warp and 64 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.3654	28.31
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.9252	71.69
Total cost.....	1.2906	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 409.—*Cloth*: United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cassimere; 54 inches wide; weight, 20 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 4-run; weft yarn, 5-run; 60 ends of warp and 52 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.2801	28.09
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.7172	71.91
Total cost.....	.9973	100.00

No. 410.—*Cloth*: United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cassimere; 55 inches wide; weight, 22 ounces per yard; 4½-run yarn, single, double, and twisted, is used in both warp and weft; 38 ends of warp and 38 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.2163	17.30
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	1.0337	82.70
Total cost.....	1.2500	100.00

No. 411.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cheviot; 56 inches wide; weight, 32 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 2-ply No. 24 worsted face and 2½-run wool; back weft yarn, 2½-run face and 2-run back; 86 ends of warp and 60 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.42	28.00
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	1.08	72.00
Total cost.....	1.50	100.00

No. 412.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897, unit, 1 yard.
Cheviot; 55 inches wide; weight, 28 ounces per yard; 1½-run yarn used in both warp and weft; 38 ends of warp and 32 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.22	22.45
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.76	77.55
Total cost.....	.98	100.00

No. 413.—*Cloth*: United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cheviot; half shoddy; 56 inches wide; weight, 22 ounces per yard; 1½-run yarn is used in both warp and weft; 28 ends of warp and 26 ends of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.15	28.30
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.38	71.70
Total cost.....	.53	100.00

No. 414.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cheviot; piece dyed; 55 inches wide; weight, 20 ounces per yard; 2 threads of 3½ runs each, doubled and twisted, used in both warp and weft; 40 ends of warp and 30 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.1688	22.51
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.5812	77.49
Total cost.....	.7500	100.00

No. 415.—*Cloth*: United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Kersey; high grade; finely finished; 55 inches wide; weight, 20 ounces per yard; 4½-run yarn is used in both warp and weft; 48 ends of warp and 48 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.54	30.86
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	1.21	69.14
Total cost.....	1.75	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 416.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Kersey; 55 inches wide; weight, 27 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 4 run; weft yarn, 4½-run face and 2-run back; 76 ends of warp and 60 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.38	31.93
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.81	68.07
Total cost.....	1.19	100.00

No. 417.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Kersey; piece dyed; 55 inches wide; weight, 32 ounces per yard; warp yarn, ⅔ of 7 run and ⅓ of 2½ run; weft yarn, ⅔ of 5 run and ⅓ of 2½ run; 88 ends of warp and 66 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.4202	22.47
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	1.4498	77.53
Total cost.....	1.8700	100.00

No. 418.—*Cloth*: United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Kersey; one-third shoddy; 56 inches wide; weight, 28 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 20 ends of 3½ run and 20 ends of 1½ run per inch; weft yarn, 2 run; 40 ends of warp and 40 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.288	25.09
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.860	74.91
Total cost.....	1.148	100.00

No. 419.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Kersey; half shoddy; piece dyed; 55 inches wide; weight, 32 ounces per yard; warp yarn, ⅔ of 3 run and ⅓ of 1 run; weft yarn, 2½ run; 54 ends of warp and 40 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.2388	28.09
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.6112	71.91
Total cost.....	.8500	100.00

No. 420.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Friese; 55 inches wide; weight, 32 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 3½ run; weft yarn, 1½ run; 44 ends of warp and 44 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.26	25.49
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.76	74.51
Total cost.....	1.02	100.00

No. 421.—*Cloth*: United States; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Melton; 54 inches wide; weight, 28 ounces per yard; warp yarn, 3 run; weft yarn, 3½ run; 58 ends of warp and 54 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.2549	25.67
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.7381	74.33
Total cost.....	.9930	100.00

No. 422.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Thibet; 55 inches wide; weight, 23 ounces per yard; 3½ run yarn used in both warp and weft; 95 ends of warp and 46 picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.32	28.57
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.80	71.43
Total cost.....	1.12	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 423.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Thibet; piece dyed; 55 inches wide; weight, 22 ounces per yard;
warp yarn, 5 run; weft yarn, 1½ run; 46 ends of warp and 32 picks
of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	\$0.1825	28.08
Cost of materials and all other items except labor4675	71.92
Total cost.....	.6500	100.00

No. 424.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Tricot; piece dyed; 32 inches wide; weight, 3¼ ounces per yard;
6½ run yarn used in both warp and weft; 35 ends of warp and 26
picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	\$0.035	25.00
Cost of materials and all other items except labor105	75.00
Total cost.....	.140	100.00

No. 425.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Whip cord; 55 inches wide; weight, 22 ounces per yard; warp yarn,
5½ run and 9 run, twisted; weft yarn, 4 run; 98 ends of warp and 40
picks of weft per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	\$0.38	24.36
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	1.18	75.64
Total cost.....	1.56	100.00

No. 426.—*Cloth*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Woolen cloth; 55 inches wide; weight, 23 to 24 ounces per yard;
warp yarn, 2-ply 3½ run wool; weft yarn, 2-ply ⅔ worsted; 30 picks
per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	\$0.24	16.44
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	1.22	83.56
Total cost.....	1.46	100.00

No. 427.—*Cloth*: Great Britain; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Cheviot; 54 inches wide; worsted warp and woolen weft; warp 2 fold
No. 10 worsted; weft No. 9½ and No. 30 twist; 20 picks per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	\$0.2233	29.45
Cost of materials and all other items except labor5349	70.55
Total cost.....	.7582	100.00

No. 428.—*Cloth*: Great Britain; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Melton; 54 inches wide; woolen warp and weft; warp No. 12; weft
No. 12; 32 picks per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	\$0.2026	29.89
Cost of materials and all other items except labor4752	70.11
Total cost.....	.6778	100.00

No. 429.—*Cloth*: Great Britain; 1897; unit, 1 yard.
Undress worsted; 56 inches wide; woolen warp and weft; warp No.
18; weft No. 18; 50 picks per inch.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	\$0.2407	25.15
Cost of materials and all other items except labor7162	74.85
Total cost.....	.9569	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 430.—*Woolen yarn*: United States; 1897-98; unit, 1 pound.
No. 1 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	\$0.0260	5.44
Cost of materials and all other items except labor4522	94.56
Total cost.....	.4782	100.00

No. 431.—*Woolen yarn*: United States; December, 1897; unit, 1 pound.
No. 2 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	\$0.0287	4.74
Cost of materials and all other items except labor5773	95.26
Total cost.....	.6060	100.00

No. 432.—*Woolen yarn*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 pound.
No. 2 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials	\$0.0800	21.82
Cost of materials and all other items except labor2866	78.18
Total cost.....	.3666	100.00

No. 433.—*Woolen yarn*: United States; 1897-98; unit, 1 pound.
No. 3 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0382	7.11
Cost of materials and all other items except labor4987	92.89
Total cost.....	.5369	100.00

No. 434.—*Woolen yarn*: United States; December, 1897; unit, 1 pound.
No. 3 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0337	5.50
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.5788	94.50
Total cost.....	.6125	100.00

No. 435.—*Woolen yarn*: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 pound.
No. 3½ yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.1000	23.12
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.3325	76.88
Total cost.....	.4325	100.00

No. 436.—*Woolen yarn*: United States; December, 1897; unit, 1 pound.
No. 4 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0412	6.49
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.5938	93.51
Total cost.....	.6350	100.00

No. 437.—*Woolen yarn*: United States; 1897-98; unit, 1 pound.
No. 5 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0640	10.48
Cost of materials and all other items except labor5469	89.52
Total cost.....	.6109	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 438.—Woolen yarn: United States; December, 1897; unit, 1 pound. No. 5 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0512	7.71
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.6133	92.29
Total cost.....	.6645	100.00

No. 439.—Woolen yarn: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 pound. No. 5½ yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.1200	22.37
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.4163	77.63
Total cost.....	.5365	100.00

No. 440.—Woolen yarn: United States; 1897-98; unit, 1 pound. No. 6 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0742	11.88
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.5505	88.12
Total cost.....	.6247	100.00

No. 441.—Woolen yarn: United States; December, 1897; unit, 1 pound. No. 6 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0637	9.29
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.6218	90.71
Total cost.....	.6855	100.00

No. 442.—Woolen yarn: United States; 1897-98; unit, 1 pound.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0941	13.51
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.6025	86.49
Total cost.....	.6966	100.00

No. 443.—Woolen yarn: United States; November, 1897; unit, 1 pound. No. 9 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.1500	19.85
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.6055	80.15
Total cost.....	.7555	100.00

No. 8 yarn.

No. 444.—Woolen yarn: United States; 1897-98; unit, 1 pound. No. 10 yarn.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.1085	14.65
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.6322	85.35
Total cost.....	.7407	100.00

No. 445.—Woolen yarn: Belgium; 1897; unit, 1 pound.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0700	26.66
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.1926	73.34
Total cost.....	.2626	100.00

Woolen goods—Continued.

No. 446.—Woolen yarn: Belgium; 1897; unit, 1 pound.

	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Cost of labor in transforming materials.....	\$0.0306	11.65
Cost of materials and all other items except labor.....	.2320	88.35
Total cost.....	.2626	100.00

CENSUS TABLES, SHOWING PERCENTAGE OF LABOR TO VALUE OF PRODUCT IN COST OF PRODUCTION.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I submit the following tables, taken from Table 156 of the Abstract of the Census of 1900, relative to 15 groups of industries. While these tables can not be called microscopically exact, they certainly comprise the best evidence available to show the relative return to labor and to capital affected by the tariff, and in so far as they lack precision are more favorable to capital than to labor, because these figures were obtained from the reports of manufacturing establishments controlled by capital, and the evidences, therefore, are out of the mouths of the manufacturers themselves, but are based on watered stocks, and cover returns to capital contained in salaries and miscellaneous items which can not be determined.

These tables which I shall submit will show the capital alleged to be invested in 1890, 1900, and 1905, with the expenses, including salaries of officers, amounts paid in wages, amounts paid under the head of "Miscellaneous," and the amount paid for "materials," with the value of the product and the profit, showing the percentage of profit to capital and the percentage paid to labor out of the proceeds of labor, and the percentage of wages to the increase of value by manufacture.

I have been compelled to make these compilations, and am indebted for the calculations to Mr. Josiah H. Shinn, of Washington, a statistical expert of high standing, and to Mr. J. J. McCoy, Actuary of the United States Treasury. The Census Bureau neglected to point out in its tables the comparative reward of capital and labor, and I have done so, in order to show the truth with regard to it.

Neither the Committee on Finance nor the Committee on Ways and Means in the House has seen fit to furnish this information to the country, and yet only in this direction and by like methods and tables can be determined "the difference in cost of labor or of production at home and abroad" on which this tariff bill is falsely pretended to be drawn.

The percentage of labor is worked out in every one of the great tables affecting the 14 groups of industries in the United States from details gathered with infinite care from the manufacturer himself, and are therefore as favorable to him as they might naturally be expected to be. A very interesting ratio of the relative wages is found in these tables; that is to say, that under this high prohibitive tariff, engendering monopolies, the result has followed which might be expected to follow—that labor continually receives a diminishing share of that which it produces. For instance, taking the textile industry, in 1890 labor received 22 per cent of the gross product; in 1902 it received 20.8 per cent of the gross product; and in 1905 it received 19.5 per cent. So it will be found all through these tables that the monopolies which have been built up upon these tariffs have gradually diminished the part which labor receives.

Look at these wonderful tables, showing the profits of the various manufacturers of the country by groups of industries. Remember the enormous stock-watering operations shown by Moody's Manual and by Poor's Manual and the corporation statistics of the last fifteen years, and then consider what it means when this watered capital on food products pays 16.4 per cent interest, with a fairly estimated profit, considering water, of 32 per cent; on textiles, of 12 per cent, with a fairly estimated profit of 24 per cent; on iron and steel, of 10.6 per cent, which would be probably 30 per cent; on lumber, of 18.7 per cent, and probably of nearly 50 per cent; on the industries of leather, 13.5 per cent, when it should be at least three times that; and so all through the list.

These monopolies are shown to have the certain enormous rates of profits which these tables point out. These tables necessarily include a multitude of companies whose profits are reasonable and just in every respect, who are not monopolists, who are doing business on a fair competitive market, so that the profits of monopoly are the special profits which swell this total to a high figure, and which stand above, and far above, the averages

which are given. When there is also taken into consideration the fact that on a physical valuation they would not have probably one-third of the capital invested which they pretend to have by their capital stock; when it is remembered that under the head of salaries and miscellaneous expenses and other artful methods of bookkeeping the earnings of these monopolies are being secretly used and concealed and being invested in various forms of property, it is no exaggeration to say that the earnings on physical valuation are probably three times what they appear to be on the face of the census reports.

Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators in considering these tables and invite them to remember that since 1890 the United States has gone through the most remarkable stock-watering operation that the civilized world has ever seen. And the earning power of labor and of public franchises has been capitalized in a multitude of monopolies, which have been established by combining competing enterprises into single companies, so that, while the capital of 1890 was in a large measure watered stock, it is probably no exaggeration to say that the capital of 1905 will average probably 66 per cent of "water;" so that when you consider the percentage of profit on the capital in these tables it should be at least doubled and should be probably trebled to give a fair estimate.

Another item which should be kept in mind is that the men who control corporate organizations can allow themselves such enormous rewards under the head of salaries that this item is also an important additional item in favor of capital. With this explanation, it will be seen that labor's share of the return of the work done in this aggregate group of all the great industries relating to manufactured products is very small and, after supplying the necessities of life, leaves labor no surplus; the profit of capital, confessedly, is 16.4 per cent.

Now, Mr. President, I submit a tabulated abstract showing the profits of capital conceded; also a table of estimated profits and a table of probable profits in the 14 great groups of our national industries.

THE MEANING OF WORDS USED IN THE TABLES.

Salaries.—Covers the salaries of officials, salesmen, bookkeepers, clerks, stenographers; in some cases, superintendents and foremen.

Wages.—The word "wages" means the wages of workingmen.

Miscellaneous.—Means (see Special Report of Census, Manufactures, vol. 1, 1905, p. xcix):

1. Amount paid for rent of factory or works.
2. Amount paid for taxes, not including internal revenue.
3. Amount paid for rent of offices and buildings other than factory or works, and for interest, insurance, internal-revenue tax, ordinary repairs of buildings and machinery, advertising, traveling expenses, and all other sundry expenses not reported under the head of "Materials."

Materials.—The word "materials," page ci, means:

1. Cost of components of the product.
2. Cost of fuel, oil, and waste.
3. Packing boxes, and materials to make them.
4. Wrapping paper.
5. Freight paid by the manufacturers.
6. Rent of power and heat.

The salaried officials include the administration force, whether of sales, manufacturing, purchasing, advertising, or mail orders (p. lxxiv).

See Exhibit 1.

EXHIBIT 1.

summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries.

[Special Census Report, Manufactures, pt. 1, 1905, p. 28 et seq.; Twelfth Census, 1900, Manufactures, pt. 1, p. 20 et seq., and pp. cxlv and cxlv; with special calculations by Josiah H. Shinn and J. J. McCoy, actuary of United States Treasury.]

	1905.	1900.	1890.
1. Food-products industries:			
Capital.....	\$1,173,151,276	\$940,889,838	\$507,678,328
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$51,456,814	\$39,313,634	\$33,313,634
Wages.....	\$164,601,813	\$129,910,070	\$90,373,450
Miscellaneous.....	\$131,773,642	\$77,086,185	\$52,986,982
Materials.....	\$2,304,416,564	\$1,839,256,143	\$1,318,963,830
Total.....	\$2,652,248,533	\$2,086,466,062	\$1,495,557,926
Profit.....	\$192,980,067	\$191,235,948	\$140,609,265
Gross product.....	\$2,845,234,900	\$2,277,702,010	\$1,636,197,191
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	16.4	20	27.6
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	5.7	5.7	5.5

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries—Continued.

	1905.	1900.	1890.
2. Textile industries:			
Capital.....	\$1,744,169,234	\$1,386,604,058	\$1,008,050,208
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$69,281,415	\$49,982,357	\$35,406,483
Wages.....	\$419,841,630	\$341,734,399	\$278,167,769
Miscellaneous.....	\$199,056,264	\$128,481,214	\$78,404,675
Materials.....	\$1,246,562,061	\$905,984,796	\$705,004,909
Total.....	\$1,934,751,370	\$1,416,182,766	\$1,007,078,839
Profit.....	\$212,600,048	\$221,301,718	\$164,598,665
Gross product.....	\$2,147,441,418	\$1,637,484,484	\$1,261,672,504
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	12	16.1	16.3
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	19.5	20.8	22
Value of gross output.....	\$2,147,441,418	\$1,637,484,484	\$1,261,672,504
Cost of materials.....	\$1,246,562,061	\$905,984,796	\$705,004,909
Increase in value.....	\$900,879,358	\$741,499,688	\$550,667,595
Cost of labor.....	\$419,841,630	\$341,734,399	\$278,167,769
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	46.6	46.1	50
3. Iron and steel industries:			
Capital.....	\$2,331,498,157	\$1,528,079,076	\$997,872,488
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$100,444,683	\$58,000,781	\$36,583,536
Wages.....	\$482,357,503	\$381,875,409	\$285,851,714
Miscellaneous.....	\$166,896,587	\$91,492,127	\$57,694,833
Materials.....	\$1,179,981,458	\$987,198,370	\$617,554,226
Total.....	\$1,929,680,234	\$1,518,056,777	\$907,184,229
Profit.....	\$247,059,492	\$274,834,131	\$146,872,208
Gross product.....	\$2,176,739,726	\$1,793,490,908	\$1,144,056,537
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	10.6	17.9	14.7
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	23.10	21.2	24.9
Value of gross output.....	\$2,176,739,726	\$1,793,490,908	\$1,144,056,537
Cost of materials.....	\$1,179,981,458	\$987,198,370	\$617,554,226
Increase in value.....	\$995,758,268	\$806,292,538	\$526,502,311
Cost of labor.....	\$482,357,503		
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	48.5	45	46
4. Lumber industries:			
Capital.....	\$1,013,827,138	\$946,116,515	\$844,418,472
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$48,571,951	\$28,982,927	\$30,853,184
Wages.....	\$336,058,173	\$212,201,768	\$201,558,706
Miscellaneous.....	\$130,850,824	\$42,142,321	\$45,510,782
Materials.....	\$518,908,150	\$561,501,302	\$462,658,350
Total.....	\$1,034,389,008	\$844,828,318	\$740,591,022
Profit.....	\$189,341,328	\$188,073,261	\$137,363,898
Gross product.....	\$1,223,730,336	\$1,080,906,579	\$877,954,920
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	18.7	19.6	16.2
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	27.4	20.6	22.9
Value of gross output.....	\$1,223,730,336	\$1,080,906,579	\$877,954,920
Cost of materials.....	\$518,908,150	\$561,501,302	\$462,658,350
Increase in value.....	\$704,822,186	\$469,405,277	\$415,296,570
Cost of labor.....	\$336,058,173	\$212,201,768	\$201,558,706
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	47.7	45.2	48.5
5. Leather industries:			
Capital.....	\$440,777,194	\$343,600,513	\$246,795,713
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$18,372,722	\$14,186,690	\$15,348,267
Wages.....	\$116,694,140	\$99,759,885	\$98,432,593
Miscellaneous.....	\$40,737,343	\$22,942,594	\$18,587,831
Materials.....	\$471,112,921	\$395,551,232	\$294,446,011
Total.....	\$646,917,126	\$532,440,401	\$426,814,702
Profit.....	\$58,830,344	\$51,290,645	\$60,741,328
Gross product.....	\$705,747,470	\$583,731,046	\$487,556,030
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	13.3	14.9	24.6
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	16.5	15.9	20.1
Value of gross output.....	\$705,747,470	\$583,731,046	\$487,556,030
Cost of materials.....	\$471,112,921	\$395,551,232	\$294,446,011
Increase in value.....	\$234,634,549	\$188,179,814	\$193,110,019
Cost of labor.....	\$116,694,140	\$99,759,885	\$98,432,593
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	49.7	53	51

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries—Continued.

	1905.	1900.	1890.
6. Paper and printing:			
Capital.....	\$798,758,312	\$557,610,887	\$344,008,723
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$81,808,311	\$48,974,138	\$34,625,986
Wages.....	\$185,547,791	\$140,092,453	\$117,611,864
Miscellaneous.....	\$138,245,437	\$76,069,603	\$59,524,277
Materials.....	\$308,209,655	\$214,158,423	\$149,507,579
Total.....	\$713,811,194	\$479,294,677	\$361,359,706
Profit.....	\$143,301,062	\$127,023,091	\$84,227,724
Gross product.....	\$857,112,256	\$606,317,768	\$445,587,430
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	17.9	22.7	24.4
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	21.6	23.1	26.5
Value of gross output.....	\$857,112,256	\$606,317,768	\$445,587,430
Cost of materials.....	\$308,209,655	\$214,158,423	\$149,507,579
Increase in value.....	\$548,902,601	\$392,159,345	\$295,089,851
Cost of labor.....	\$185,547,791	\$140,092,453	\$117,611,864
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	33.8	35.7	39.7
7. Liquors and beverages:			
Capital.....	\$650,547,620	\$534,101,049	\$310,092,635
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$21,421,353	\$16,893,405	\$11,118,673
Wages.....	\$45,146,285	\$36,946,557	\$29,140,916
Miscellaneous.....	\$223,446,420	\$188,754,387	\$117,046,590
Materials.....	\$130,854,147	\$122,218,073	\$109,830,410
Total.....	\$420,868,205	\$364,812,422	\$267,136,589
Profit.....	\$71,398,400	\$90,691,745	\$74,018,772
Gross product.....	\$501,266,605	\$425,504,167	\$341,155,361
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	10.8	11.3	23.8
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	8.9	8.6	8.5
Value of gross output.....	\$501,266,605	\$425,504,167	\$341,155,361
Cost of materials.....	\$130,854,147	\$122,218,073	\$109,830,410
Increase in value.....	\$361,412,458	\$303,286,094	\$231,324,951
Cost of labor.....	\$45,146,285	\$36,946,557	\$29,140,916
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	12.5	12.2	12.6
8. Chemicals and allied products:			
Capital.....	\$1,504,728,510	\$498,390,219	\$322,543,674
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$49,864,233	\$26,335,164	\$14,171,587
Wages.....	\$93,965,248	\$43,870,602	\$33,872,540
Miscellaneous.....	\$128,879,823	\$49,825,945	\$29,508,932
Materials.....	\$609,351,160	\$356,192,334	\$239,915,794
Total.....	\$882,059,964	\$476,224,045	\$317,468,913
Profit.....	\$149,905,299	\$76,667,832	\$82,587,584
Gross product.....	\$1,031,965,263	\$552,891,877	\$380,056,497
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	9.9	15.3	19.4
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	8	7.9	8.9
Value of gross output.....	\$1,031,965,263	\$552,891,877	\$380,056,497
Cost of materials.....	\$609,351,160	\$356,192,334	\$239,915,794
Increase in value.....	\$422,614,103	\$196,699,543	\$140,140,703
Cost of labor.....	\$93,965,248	\$43,870,602	\$33,872,540
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	22.2	22.3	24.2
9. Clay, glass, and stone products:			
Capital.....	\$553,846,682	\$350,902,367	\$217,386,297
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$21,555,724	\$13,718,966	\$11,370,622
Wages.....	\$148,471,903	\$109,022,582	\$90,541,771
Miscellaneous.....	\$37,822,036	\$19,185,657	\$14,094,740
Materials.....	\$123,124,892	\$94,615,281	\$68,990,146
Total.....	\$330,974,555	\$236,542,486	\$184,967,279
Profit.....	\$90,256,367	\$57,021,749	\$44,808,724
Gross product.....	\$391,230,422	\$293,564,235	\$229,806,003
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	10.8	16.2	20.6
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	37.1	37.4	39.3
Value of gross output.....	\$391,230,422	\$293,564,235	\$229,806,003
Cost of materials.....	\$123,124,892	\$94,615,281	\$68,990,146
Increase in value.....	\$268,106,030	\$198,948,954	\$160,815,857
Cost of labor.....	\$148,471,903	\$109,022,582	\$90,541,771
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	55.4	54.8	56.3
10. Metals and metal products other than iron and steel:			
Capital.....	\$598,340,758	\$410,646,057	\$204,285,820

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries—Continued.

	1905.	1900.	1890.
10. Metals and metal products other than iron and steel—Continued.			
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$24,854,590	\$16,059,194	\$14,924,917
Wages.....	\$117,599,837	\$96,749,051	\$94,055,644
Miscellaneous.....	\$41,585,062	\$21,295,406	\$14,731,078
Materials.....	\$644,367,583	\$496,979,368	\$179,169,940
Total.....	\$828,417,072	\$631,083,019	\$272,881,579
Profit.....	\$96,845,384	\$117,712,445	\$44,026,571
Gross product.....	\$922,262,456	\$748,795,464	\$316,908,150
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	15.6	28.6	21.5
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	12.7	12.9	20.4
Value of gross output.....	\$922,262,456	\$748,795,464	\$316,908,150
Cost of materials.....	\$644,367,583	\$496,979,368	\$179,169,940
Increase in value.....	\$277,894,873	\$251,816,096	\$137,738,210
Cost of labor.....	\$117,599,837	\$96,749,051	\$94,055,644
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	42.3	38.4	46.5
11. Tobacco:			
Capital.....	\$323,983,501	\$124,089,871	\$96,094,753
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$8,800,434	\$8,951,534	\$10,241,271
Wages.....	\$62,640,303	\$49,852,484	\$44,550,735
Miscellaneous.....	\$80,145,016	\$79,495,422	\$37,561,631
Materials.....	\$126,088,608	\$107,182,656	\$92,304,317
Total.....	\$277,674,361	\$245,482,096	\$184,658,004
Profit.....	\$53,443,320	\$37,594,450	\$27,088,619
Gross product.....	\$331,117,681	\$283,076,546	\$211,746,623
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	16.4	30.2	28.1
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	18.9	17.6	21
Value of gross output.....	\$331,117,681	\$283,076,546	\$211,746,623
Cost of materials.....	\$126,088,608	\$107,182,656	\$92,304,317
Increase in value.....	\$205,029,073	\$175,893,890	\$119,442,306
Cost of labor.....	\$62,640,303	\$49,852,484	\$44,550,735
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	30.5	28.3	37.3
12. Vehicles for land transportation:			
Capital.....	\$447,697,020	\$396,778,672	\$248,224,770
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$24,334,118	\$15,191,444	\$11,172,134
Wages.....	\$221,800,517	\$164,614,781	\$118,212,379
Miscellaneous.....	\$20,107,649	\$19,842,332	\$9,460,374
Materials.....	\$334,244,377	\$268,278,205	\$174,624,639
Total.....	\$600,486,661	\$467,926,762	\$313,460,526
Profit.....	\$34,437,781	\$40,722,367	\$31,008,717
Gross product.....	\$643,924,442	\$508,649,129	\$344,476,243
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	7.0	10.2	12.4
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	34.4	32.4	31.3
Value of gross output.....	\$643,924,442	\$508,649,129	\$344,476,243
Cost of materials.....	\$334,244,377	\$268,278,205	\$174,624,639
Increase in value.....	\$309,680,065	\$240,370,924	\$169,851,604
Cost of labor.....	\$221,800,517	\$164,614,781	\$118,212,379
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	71.6	68.5	69.6
13. Shipbuilding:			
Capital.....	\$121,623,700	\$77,332,701	\$53,393,074
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$3,339,741	\$2,008,537	\$1,194,870
Wages.....	\$29,241,087	\$24,839,163	\$14,833,977
Miscellaneous.....	\$5,255,506	\$3,085,661	\$1,392,551
Materials.....	\$37,463,179	\$33,483,772	\$16,925,109
Total.....	\$75,299,513	\$64,020,133	\$34,346,507
Profit.....	\$7,460,726	\$10,558,925	\$5,995,608
Gross product.....	\$82,769,239	\$74,578,158	\$40,342,115
Per cent profit on capital stock.....	6.1	13.6	11.2
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	35.2	33.3	35.7
Value of gross output.....	\$82,769,239	\$74,578,158	\$40,342,115
Cost of materials.....	\$37,463,179	\$33,483,772	\$16,925,109
Increase in value.....	\$45,306,060	\$41,094,386	\$23,417,006
Cost of labor.....	\$29,241,087	\$24,839,163	\$14,833,977
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	64.5	60.4	63.3

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries—Continued.

	1905.	1900.	1890.
14. Miscellaneous:			
Capital.....	\$974,316,571	\$1,348,920,721	\$768,570,920
Expenses—			
Officers.....	\$50,655,229	\$49,199,283	\$33,363,252
Wages.....	\$187,514,312	\$202,746,162	\$136,643,444
Miscellaneous.....	\$101,198,864	\$81,933,611	\$49,025,323
Materials.....	\$460,205,501	\$490,073,705	\$300,231,851
Total.....	\$799,573,406	\$823,952,761	\$519,268,870
Profit.....	\$142,031,467	\$180,139,533	\$126,310,589
Gross product.....	\$941,604,873	\$1,004,092,294	\$645,574,453

Summary of manufactures by fourteen groups of industries—Continued.

	1905.	1900.	1890.
14. Miscellaneous—Continued.			
Percent profit on capital stock.....	14.5	13.3	16.4
Labor's share of gross product, per cent.....	19.9	21.6	21.1
Value of gross output.....	\$941,604,873	\$1,004,092,294	\$645,574,453
Cost of materials.....	\$460,205,501	\$490,073,705	\$300,231,851
Increase in value.....	\$481,399,372	\$514,018,589	\$345,342,602
Cost of labor.....	\$187,514,312	\$202,746,162	\$136,643,444
Per cent of cost of labor to increase in value.....	38.9	39.4	39.5

Average percentage of wages to labor compared to gross product in the 14 great classes of industries.

Industries.	Profit on capital, 1905.	Ratio of wages to gross product.			Estimated profit on capital.	Probable profit on capital.	Per cent of labor wages to gross product.	Per cent of wages to increase of value in manufactures by labor.		
		1905.	1900.	1890.				1905.	1900.	1890.
1. Food products.....	16.4	5.7	5.7	5.5	32.8	49.2	5.7	30.4	33.7	35.1
2. Textiles.....	12	19.5	20.8	22	24	30	19.5	46.6	46.1	50
3. Iron and steel.....	10.6	22.1	21.2	24.9	21.2	31.8	22.1	48.5	45	46
4. Lumber.....	18.7	27.4	20.6	22.9	37.4	50.1	27.4	47.7	45.2	48.5
5. Leather.....	13.3	16.5	16.9	20.1	26.6	39.9	16.5	49.7	53	51
6. Paper and printing.....	17.9	21.6	23.1	26.5	35.8	53.7	21.6	33.8	35.7	39.7
7. Liquors and beverages.....	10.8	8.9	8.6	8.5	20.6	32.4	8.9	12.5	12.2	12.6
8. Chemicals and allied products.....	9.9	8	7.9	8.9	19.8	29.7	8	22.2	22.3	24.2
9. Clay, glass, and stone.....	10.8	37.1	37.4	39.3	20.6	32.4	37.1	55.4	54.8	56.3
10. Metal and metal products other than iron and steel.....	15.6	12.7	12.9	20.4	31.2	46.8	12.7	42.3	38.4	46.5
11. Tobacco.....	16.4	18.9	17.6	21	32.8	49.2	18.9	30.5	28.3	37.3
12. Vehicles for land transportation.....	7.6	34.4	32.4	34.3	15.2	22.8	34.4	71.0	68.5	69.6
13. Shipbuilding.....	6.1	35.2	33.3	36.7	12.2	18.3	35.2	64.5	60.4	63.3
14. Miscellaneous.....	14.5	19.9	24.6	21.1	29	43.5	19.9	38.9	39.4	39.5

For full details see Exhibit 1. Average rate of wages to gross product in all industries, 17.8 per cent, calculating from table of totals of wages and value of products.

RELATIVE LABOR COST.

Mr. OWEN. The first important deduction shown from these tables is the relative cost of labor as compared with the gross product. It is less than 6 per cent in food products, and yet the tariff on food products is an average of 32 per cent, in order to measure the cost of difference at home and abroad.

The total labor cost in textiles is 19.5 per cent, and yet the tariff in this bill on flax manufactures is over 44 per cent, on cotton manufactures over 47 per cent, on wool manufactures over 58 per cent, and on silk manufactures over 60 per cent to measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad; a patent and ridiculous fraud on its face, which has not been explained, which will not be explained, and which can not be explained by the managers of this bill, and so it goes all through this table.

The total percentage of the value of the product paid in wages in textiles is 19.5 per cent.

If we concede that the labor cost in Europe is absolutely nothing; if we concede that the foreigner would not have to pay any freight to bring his goods to America, would pay nothing for ocean insurance, for breakage, wharfage, dockage, leakage, rattage, or stealage, still 19.5 per cent would be high enough to protect the American manufacturer on an average.

Granting, however, that the European laborer earns half as much, then one-half of 19.5 per cent would be sufficient.

Granting that the American laborer has twice the efficiency of the European laborer, then no tariff whatever is necessary to protect the American manufacturer; and granting that the wages paid in Europe buy more of manufactured products and as much of food products as in America, the European manufacturer would be entitled to a bonus from his home government to put him on a parity with the American manufacturer.

In some cases a duty is necessary for protective purposes, but the cases are few and the rate not high. A tariff for revenue intelligently drawn will be more than three times as high as a tariff for pure protection drawn in a spirit of perfect honesty.

If the Finance Committee can show any justification for the schedules on the basis of the "difference of the cost of production at home and abroad," I am willing to concede this measure of incidental protection under a tariff for revenue, but to con-

ceal the facts, to refuse to hear, to ridicule the inquiry, and ignore the facts when proven is surely indefensible.

This abstract briefly exhibits the ratio of wages to gross products and affords a basis of comparison with the ratio of wages to gross products in countries competing with ours. This supplies a basis for a generalization showing the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

It will be seen, for example, that the average ratio of wages paid to the gross product in the textile industry averages 19.5 per cent, less than 20 per cent. The difference in the wage cost in the United States and abroad, conceding that the foreign workman receives a wage only half of that paid the American workman and conceding that he is equally efficient and conceding that his wages (half in money) has a purchasing power of half the wages of the American workman, the difference in the cost of production based on such wages would be an average of less than 10 per cent.

But it is not true that the wages paid foreign workmen buys only half as much, but the fact is that every dollar paid the foreign workman buys at least 50 per cent more than the dollar paid the American workman, so that \$10 paid a European workman is equivalent to \$15 in purchasing power in the United States.

So that the difference in the amount paid in wages because of this factor as compared to the value of the gross product is less than an average of 10 per cent, as above estimated.

Another factor of vital importance is the superior efficiency of the American workman. Ten dollars paid to him turns out twice as much goods as that paid the European workman; consequently the difference in wages compared to gross product is not only not against the American workman, but it is in his favor, although he does not get the benefit of it from the man who employs him.

It is not surprising, in view of these calculations based upon our national statistics and well-established facts, that the managers in charge of this bill dare not answer the question whether this bill is being written in accordance with the pledge of the party that the rates should be determined by the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

The monopolist can not and does not consume his profit. So that the result is that the capital of monopoly is rolling up like

a huge snowball, picking up every opportunity offered by God to mankind in our natural resources—the forests, the mines, the water powers, the highways, and the land, both of city and of the countryside; and labor, the creator of wealth, languishes and grows weaker as the creature of wealth grows stronger and exercises a natural but unrestrained appetite by “acquiring” the title to every visible and invisible natural resource.

Mr. President, I am a firm friend of capital and always ready to befriend its just rights. I believe in giving it safety and stability, protecting it in its right to earn a fair reward upon its employment. It is of great importance that the incentive should be removed neither from the capitalist nor from the business man who uses capital nor from the laborer who is employed by capital, but I do not believe that all of the net proceeds of human labor and every opportunity of human life should be appropriated by capital and all the reasonable opportunities of life cut off from millions of wage-earners who have no more wisdom or knowledge of how to protect themselves against the crafty schemes of monopoly than if they were so many blind girl babies. The Senate and the Senators on this floor, it seems to me, are under a solemn personal responsibility to find the way to protect the weaker elements of society, and they ought not to write the laws of this country to serve monopoly at the expense of the defenseless citizen wage-earner.

The incentive ought not to be taken away from capital; neither should the incentive be taken away from the small business man who may be crushed by gigantic organizations of capital, and above all the incentive of a reasonable reward, of a reasonable return for labor, of the power to support a family by labor, industry, and providence. The power to have some leisure for playtime should not be taken away from the American workingman or the American working woman or the American working child by the grinding process of unthinking corporate monopoly.

Under the head of “Miscellany” are concealed many items favorable to capital by increasing the capital itself under color of repairs, and so forth.

The estimate of the profit on capital is also too small, because more than half of the capital claimed is water.

All of the return on capital, except a small percentage, necessary to provide for a reasonable return on capital, is a net profit, while the return on labor contains no net profit worth mentioning, although it is true that by long, hard hours of labor, great deprivation, rigid economy, and careful saving, the labor classes, through the savings banks exhibit a considerable accumulation out of the proceeds of their labor.

Statistics of the savings banks of the United States for 1906.

[Comptroller Currency Report, 1907.]

	Total depositors.	Amount of deposits.	Average.
New England.....	2,987,261	\$1,168,148,705	\$391.04
Eastern States.....	3,562,804	1,658,905,727	465.06
Southern States.....	31,598	6,143,167	194.41
Middle States.....	1,087,746	885,503,885	354.41
Pacific States.....	357,783	295,435,714	741.89
Total United States.....	8,027,192	3,482,137,198	433.79

The savings under forty years of high-protective tariff average \$433.79 to those who have been able to save, and these figures include hundreds of millions of the savings of the well-to-do and many of the capital class, but only one person in ten, after all, has a savings account, and the savings between the laboring people and actual want will not average \$43 per capita for our entire productive population, counting all savings as the savings of labor, while many millions are utterly defenseless against the exactions of capital.

When it is remembered what the enormous product of the labor of the average American workman is—\$2,500 per annum—it will be observed that these savings of many years comprise but a small part of the proceeds of labor.

In the table exhibited—the industries engaged in “food products”—labor’s share of the gross product is very small, because of the very large amount of raw material used, out of which labor had previously been paid in the process of production.

The same thing is relatively true of the industries dealing with liquors and beverages.

It is also true that labor’s share in lumber and iron and steel, and clay, glass, and stone products, and in vehicles and shipbuilding reaches a high percentage relative to the product, for the simple reason that nearly all of the value in lumber, outside of the stumpage, is pure labor. Labor goes into the woods, cuts the tree down, hauls it to the mill, puts it on the runway, saws the log, planes it, stacks the lumber, and puts the lumber on the car. Capital, having acquired the land, furnishes the sawmill, and permits labor to have a part of its own profits in wages, but no more than labor can command in a free, competitive market for labor.

The same thing is true with regard to clay products. The workman digs the clay out of the ground, puts it through every process with the work of his hands, and converts it into a finished product. Capital, having acquired the title to the clay, permits the workmen to dig upon the earth, owned by the capitalist, and furnishes the workmen with tools, and pays the workmen precisely as much, and no more, as his labor commands in a free, competitive, labor market.

The laborer has a very narrow margin, and unless he be exceptional in self-denial, in providence, and is free from accident or sickness or other incidental loss, he may, perhaps, save enough to lift himself from the severe conditions which so environ him to a more fortunate place where he can join the capital class and get the benefits of a system which is well devised to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

THE HIGH TARIFF HAS LOWERED THE WAGES OF AMERICAN WORKMEN.

Mr. President, the advocates of a high tariff have always professed, and I suppose usually felt, the greatest solicitude for the welfare of the laboring man, and have believed, or appeared to believe, that a high tariff would protect the American laboring man against the injurious competition of the “pauper labor” of Europe. I shall show by our own statistics that *the wages of the American workman have been lowered under the operation of this tariff.*

Wages are not valued alone by dollars and cents; dollars change in purchasing power, depending on the number of dollars put in circulation in any given country and the intimacy of its commercial relations with other countries, and the whole world is confused in the question of prices by the grossly unequal distribution of currency in the different nations of the world; a great problem, which is now undergoing and will undergo a more rapid readjustment under the fast increasing improvement of rapid modern intercourse.

Attention is expressly called to the fact that labor’s share of the proceeds of labor has not increased in the highly protected industries—it has decreased.

In the textile industries labor received 22 per cent of the gross product in 1890, 20.8 in 1900, and 19.5 in 1905.

In iron and steel labor received 24.9 per cent in 1890 and 22.1 per cent in 1905.

In leather goods labor received 21.1 per cent of the proceeds of labor in 1890, 16.9 per cent in 1900, and 16.5 per cent in 1905.

In paper and printing labor received 26.5 per cent of the proceeds of labor in 1890, 23.1 per cent in 1900, 21.6 per cent in 1905.

In chemical and allied products labor received 8.9 per cent in 1890, 8 per cent in 1905.

In clay, glass, and stone products labor received 39.3 per cent in 1890, 37.1 per cent in 1900.

In metal and metal products, other than iron and steel, labor received 20.4 per cent in 1890 and 12.7 per cent in 1905.

In tobacco labor received 21 per cent in 1890 and 18.9 per cent in 1905.

In shipbuilding labor received 36.7 per cent in 1890 and 35.2 per cent in 1905.

In miscellaneous industries labor received 21.1 per cent in 1890 and 19.9 per cent in 1905.

It is perfectly obvious that under the high tariff the reward of labor has diminished relatively to the gross product of labor.

When we compare the increase of the value of products, the increase of the cost of materials, and the number of wage-earners, and the total wages between 1890 and 1900, we find that the growth of capital value corresponding with that of the value of products is decidedly more than the increase of total wages; that the average wage for all classes of wage-earners, in dollars and cents, is less in 1900 than in 1890. The increase of earnings is 25 per cent; that of wages only a little over 22 per cent.

	Capital value.	Value of products.	Cost of materials.	Number of wage-earners.	Total wages.	Average value, product of the wage-earner.	Per cent.
1900.....	\$9,813,834,390	\$13,000,149,159	\$7,343,627,875	5,306,143	\$2,320,688,108	\$2,450	17.8
1890.....	6,525,050,759	9,372,378,843	5,162,013,878	4,251,535	1,891,958,795	2,204	20.2
Increase.....	3,288,783,631	3,627,770,316	2,181,613,997	1,054,608	428,984,373		

Nineteen hundred average wage, \$437; annual weekly wage, \$8.60, to support 3 people, a labor loss of 10 per cent in wages relative to value of product.

The percentage of wages to value of products was 17.8 per cent in 1900, 20.2 per cent in 1890, a loss for labor of 10 per cent.

Here is an increase of \$3,627,740,316 in the value of the products of labor under the "value of products," and \$428,984,373 goes to 1,054,608 additional laborers, while \$3,198,755,943 is the net value of the products of such labor. One million fifty-four thousand six hundred and eight new workmen get \$428,984,373 with which to sustain approximately 3,000,000 people; to feed, clothe, and shelter them; leaving no surplus for enforced idleness, sickness, accident, or death; and a vast profit goes to capital that does not have the same exacting demands for food and clothing. The annual weekly wage is only \$8.60 to support three people. How does this compare with Europe where the dollar buys 50 per cent more, and \$8.60 here is only equal to \$5.73 there? Look at their wages, their earning power, and ask what is the difference in the cost of production here and there. Do these census records teach us nothing?

The above figures demonstrate beyond the possibility of dispute that wages are being lowered under the operation of a monopoly-protecting tariff. It shows more, that a tariff averaging nearly 50 per cent is thoroughly unjustifiable on the Republican theory of protecting labor, since the gross amount of labor's wages only comprises an average of 19.7 per cent of gross product value (Exhibit 1), much less on the theory of providing only the "difference in the cost of labor," since the difference in the cost of labor will not approximate 20 per cent, nor equal the half of it.

The plain truth is the bill will not protect labor, but will gratify the clamorous demand of organized greed and avarice urged by the lobby of numerous monopolies. This tariff, in the pretended interest of the American workman, does not properly include over 1,000,000 out of 29,000,000 workmen, while it taxes all.

It has been convincingly shown by Edward Atkinson, in his learned report of December, 1902 (Exhibit 2), that not over 1,000,000 persons out of 29,000,000 persons would be affected in an adverse way if the tariff were absolutely abolished. This calculation, made in great detail, goes far to show the utterly false pretense of a great public demand for a high protective or prohibitive tariff. Attention is earnestly called to it in Senate Document No. 46, Sixty-first Congress, first session, from which I submit the essential part as Exhibit 2.

THE HIGH TARIFF HAS LOWERED THE WAGES OF AMERICAN WORKMEN IN PROTECTED INDUSTRIES MORE THAN THE WAGES OF WORKMEN IN UNPROTECTED INDUSTRIES.

I submit as Exhibit 3 a carefully compiled table of the labor wages of our American railways (Statistics of Railroads in United States, 1907, Interstate Commerce Commission, p. 59), showing the wages of railroad employees in the unprotected industries of the railroad service, and also a table of the wages of employees in building trades, which are not protected, but which are duly organized, prepared by William J. Spencer, secretary of the building-trade department of the American Federation of Labor, for 1908 (Exhibit 4), showing the average wages of masons and bricklayers, structural iron setters, ornamental iron setters, plasterers, lathers, hoisting engineers, tile setters, plumbers, steam fitters, steam fitters' helpers, gas fitters, carpenters, stonecutters, marble cutters and setters, painters, sheet metal workers, electricians, roofers, cement finishers, laborers, and hod carriers. Their wages per hour will be seen to be, on an average, at least twice as high as the wages of labor in protected industries (Exhibit 5), as shown by Census Bulletin 77 of the Bureau of Labor of 1907.

Mr. President, here will be seen that the cheapest workmen (Exhibit 3) in the railroad service, the brakemen, received an average throughout the United States for 1907, \$1.46 a day; section foremen, \$1.90; other shopmen, \$2.06; carpenters, \$2.40; machinists, \$2.87; firemen and other trainmen, \$2.54; conductors, \$3.69; engineer men, \$4.30; station agents, \$2.05; gen-

eral office clerks, \$2.30; other officers, \$5.99; general officers, \$11.93. These wages in unprotected industries are decent, are reasonable, are just according to service, in the transportation work of the United States. These people have their wages influenced to an important degree by labor organization.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact—and a vital fact in this matter—that in the protected industries of the United States the wage-earner does not receive one-half as much as in the unprotected industries, and these tables abundantly exhibit it.

Exhibit No. 4 shows that masons and bricklayers get from 45 to 87 cents an hour; structural iron setters, 30 to 62 cents an hour; ornamental iron setters, 30 to 70 cents an hour; plasterers, 50 to 87½ cents an hour; lathers, 45 to 62½ cents an hour; hoisting engineers, 50 to 75 cents an hour; tile setters, 35 to 75 cents an hour; plumbers, 50 to 75 cents an hour; steam fitters, 35 to 75 cents an hour; steam fitters' helpers, 15 to 37½ cents an hour; gas fitters, 35 to 81 cents an hour; carpenters, 35 to 62½ cents an hour; stonecutters, 45 to 70 cents an hour; marble cutters and marble setters, 30 to 62½ cents an hour; painters, 25 to 56 cents an hour; sheet metal workers, 30 to 62½ cents an hour; electricians, 25 to 65 cents an hour; roofers, 25 to 75 cents an hour; cement finishers, 35 to 75 cents an hour; laborers and hod carriers, 15 to 50 cents an hour.

Mr. President, these people are outside of the protected industries; they have some degree of organization and can demand the value from capital for their labor.

The laws of human nature operate upon the laboring man precisely as they do upon the capitalist, and he tries to get the greatest return for his wares. Labor organizations have sometimes gone to extremes and put the price of labor above a reasonable market value and lowered the demand to the point of putting themselves out of business. The urgency of labor's need for supplying food and clothing is an extenuating circumstance even when the demand itself is unreasonable and foolish, but when the demand of monopoly puts an exorbitant price upon the necessities of life its motive is not hunger for food or need for clothing or shelter for children, but merely ambition for power or mere greed for gain.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the astonishing difference between the wages of men in unprotected industries with the wages in the "protected industries," so called, and you will observe that the wages in the protected industries, except where modified by a powerful organization of the laborers, as in the glass industry, are far below the wages in unprotected industries. Organized capital has beaten down the wages of labor to a point at which the proper support of a family required by a decent American standard is often impossible. This meanness on the part of such offending manufacturers is painfully apparent.

THE PROTECTED INDUSTRIES HAVE DRIVEN OUT THE AMERICAN AND SUBSTITUTED THE FOREIGNER.

It has resulted in driving out the native American who was able to escape and has substituted in his place the oppressed people of other races, who, having been under the grinding monopoly of the landed nobility and powers which have seized every opportunity in European countries, do not feel so keenly the crushing conditions imposed upon them in these offending factories.

I call attention to the low wages which are paid in the protected industries, so low as not to be sufficient to sustain an American family upon the wages of the head of the family, who may be devoting all his time to that purpose. The average wage in the cotton and wool industry will not exceed a dollar a day, and that is shown by our census tables, which I submit.

Now, Mr. President, the protected industries have driven out the American and substituted the foreigner. We have been listening for years to talk about the protection of American labor against the pauper labor of Europe; and yet our census shows how shallow and how hollow that pretension is. I call your attention to what is shown by our census.

The Boston Traveler in the article of June 2, 1900, ridicules the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and says:

He made an impassioned plea for the mill operatives of New England, who "must not be deprived of their right to work and wages," and for the manufacturers, who must be protected against "cheap labor abroad." The mill operatives, for whom the Nahant Senator's eloquence was unloosed, are practically all Greeks, Syrians, Poles, Armenians, and Italians, who have driven out every other kind of labor, because, under present wages in the cotton mills, to bring up a family under American conditions is absolutely impossible.

Mr. LODGE's defense of the cotton manufacturers, whose mills are filled with aliens on starvation wages, is paralleled in history only by the arguments made in parliament at the time England was attempting to abolish the slave trade, that if the bringing of black people from Africa to America and elsewhere was prohibited shipowners would not find any use for their vessels, and that these slave ships furnished the only market for decayed fish and other putrid food, on which there would be a dead loss if the slave trade was outlawed.

The Pittsburg Survey gives a tabulated map showing that the Carnegie mills at Homestead, from which organized labor was driven by private armed military power in the Homestead riots, is filled with Slovaks, 6,477 of them; with Poles, 611 in number; with Bohemians and Germans, in another group; with Croats, 1,249 in number; with Hungarians, 1,323 in number; with Roumanians, 410 in number; with Poles, 1,644 in number; with Lithuanians, 476 in number. Austria-Hungary furnished 10,421; Russia, 2,577; etc.

Representatives on behalf of these monopolies make "impassioned appeals" to protect the American workman against the foreign pauper labor which the monopolies have imported and are using wholesale with the effect of driving the native American to despair.

Mr. President, examine the census of 1900, Volume I, pages cxxxi and 698, on population and see what it exhibits.

Table of foreign born, etc.

Census 1900, Volume I.	Foreign born (cxxxi).	White population foreign parentage (p. 698).	Total foreign born and of foreign-born parentage.	Total population.	Percentage of population foreign born and of foreign-born parentage.
Massachusetts.....	846,324	897,386	1,743,710	2,805,346	62.1
Rhode Island.....	134,519	140,292	274,811	428,556	64.1
Connecticut.....	238,210	282,245	520,455	908,420	57.3
New York.....	1,900,425	2,415,845	4,316,270	7,268,894	59.3
New Jersey.....	431,831	556,294	988,125	1,883,669	52.4
Pennsylvania.....	985,250	1,430,028	2,415,278	6,302,115	38.3

It will be seen by the table which I submit that Massachusetts has 1,743,710 persons foreign born or of foreign-born parentage out of 2,805,346 total population, having therefore 62.1 per cent of people who are foreign born or of foreign-born parentage; Rhode Island, in like manner, has 64.1 per cent of its population foreign born or of foreign-born parentage; Connecticut has 57.3 per cent of foreign born or of foreign-born parentage; New York has 59.3 per cent of its people foreign born or of foreign-born parentage; New Jersey has 52.4 per cent of its population foreign born or of foreign-born parentage; thus disclosing in the completest manner the extent to which this use of foreign labor has driven out the American.

Mr. KEAN. What is the date of that?

Mr. OWEN. The last census of 1900, to which I invite the Senator's prayerful attention.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I will be glad to have the Senator give, if he has them, the figures of the percentage of foreign-born as distinguished from their children.

Mr. OWEN. I have it, Mr. President, in the table which I submit, giving the exact details.

I call attention to this matter because too much has been said in behalf of protecting the American laborer and keeping out the pauper labor of Europe. The pauper labor of Europe to-day fills the very factories of these protected monopolies, and those same pauper laborers of Europe are coming into this country at the rate of 100,000 a month. It is time that this hypocrisy should cease.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Senator the statistics for the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. OWEN. The statistics will be found in the same tables to which I have referred.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has them not at hand?

Mr. OWEN. Not at hand. I have them available, but not so as to easily read them.

I will say that, of course, on the eastern coast, with our country inviting foreigners into this land we should expect a large percentage; and I do not speak that in any sense of reproach to those States. I, for one, am not at all in favor of closing our ports by any tax upon these poor souls who seek a refuge in our land from a monopoly which is worse by far than that which we endure. I invite them, and bid them God speed and welcome. This Republic is under the deepest obligations to those who have come from abroad and to their children. I honor them, and I am glad, as one American, to give them a cordial welcome. I wish they were better paid; and when they go West and enter the fields of the West, perhaps they will find conditions more congenial to human life and more profitable and beneficial to them.

Mr. President, I am glad to see America, the land of liberty, made an asylum for the oppressed of other lands, and recognize the fact that the United States is under enormous obligations to people who have come from foreign lands, and I only call attention to these figures to show that the plea of the monopolies that they are deeply concerned about high wages for the American workman is so offensively hypocritical and absurd that no words known to the English language are capable of describing it.

I have submitted Table 5, showing the wages of workmen in American industries; and I call your attention to the fact that, except where they are organized, they are on almost starvation wages. The papers were full a few days ago of the slavery of white women brought into these protected factories from Italy, sold by their kinspeople, and all their wages practically taken for their keep and to pay to the foreign home—a substantial exhibition of white slavery under the color of freedom and under the protection of the American flag, which ought not to endure slavery either of the white man or the black man.

WAGES IN PROTECTED INDUSTRIES LOWER THAN IN UNPROTECTED INDUSTRIES.

I respectfully submit a table (Exhibit 5) showing the wages of workmen in the protected industries of every class: In the industry of making carpets; of clothing; cotton goods; foundry and machine shops; furniture; glass; fur hats; hosiery and knit goods; iron and steel, bar, and iron and steel, Bessemer; iron and steel, blast furnace; lumber, paper, and wood pulp; pottery; printing and binding; shipbuilding; silk goods; woolen and worsted goods. I have indicated in every case in these tables the condition of labor organization.

It will be seen by the tables of Exhibit No. 5, in the grouped industries, for example, that in 1907 burlers got 14 cents an hour; dyers, 16 cents an hour; loom fixers (who must be men of a high class), 28 cents an hour; spoolers, 13 cents an hour; twisters, 12 cents an hour; weavers, Wilton (high-class experts), 30 cents an hour; weavers, ingrain, 15 cents an hour; winders, 13 cents an hour; and, except where the workmen must be trained experts, their wages are very low.

Buttonhole makers (female), 12 to 14 cents an hour; examiners (female), 11 to 14 cents an hour; finishers, 10 to 13 cents an hour; pressers (male), 19 to 26 cents an hour; sewing-machine operators, 22 to 31 cents an hour; carding-machine tenders, 10 to 13 cents an hour; dyers, 11 to 15 cents an hour; loom fixers, 16 to 24 cents an hour; spinners, 9 to 13 cents an hour; spinners (female), 7 to 12 cents an hour; weavers (male), 11 to 19 cents an hour; weavers (female), 9 to 16 cents an hour; bleachers, 13 cents an hour; calenderers, 14 cents an hour; color mixers, 14 cents an hour.

In the hat business, colorers get 19 cents an hour; fitters, 12 cents an hour; flower blowers, 17 cents an hour; trimmers, 15 cents an hour; weavers, 13 cents an hour.

Silk goods.—Beamers get 19 cents an hour; doublers, 11 cents an hour; dyers, 19 cents an hour; loom fixers, 27 cents an hour; pickers, 12 cents an hour; quillers, 9 cents an hour; spinners, 10 cents an hour; weavers, female, 10 cents an hour; weavers, female, 17 cents an hour.

Woolen goods.—Burlers get 11 cents an hour; carders, 12 cents an hour; card strippers, 13 cents an hour; combers, 12 cents an hour; combers, female, 9 cents an hour; dyers, 15 cents an hour; loom fixers (experts), 26 cents an hour; male spinners,

11 cents an hour; male weavers (expert), 21 cents an hour; female weavers (expert), 18 cents an hour.

It must be remembered that these figures, low as they are, are not uniformly paid; that the laborer who misses an hour from sickness or weakness, or who is thrown out of employment by the closing of the shop for repairs or for any other reason must then rely upon his accumulation in savings out of the wages paid. The matter which I wish to call attention to is that under the pretense of protecting the American workman in protected industries, the most of whom are foreigners, they are paid only about half of the wages that workmen received in unprotected industries, and with these pretenses of "passionate interest" in the American workman is an unspeakable fraud which ought not to be endured by men who regard this matter soberly and seriously from a standpoint of patriotism and the better interests of the American Republic.

A great advantage which men have who are organized and not in the "protected industries," so called, is that they no longer submit to the long, grinding, sweat-shop hours, but have an eight-hour day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator kindly inform me in what part of the country the wages are paid that he has just read?

Mr. OWEN. Table No. 5, which I submit with this matter, shows the wages paid in different parts of the country.

THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN WORKMEN.

Mr. President, I have been gratified to observe the growing organization of workingmen, which is steadily advancing in the United States. Only by such organization and by the solidarity of their interests can labor make effective its righteous hope for a decent market for its wares; only in this way can men, under present conditions of organized capital, obtain a fair return for their labor.

It is true that sometimes the unwise members in certain labor organizations compel their leaders to stand for wages "higher than the traffic will bear," and in this case they throw themselves out of employment and are thus compelled to be more moderate in their demands. It is true that sometimes thoughtless men force their leaders into gross error and compel them to make demands that are unreasonable, but all men make errors, and all men are unreasonable at times, and these things are self-correcting.

Examine these tables which I submit, and you will observe that just in degree as they are organized just in that degree do they receive proper compensation and obtain decent hours.

They deserve the greatest credit for what they have done in obtaining the eight-hour rule among the organized trades and in promoting legislation to protect labor and to promote its interest. If Congress had heretofore seen more clearly its duty, their organization would have been in large measure unnecessary.

Shall the organization of labor be condemned because of the thoughtless or even criminal act of some occasional individuals out of this vast army? It would be as reasonable to condemn the church because of the sins of its occasional members. The organization of labor stands in the main for good order, for respect to law, for patriotism, for the upbuilding of our country, for the preservation of human life and a decent reward to those who perform the hardest labors of life and bear the sweat and dust, exposure and danger, of life's hard places.

These great organizations are a bulwark to society and stand for the future stability and preservation of our institutions, while their chief antagonists, the captains of monopoly, who, I trust, will soon be led by public opinion to better methods, have been often misled by avarice and greed, have been thus blinded to their duty toward the working people, and are blindly pursuing a policy whose results constitute a menace to the stability of our present peaceful progress.

I think the less of the management of the United States Steel, and of the American Tobacco Company, and of the sugar trust, and the Cramp shipbuilding yards, and others, that they have so opposed organized labor that no member of organized labor can be employed by these monopolies.

Prof. John R. Commons, of the University of Wisconsin (vol. 2, Publications of the American Sociological Society, p. 141), says:

The unions have practically disappeared from the trusts, and are disappearing from the large corporation as they grow large enough to specialize minutely their labor. The organized workmen are found in

the small establishments like the building trades or the fringe of independents on the skirts of the trusts; on the railways where skill and responsibility are not yet displaced by division of labor; in the mines where strike breakers can not be shipped in; on the docks and other places where they hold a strategic position.

Aaron Jones, esq., master of the National Grange, November 11, 1903, at Rochester, N. Y., said:

Combinations and trust methods in the sale of supplies and in the purchase of the products of the farm have in previous addresses been set out. A striking and forceful illustration of these methods and their effect on both the producer and the consumer is furnished by the market reports of meats. October 10, 1902, market reports show that in one of the leading live-stock markets of the country the price of hogs has been lowered during the year 30 per cent and the price of pork raised 10 per cent. These manipulations add 40 per cent profit to the meat trust, taking 30 per cent from the farmer and 10 per cent from the consumer. Beef steers in the hands of farmers were reduced 20 per cent and dressed beef raised 10 per cent, thus adding 30 per cent profit to the trust and taking 20 per cent from the farmer and 10 per cent from the consumer. More than \$150,000,000 has been lost to the live-stock industry in the past year by the manipulations of the meat trust. This may in a measure explain how the meat trust may contribute \$50,000 to place the official management of a single city under obligations to it. If the entire product of the farm—wheat, corn, hay, cotton, live stock, dairy, and fruit—is taken into account, farmers have lost more than \$700,000,000 in the past year through manipulations of combines and trusts, and because farmers have not developed and maintained a wise, safe, and well-guarded business system of selling the products of the farm. Farmers have also suffered another great loss in the purchase of supplies needed in this business.

Monopolies prefer unorganized labor; they prefer that labor should be helpless and incapable of making effective any demand for its comfort or convenience, or for its rights.

The law should firmly and unhesitatingly demand and require of labor, organized or unorganized, strict obedience to the law; but it should also demand and require of monopoly considerate and decent treatment of labor and of its rights both as producer and consumer.

The tables indicating the wages of working people in high-tariff industries are taken from Bulletin No. 77 of the United States Bureau of Labor for 1907.

I call upon the chairman of the Committee on Finance to explain the astonishing parallel between the low rate of wages paid to people in protected industries and the high wages paid those in industries not protected.

What satisfactory explanation can the Senator from Rhode Island offer for the difference in the pay of masons and bricklayers, who receive 60 cents an hour in Boston, and the burler in the carpet factory receiving 14 cents; the dyer, 16 cents; the loom fixer, 28 cents; the spooler, 13 cents; the twister, 12 cents; the weaver of Brussels and Wilton, 30 cents; the weavers of ingrain, 16 cents; and the winders, 13 cents an hour?

How does the Senator from Rhode Island explain why the plasterer receives 60 cents an hour in Boston and the workers in cotton goods can not possibly receive half as much, and do not average one-third as much?

In good old Boston the plasterer gets 60 cents an hour; the tile setter gets 60 cents an hour; the plumber, 55 cents an hour; the steam fitter, 53 cents; the stonemason, 50 cents; the carpenter, 40 cents; the marble cutter, 56 cents; and side by side with these unprotected industries the carding-machine tender in the cotton goods protected industry receives 13 cents; the dyers, 15 cents; the loom fixers, 24 cents; the spinners, 13 and 14 cents; the mule spinners, 24 cents; the weavers, 20 cents; the female weavers, 17 cents; the bleachers, 14 cents; the color mixers, 14 cents; the male dyers, 15 cents; the male engravers, 45 cents; the male printers, 44 cents; and this remarkable comparison is most striking all the way through these tables, except in cases where labor itself, by its own organization, has prevented itself from being plundered by the employer.

PROTECTION AS IT IS PRACTICED IS AN OPEN, OBVIOUS FRAUD.

It is time that the New England Senators were dropping the mask of superior knowledge and of mysterious learning with regard to the protective tariff.

The worst enemy of protection, as it is practiced, is detection. The infinite pains taken by the committee in charge of this bill to furnish Members of this body with all sorts of data except the vital facts with regard to "the difference in cost of production at home and abroad," does not argue well for their judgment or for their sincerity in dealing with this question.

I am more than willing to believe that they have merely followed a beaten track and trodden the pathway of greatest convenience, of easy good nature, but I can not but feel that a generous complaisance to those who have contributed to their successful campaigns is also responsible for the lack of this essential information. I wish to make record here that the information which I have obtained with regard to this matter is due to no effort of theirs. I have been compelled as a Member

of this body to dig out laboriously the information which I lay before the Senate.

How does the Senator from Rhode Island explain the fact that in the unprotected industries of New England, of transportation for example, the station agents get an average daily pay of \$2.03, while a carding machine tender in the protected cotton-goods industry receives 13 cents an hour, and the dyers 15 cents an hour, and the spinners 13 cents an hour, and the weavers 19 cents an hour.

How does he explain that enginemen in the unprotected industry on the railway service receive \$3.78 a day and conductors \$3.26 a day, and in the protected industry of printing textiles the bleachers receive 13 cents an hour, the calenderers 14 cents an hour, the color mixers 14 cents an hour, and dyers 15 cents an hour?

How does the Senator from Rhode Island explain why it is that in the unprotected industry of railways in New England firemen receive \$2.20 a day, trainmen \$2.32 a day, carpenters \$2.25 a day, section foremen \$2.24 a day, laborers \$1.85 a day, when in the protected industry of hosiery and knit goods the knitters receive only 20 cents an hour for men and 13 cents an hour for women, loopers 14 cents an hour, the menders 13 cents an hour, the men pressers 17 cents, and the women pressers 10 cents an hour?

And how do these higher wages in unprotected industries contrast with the blast-furnace men and cinder snappers receiving 15 cents an hour, the hot-blast men 19 cents an hour, the keepers' helpers 17 cents an hour, and the top fillers 17 cents an hour?

The plain truth is that in the unprotected industries of transportation, as shown by the compilation of wages by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the labor in the unprotected industries of the building trades, compiled by the American Federation of Labor, by William J. Spencer, secretary, is far better paid than in the protected industries of the cotton mills, the hosiery mills, the woolen mills, and iron mills, and other factories.

The tables submitted of the wages of the building trades, which are unprotected, show that they receive a wage over 200 per cent higher than the wages in the protected industries, and the reason for this is not difficult to see. Labor in the building trades and in the railroad business is comparatively easy of organization, because the men in the railroad and building trades are out of doors and can be reached and talked to and organized. They are not locked up inside of the jail-like inclosures of private factories, where it is almost impossible to reach the employees or to organize them.

Labor has rarely succeeded in thoroughly organizing itself in any of the great manufacturing industries, which are usually controlled by monopolies and mechanical corporate power.

Organized labor was practically driven out of the shops of Andrew Carnegie and of the United States Steel Corporation, American Tobacco Company, Cramps' shipyards, and various others of the existing monopolies.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has put in tables—I have not seen them—showing the wages in protected and unprotected industries. In the New York Sun of the 13th instant there is a dispatch from London giving the wages paid in unprotected industries in Great Britain. Is the Senator willing that I should have this inserted in the Record?

Mr. OWEN. I am perfectly willing that it should be inserted in my remarks.

Mr. GALLINGER. Thank you.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be inserted.

Mr. OWEN. I will state to the Senator from New Hampshire that in my examination of this matter I have tried not to make a partial statement giving the facts favorable to my view and those unfavorable to the other side, but have tried to give, in a just measure, both sides, because the only purpose which I have in view is to arrive at the truth and to make it manifest. I do not know what the quotation from the Sun is nor its sources nor its accuracy.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a dispatch bearing a London date, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. OWEN. I have heard of dispatches from London which were not reliable.

The matter submitted by Mr. GALLINGER is as follows:

WOMEN ON STARVATION PAY—REVELATIONS OF THE "SWEATING" SYSTEM IN LONDON—FACTS BROUGHT OUT BY A POOR SEAMSTRESS'S ATTEMPT AT SUICIDE—HOME WORKERS, 62 CENTS TO \$1.10 A WEEK—AVERAGE WEEKLY PAY OF ENGLISH WOMEN \$1.75.

[From New York Sun, June 13, 1909.]

LONDON, June 2.

A poor little seamstress attempted suicide in London recently. She jumped into the Thames and was ignominiously fished out, not drowned, and not in the least repentant. When questioned as to reasons for her act she had only one to give. She simply could not keep body and soul together by working her hardest at her trade, and in utter fatigue she had decided to end her struggles.

There was nothing very new in her story, but when she explained that she always had plenty of work to do, the only difficulty being to live on the prices paid for her labors, London was roused from its apathy long enough to protest against the "sweating" of women thus revealed.

The House of Lords once defined "sweating" as a condition under which work is carried on in insanitary surroundings and for low wages. There are those who would add that it is a condition of labor which does not give the laborer, in return for a fair day's work, enough to maintain himself and his family in decency and comfort.

In England it is women who are the greatest sufferers from sweating. Their average wage, taking it all the year round and allowing for sickness and slackness, is not much more than \$1.75 a week. The Lancashire textile trade average is \$3.75, and in some districts as much as \$6; but this comparatively high rate is pulled down by the East End home worker, who earns anything from 62 cents to \$1.10 a week.

In the unskilled women's trades there is no standard by which wages are computed. For instance, one famous firm of cocoa manufacturers pays women for filling bags with cocoa 28 cents a thousand bags, and exactly the same work is done for 16 cents for another firm. In East London there is a firm whose girls earn \$3.50 a week by packing tea. In the same locality there is another firm, the head of which is a well-known sportsman and yachtsman, where the earnings of the girls average only \$1.87 a week.

The manager of a tin-plate factory recently fixed time rates at \$1.50 a week for his women workers, and he openly gave the reason that they had taken advantage of piecework rates to make too much. Some had earned \$4!

The average wage paid to waitresses in tea shops or restaurants throughout the country does not exceed \$2.50 a week. On this the girls must keep up a neat and well-dressed appearance. Then wages are likely to be interfered with and even, if "necessary," reduced.

Many firms don't pretend to pay their girls a living wage. The head of a large company was asked recently how he expected the girls in his employment to live on \$1.50 a week.

"I don't expect it," he answered. "Immediately we hear that a girl has lost her father or that she has no outside means of support, she is discharged."

This same firm employs what it calls "half-day waitresses." They work from 11.30 a. m. till 6.30 p. m. for \$1 a week. All tips are forfeited.

The lot of the home worker is the worst of all. Miss Mary MacArthur, secretary of the Women's Trade Union League, gave a picture of the home worker in the East End in an interview.

"So terrible is their life that I wonder that they take the trouble to exist at all," she said. "Here is a single room in a Stepney slum. The furniture consists of a table, a chair, and a bed. The unfinished trousers at which the woman stitches serves as a blanket at night."

"She slaves from daybreak until her eyes fail, and she never earns more than 5 shillings a week. She sustains herself mainly, almost entirely, upon weak tea. Some days she drinks 14 cups, making the same tea leaves do service again and again. That is one of the women slaves of England, and there are thousands in similar plight."

"I know many women who make men's shirts at 1 shilling or 9 pence a dozen. I have even found the actual worker making at 8 pence a dozen shirts which had originally been given out at 1 shilling a dozen."

"There is a girl in Woolwich; she has one child, aged 2 years, entirely dependent upon her. She is a shirt finisher and does buttoning and buttonholing by hand. She is paid 5 shillings a dozen for collars. Remember, this is high-class work. Cotton costs her from 3 pence to 4 pence a week. Her average earnings are 4 shillings 6 pence a week, or from one-half pence to three-fourths pence an hour."

"Every day she has to spend an hour and a half in fetching her work, as it is only given out in small quantities. Sometimes she has worked with hardly any break for twenty hours, from 6 a. m. until 2 a. m. the following morning. The rent of the room is 1 shilling and 6 pence a week."

"All this she told the parliamentary committee. The members of Parliament were aghast. Some were incredulous. 'But how do you live, you and the child?' asked one member of Parliament. 'We don't live,' the woman replied, with a passion in her tone I had never heard before. 'Often we have no food at all.'"

Miss MacArthur contends that goods are not sold any cheaper when made by sweated labor. She tells of a fur-lined motor coat, marked at \$105, which was made for \$1.88 by sweated labor; and of a \$5.25 night-dress for which the home worker who made it got 5 cents—63 cents for a dozen of these nightdresses. The employer of the girls who made these nightdresses said he could not pay more, as there was no profit in his trade.

There are many persons who are struggling to organize and help the women workers of England. There is a scheme for a trades board, which shall fix a legal minimum wage, and there are other propositions which will help to do away with the present sweating system, if they are ever put into practice.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire might have struck out the London heading and inserted New York, Pittsburg, or Jersey City, and the cruel oppression of

labor by organized capital, *uncontrolled by law*, would not be overdrawn, as I shall abundantly show before I conclude.

The Senator and the party of which he is a conspicuous leader have a duty to perform in which they seem strangely oblivious.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has made a comparison about a man, a bricklayer—

Mr. GALLINGER. Or a plumber.

Mr. SMOOT. In an unprotected industry, receiving 60 cents an hour, while a little girl who does spooling in a woolen mill gets 14 cents. Is that a fair comparison?

Mr. OWEN. I should say it is not a fair comparison. That comparison has not been made.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator just made a comparison that was even worse than that, because he spoke of burlers in a woolen mill, and they were receiving only 11 cents.

Mr. OWEN. I gave, in extenso, the wages paid to burlers and to all other employees in woolen mills and in silk mills and in cotton mills, stating what it was, whether they were male or whether they were female. I have given them all, and the comparison is just which I have made, substantially, and no comparison the Senator might suggest of a little girl and a big, burly brick mason, who weighs 247 pounds, will affect the general comparison in the slightest degree.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly the comparison which the Senator makes. And in relation to the wages paid here for weavers, I may say I do not know a weaver in any part of this country who earns so small an amount as that stated by the Senator. I have many times seen weavers earn as high as \$3 a day, and the higher the wage they earn the better it is for the manufacturer, because they are all on piecework.

Mr. OWEN. Does the Senator challenge the accuracy of the census in this matter?

Mr. SMOOT. I challenge the figures the Senator gave here as to the wages paid to woolen weavers in this country.

Mr. OWEN. Then I commend the Senator to the United States census, from which the table was taken, and he may dispute the authoritative tables of the Federal Government; but he can not correct the accuracy of my quotation from the census reports.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not saying that the figure quoted by the Senator was not quoted from some table, but I do positively say that weavers in this country are not paid the price the Senator quoted.

Mr. OWEN. I appeal from the evidence of the Senator from Utah, as a special pleader, to the evidence of the federal census and of the London Board of Trade, and prefer to take the census of the United States and the official figures to his off-hand comments.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. I cordially yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have been very much interested in the Senator's statistics and figures, but it has often occurred to me that the industries to which he refers as unprotected industries are really the only perfectly protected industries we have in the United States, for the reason that if a man is to build a brick house here at all he has no competition from any quarter on earth. A man making a horseshoe has to be protected by a law, but a man shoeing a horse has an absolute, perfectly natural protection, because the horse has to be shod where he is and not in some other country, and no competition, direct or indirect, beats upon those occupations which are naturally and perfectly protected.

Mr. OWEN. I think there is force in the observation of the Senator from Iowa, and I shall not quarrel with it, but content myself with saying that like industries abroad are also much better paid than factory labor. But I do call attention to the fact that these men who are in the railway service and in the unprotected building trades and not in the business of manufacturing woolen or cotton or flax textiles are receiving a very much higher reward than those who are in those industries, and I have shown by these tables that they could be paid a much larger price without depriving the factories of a just reward. If there were some competition, it would be far better for labor; and if there were some measure of competition in this country, I believe it would be better for the manufacturers themselves.

LABOR HAS NOT BEEN ABLE TO SHARE EQUITABLY WITH THE EMPLOYERS IN THE VALUES THAT LABOR HAS INCREASINGLY CREATED.

In Volume VIII, page 982, of the Twelfth Census, 1900, is the following table. It shows that labor received in 1850, 23.21 per cent of the total value of products, while in 1900 it received only 17.8 per cent of the product, although the per capita increase in production was greater by 130 per cent in 1900 than in 1850.

Year.	Average number of wage-earners.	Total annual wages.	Total annual value of products.	Average per capita production.
1850.....	967,069	\$236,755,464	\$1,019,106,616	\$1,064
1900.....	5,321,389	2,330,578,010	13,039,279,566	2,451

Year.	Average annual wage.	Per cent of product paid in wages.	Per capita increase in production in the 50 years.	Per capita increase in wages in 50 years.
1850.....	\$247	23.21	Per cent.	Per cent.
1900.....	437	17.80	130	77

From Exhibit 1 labor shows a diminishing wage as compared to value of its product.

In textiles labor received 22 per cent of the product in 1890, 20.8 per cent in 1900, 19.5 per cent in 1905.

In the iron and steel industries labor received 24.9 per cent of the product in 1900, 22.1 per cent in 1905.

In the leather industries labor received 20.1 per cent of the product in 1890, 18.9 per cent in 1900, 16.5 per cent in 1905.

In paper and printing industries labor received 26.5 per cent in 1890, 23.1 per cent in 1900, 21.6 per cent in 1905.

In metal and metal products labor received 20.4 per cent of the gross product in 1890, 12.9 per cent in 1900, 12.7 per cent in 1905.

In tobacco industries labor received 21 per cent in 1890, 18.9 per cent in 1905.

Labor has constantly grown in efficiency, but has not been able to share equitably in the value it has created.

Taking a special industry, such as iron and steel, including rolling mills and blast furnaces, as shown by the special report of the United States Census Office, Part IV, selected industries, 1905, on pages 5 and 16, will be found the tables for the years 1890 and 1905. I submit an analysis which shows that the per capita increase of the product of labor by weight was 50 per cent; by value, 33.5 per cent; while the increase in wages is only 11 per cent.

Year.	Average number of wage-earners employed.	Total annual wages paid.	Total value of products.	Total weight of products in tons.
1890.....	171,181	\$89,273,956	\$478,687,519	16,264,478
1905.....	242,740	141,439,906	905,854,152	34,844,933

Year.	Per capita increase in production in 15 years in values.	Per capita increase in production by weight.	Per capita increase in wages in 15 years.	Average weekly wage.
1890.....	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	\$10.02
1905.....	33.5	50.5	11.5	11.20

These figures might be multiplied indefinitely in all of the monopoly-controlled industries.

I submit a table of the wages in the woolen and cotton goods factories of New England. It shows that they do not receive today an average wage of exceeding a dollar a day, a fact of special interest in connection with this controversy where the schedules are supposed to be written for the protection of labor.

Wages 1860 and 1900 compared in woolen and cotton goods factories of New England.

Year.	Number of employees.	Wages.	Wages per capita.	Value of product.	Value of output per capita.	Pounds of cotton used.	Actual increase in output by weight.
Cotton:							Per ct.
1860.....	81,403	\$16,720,920	\$205	\$79,359,000	\$794	283,701,306	-----
1900.....	164,944	56,258,202	341	191,690,913	1,162	940,908,114	331
Woolen:							-----
1860.....	25,583	6,144,847	240	47,722,814	1,474	-----	-----
1900.....	82,472	31,230,772	378	161,566,277	1,934	-----	-----

This schedule shows that, counting the best paid labor, the annual average wage of the employees in the cotton and woolen mills do not exceed \$1 a day, and that, therefore, the pretense of better paid labor in the United States in the cotton and woolen mills, at least, is not true, because such wages do not greatly exceed the wages in Europe; and measured by purchasing power, probably do not exceed them at all; and measured by the output of American labor, which is twice as efficient as European labor, the American labor is not as well paid as European labor. The American manufacturer gets all the net profit. It has been shown in this debate what the enormous profits of the cotton and woolen mills have been, and our statistics clearly demonstrate the inequitable manner in which these profits have been proportioned between the American monopolists and his foreign-born workmen.

AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN WAGES IN PROTECTED INDUSTRIES COMPARED.

I submit this comparison of wages in the United States, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom, with the proper authorities, showing that the wages paid in the United States in the textile industry do not very greatly exceed those paid in Germany, France, and England, while it is conceded that

the output of the American laborer is twice as much as in Europe.

The spinners, for example, in Germany in 1905, at Mulhausen, received from \$6.57 to \$7.30 per week. In France they received \$5.91 and in the United States \$4.12. The weavers, on the contrary, received in Germany \$4.02 to \$4.75; in France, \$4.48 to \$5.19; in the United Kingdom, \$5.11 to \$7.06; and in the United States, \$8.29. So that the weavers in our country received double as much as they did in Germany, and the spinners in our country received a smaller money wage than in either Germany or France.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the table show that the weavers receive less than the spinners in Germany?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. Whoever prepared the table does not know a thing about manufacturing, and it can not possibly be true.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator from Utah, having corrected the United States census with regard to employees in cotton factories, may now correct the tables used by the Board of Trade of the United Kingdom in their report to Parliament, from which this is taken.

Mr. SMOOT. I know just as well as I know I am alive that there is no country that can employ weavers at a less price than they can spinners. Spinners are boys and girls. Weavers are men and women. It can not be possible. It is a mistake.

Mr. OWEN. I again appeal from the personal assurances of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the records of the Board of Trade of London and of the United States census, from which these figures are accurately taken; and I call attention to the fact that the Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, when he was giving these tables, confined himself to those parts of the tables favorable to his contention and failed to insert those parts of the tables which were unfavorable to his contention, and such a leadership I neither approve nor follow.

These tables show the differences which I have pointed out, and they speak for themselves and are easily capable of their verification.

Wages in textile industry in Germany, France, United Kingdom, and United States.

In the protected industries.	Germany, 1905, Mulhausen.		France, 1905, Lille.		United Kingdom. Weekly pay, 1906 (W. K. Preston).	United States. Average, 1904.	Hours.
	Weekly pay.	Hours work.	Weekly pay.	Hours work.			
COTTON INDUSTRY.							
Spinners:							
Male.....	\$6.57-\$7.30	66	\$5.91	60	-----	\$4.12	64.55
Female.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	5.16	61.01
Weavers:							
Male.....	4.02-4.75	66	4.48-5.19	60	\$5.11-\$7.06	8.29	60.42
Female.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	7.58	60.13
Piecers.....	4.42-4.87	66	3.51-5.19	60	-----	-----	-----
Laborers.....	3.81	66	4.10	60	-----	-----	-----
Dyers.....	3.65-4.62	58-63	4.66-5.25	60-66	-----	6.89	62.48
Mule spinners.....	-----	-----	11.78-12.45	60	8.52-10.95	11.24	59.32
WOOLEN INDUSTRY.							
	Mulhausen.		Roubaix.		Bradford.		
Spinners.....	7.20-7.79	61	6.22-6.81	60	1.95-2.68	6.52	58.34
Weavers (Aschen):							
Male.....	5.11-5.84	60	5.45-5.84	60	3.16-4.14	9.87	58.47
Female.....	4.38	60	-----	-----	-----	8.79	57.57
Combers (Leipzig):							
Male.....	4.38	65	4.20-4.26	60	4.87-5.60	7.11	58.33
Female.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	2.68-3.41	5.49	57.40
Dyers (Leipzig).....	5.60	65	3.79-3.91	60	5.84	7.86	59.11
SILK INDUSTRY.							
Weavers:							
Silk.....							
Male.....	5.11-5.84	58-58½	3.20-3.51	60	-----	9.74	56.52
Female.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	8.19	57.82
Velvet.....	5.84-6.57	58-58½	4.10-4.97	60	-----	-----	-----
Ribbon.....							
Male.....	7.30	58-58½	3.51-4.66	60	-----	10.93	52.98
Female.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	9.84	50.71
Dyers.....	6.57	60	5.84-6.81	60	-----	10.98	55.05

• St. Etienne.

NOTE.—In 1905 the wages received at St. Etienne, France, by ribbon weavers varied from \$3.51 to \$4.66 per week. In 1906 it was over 100 per cent more than this. In August, 1907, it was from 30 per cent to 50 per cent higher than in 1905. These weavers received as pay, in piecework, from one-half to two-thirds the value of their product.
 Authority for United States figures: Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor, No. 59, July, 1905.
 Authority for foreign figures: Cost of Living in German Towns (1908); Cost of Living in French Towns (1909); Cost of Living of Working Classes, United Kingdom, 1908; Report of Board of Trade to Parliament.

I exhibit a comparison of wages in the United States, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom in the nonprotected industries, which present a very much more favorable wage to the unprotected American workingman and much more favorable hours.

Comparison of wages in United States, Germany, France, and United Kingdom.

Table comparing wages and hours for various classes of labor (Bricklayers, Carpenters, etc.) across Berlin (1905), London (Oct., 1905), Paris (Oct., 1905), and United States—North Atlantic (1904).

a Piecework. b Time work. c Day. d Night.

Report of board of trade: Cost of living in German towns, 1908; cost of living in French towns, 1909; cost of living of working classes, United Kingdom, 1908.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President— The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if he has consulted Bulletin No. 80, published in January, 1909? It is four years later than the one he quoted from.

compare the dates as nearly as they could be compared, and have not attempted to compare the tables of Great Britain, made by the board of trade there, with the tables made at a very different period.

I now take a table—Exhibit No. 6, the wages and cost of living in the United Kingdom, Germany, and France—showing the average family income, the cost of living, the articles of food, and so forth.

As Exhibit No. 6, I submit the wages and cost of living in the United Kingdom, Germany, and France.

EXHIBIT 6. Wages and cost of living in United Kingdom, Germany, and France.

Table showing wages and cost of living in United Kingdom, Germany, and France, categorized by limit weekly income (Under \$6.08, \$6.08 and under \$7.40, etc.) and various food items.

NOTE.—Totals are found by converting the totals in foreign money into United States money, and may differ from true totals. Authority for above table: Report of an inquiry by the Board of Trade for both Houses of the English Parliament, 1908, as to cost of living in German towns; 1909, as to cost of living in French towns.

As Exhibit No. 7, I submit the income and cost of living in the United States of workingmen's families.

EXHIBIT 7.
Workingmen's families, income and cost of living in the United States, 1891.

Geographical division.	Number of families noted.	Average size of family.	Average income of family.		Average expenditure of family.		Average expenditure for food.	
			Annual.	Weekly.	Annual.	Weekly.	Annual.	Weekly.
North Atlantic States.....	1,415	5.25	\$834.83	\$16.05	\$778.04	\$14.96	\$338.10	\$6.50
South Atlantic States.....	219	5.30	762.68	14.67	700.62	13.47	298.64	5.74
North Central States.....	721	5.46	842.60	16.20	785.95	15.11	321.60	6.18
South Central States.....	122	5.65	715.46	13.76	690.11	13.27	292.68	5.36
Western States.....	90	4.69	891.52	17.15	751.46	14.45	308.53	5.32
United States.....	2,567	5.31	827.19	15.91	768.54	14.78	326.90	6.99

Authority for above table: Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor, United States, No. 59, July, 1905.

As Exhibit No. 8 I submit the quantity and value of the food consumed by workingmen's families in the United States per week, 1901:

EXHIBIT 8.
Quantity and value of certain articles of food consumed by workingmen's families in the United States per week, 1901.
(Average income, \$14.78 per week. Number of families, 2,567.)

Article.	Amount.	Cost.
Bread and flour.....pounds..	17.95	\$0.56
Meats.....do.....	14.78	1.97
Fish.....do.....	1.54	.15
Eggs.....number.....	19.7	.32
Milk.....pints.....	13.7	.41
Cheese.....pounds.....	.31	.05
Butter and lard.....do.....	3.87	.73
Potatoes.....do.....	17.0	.25
Vegetables and fruit.....do.....		.68
Rice.....pounds.....	.48	.04
Coffee and tea.....do.....	1.10	.31
Sugar.....do.....	5.16	.30
Condiments, molasses, etc.....do.....		.11
Other food.....do.....		.39
Total expended for food per week.....		6.27
Total expended for food per year.....		326.90

Authority: Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor, No. 59, July, 1905.

As Exhibit No. 9 I submit the weekly rents workingmen pay in England, Germany, France, and United States.

EXHIBIT 9.
Weekly rents in England, Germany, France, and United States.

Tenements.	London.	Berlin.	Paris.	United States.
Two-room.....	\$1.46	\$1.34	\$1.12	= \$1.91
Three-room.....	1.82	1.98	1.46	
Four-room.....	2.19		1.67	

* Average of 2,567 families, 1901, irrespective of size of tenement, in total United States.

Report of board of trade to Parliament: (1908) cost of living in German towns; (1909) cost of living in French towns; (1908) cost of living of working classes, United Kingdom.

Exhibit No. 10 is the per cent of income of workingmen's families spent for food.

EXHIBIT 10.
Per cent of income of workingmen's families spent for food.

Limit of income.	United Kingdom, 1905.	Germany, 1905.	France, 1905.	United States.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
\$6.08-\$7.30 per week.....	66	62	59	= 42½
\$7.30-\$8.52 per week.....	65	59	58	
\$8.52-\$9.73 per week.....	61	58	56	

* 2,567 workingmen's families.

Authority: Bulletin of United States Bureau of Labor No. 59. Report of board of trade to Parliament on cost of living (1908-9).

IT WOULD NOT BE DIFFICULT TO DETERMINE WITH COMPARATIVE PRECISION THE DIFFERENCE IN THE COST OF PRODUCTION MEASURED BY THE COST OF MATERIALS AND OF WAGES, THE RELATIVE EFFICIENCY OF LABOR, AND THE PURCHASING POWER OF THE WAGE

RECEIVED. FUTURE TARIFFS SHOULD BE BASED UPON SUCH INFORMATION COMPILED BY EXPERTS EMPLOYED FOR THE PURPOSE. THIS WOULD GIVE A PROPER BASIS FOR DETERMINING THE DIFFERENCE IN COST OF PRODUCTION AT HOME AND ABROAD, AND FOR DETERMINING THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE AMERICAN MANUFACTURER WOULD BE PROTECTED IN PERCENTAGES OVER AND ABOVE THE DIFFERENCE IN THE COST OF PRODUCTION, AND WOULD ESTABLISH A SOUND FOUNDATION UPON WHICH TO WRITE A TARIFF FOR REVENUE WHICH WOULD AFFORD A LEGITIMATE AND REASONABLE INCIDENTAL PROTECTION, WITHOUT GIVING SHELTER TO MONOPOLY.

It will be observed from these tables the vital fact that the American laborer in the protected industries, and especially in the cotton and woolen industries, does not receive the enormous wages in comparison with the European workman in like industries which the advocates of high tariff would have us believe. On the contrary, their wages are very little, if any, better than those of the European workman, and that the workman in the United States, especially in the textiles, has been compelled to supplement his own wages by compelling his wife and his daughter and his children of tender years to help earn sufficient to enable them to keep body and soul together.

THE EXTREME USE OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN THE RACE FOR MONEY-MAKING.

An untutored, full-blood Sioux Indian was taken East and shown the glories of its civilization and, when he had been surfeited with sight-seeing, the question was asked him, what had struck him as the most important thing he saw, and he replied: "The way in which the white man makes his little children work."

So evil has been this result of a monopoly-breaking tariff in this Nation that a general alarm has been widely excited, and various States and committees throughout the Nation are engaged in attempting its correction. (Proceedings of the fifth annual conference, Chicago, Ill., National Child Labor Committee, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York.)

Bulletin No. 69, on Child Labor, Department of Commerce and Labor, shows that 26 per cent of the male children of the United States between 10 and 15 years of age are breadwinners; 1,264,000 male children between 10 and 15 years are breadwinners; 485,000 female children between 10 and 15 years are breadwinners.

2. If the number of children over 15, wage-earners and not yet adults, were classified, it would be found very large. Table 164, Census Bulletin, page 69, for example, gives the number of children at home, at school, and employed as breadwinners in families in which there are female textile workers 10 to 14 years of age, for Chicago, and New York, and out of 3,595 children over 15 years of age, 190 were at home, 52 at school, and 3,353 employed in gainful occupations. No record is made by the census of children not employed in gainful occupations under 10 years of age, nor over 15 years of age; so that it is probably no exaggeration to state that four or five million of children are engaged in labor when they ought to be in school or at play.

By Census Volume 2, page cxxxi, it is shown that the number of females engaged in gainful occupations, outside of domestic service was 5,329,292, and the probable number of women and girls now engaged in gainful occupations will probably exceed seven millions; 28 per cent being so employed in Massachusetts, 29.6 per cent in Rhode Island, 24.3 per cent in Connecticut, 20.8 per cent in New Jersey, 23 per cent in New York and 7.9 per cent in Oklahoma. The reason for women being compelled to go into competition with men in the gainful occupations is largely because the men of the family do not receive enough to maintain the family and enable the women to have the means they require and to remain at home where they properly belong

in a civilization of a high order. The driving of the American woman from the home where her activities would best be employed in promoting her own happiness and the happiness of mankind, and where her services to the race would be best employed in raising children and teaching them the lessons of religion, morality, and the sturdy virtues taught by our forefathers, is not the least of the crushing effects of modern monopoly engendered by a monopoly protecting tariff, and by the unrestrained avarice and ambition with their false standards of life which are thus set up in a mad race for power.

It will be seen by the wages in the textile industries that the cotton spinners of Germany and France are paid more in money than in the United States, the weavers less, and the mule spinners of France more, than those of the United States; that the woolen spinners of Germany and France are paid more money than they are in the United States, while the weavers are paid less, but in considering the fact that the money of the cotton spinners and woolen spinners of France and Germany will buy 50 per cent more than in the United States, the wages they receive are decidedly better. When it is remembered the American workman turns out twice as much as the German or Frenchman, then the ungenerous treatment of the American cotton and woolen spinners is obvious. It is also

obvious that the plea of the Massachusetts and Rhode Island manufacturer that the HIGHER WAGES he is compelled to pay his cotton and wool spinners in order to meet the pauper labor competition of France and Germany is a *monumental falsehood* used to hoodwink the patriotism of the American people and lead them to tax themselves for the poor spinner's sake who toil in the cotton and woolen mills.

It is interesting to observe that labor in the protected industries of Germany, France, and the United Kingdom are paid much smaller wages than in the unprotected industries, and labor might well question the value of a protective system which operates throughout the world to give them less remuneration for their labor than in the unprotected industries.

A COMPETITION-PROHIBITING TARIFF HAS SERVED TO INCREASE PRICES AND LOWER THE PURCHASING POWER OF ALL WAGES AND OF ALL INCOMES.

In the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society for March, 1909, page 68, A. Sauerbeck, an acknowledged authority, gives a comparison of world prices, based on 45 commodities, and using as an index the standards fixed by the period of eleven years, 1867-1877, which in the aggregate was the equivalent of the average of the twenty-five years preceding; that is, from 1853-1877. The index number is 100.

Prices of commodities in 1908.

[By A. Sauerbeck.]

The following table shows the course of prices of 45 commodities during the last twenty years as compared with the standard period of eleven years, 1867-1877, which in the aggregate is equivalent to the average of the twenty-five years, 1853-1877. (See the Society's Journal, 1886, pp. 592 and 648; and 1893, pp. 220 and 247.)

(Summary of index numbers. Groups of articles, 1867-1877=100.)

Year.	Vegetable food (corn, etc.).	Animal food (meat, etc.).	Sugar, coffee, and tea.	Total food.	Minerals.	Textiles.	Sundry materials.	Total materials.	Grand total.	Silver.	Wheat harvest.	Average price of consols.	Average Bank of England rate.
1889.....	65	86	75	75	75	70	68	70	72	70.2	103	98	<i>Per cent.</i> 3 1/2
1890.....	65	82	70	73	80	66	69	71	72	78.4	106	96 1/2	4 1/2
1891.....	75	81	71	77	76	59	69	68	72	74.1	108	95 1/2	3 3/4
1892.....	65	84	69	73	71	57	67	65	68	65.4	91	96 1/2	2 1/2
1893.....	59	85	75	72	68	59	68	65	68	58.6	90	98 1/2	3 1/2
1894.....	55	80	65	66	64	53	64	60	63	47.6	106	101 1/2	2 1/2
1895.....	54	78	62	64	62	52	65	60	62	49.1	91	106 1/2	2
1896.....	53	73	59	62	63	54	63	60	61	50.5	116	111	2 1/2
1897.....	60	79	52	65	66	51	62	59	62	45.3	100	112 1/2	2 1/2
1898.....	67	77	51	68	70	51	63	61	64	44.3	120	111	3 1/2
1899.....	60	79	53	65	92	58	65	70	68	45.1	113	107	3 1/2
1900.....	62	85	54	69	108	66	71	80	75	46.4	99	99 1/2	4
1901.....	62	85	46	67	89	60	71	72	70	44.7	106	94	3 1/2
1902.....	63	87	41	67	82	71	71	71	69	39.6	113	94 1/2	3 1/2
1903.....	62	84	44	66	82	66	69	72	69	40.7	104	90 1/2	3 1/2
1904.....	63	83	50	68	81	71	67	72	70	43.4	93	88 1/2	3 1/2
1905.....	63	87	52	69	87	72	68	75	72	45.7	113	89 1/2	3
1906.....	62	89	46	69	101	80	74	83	77	50.7	116	88 1/2	4 1/2
1907.....	69	88	48	72	107	77	78	86	80	49.6	117	84	4 1/2
1908.....	70	89	48	72	89	62	73	74	73	40.1	111	86	3
Average:													
1869-1908.....	64	86	48	68	92	67	71	75	72	44.6	109	92 1/2	3 1/2
1888-1887.....	62	81	66	70	70	59	66	65	67	61.0	101	101 1/2	2 1/2
1878-1887.....	79	95	76	84	73	71	81	76	79	82.1	97	99 1/2	3 1/2

It will thus be observed that as compared with 100 for 1853-1877, the grand total index number of world prices for 1889 was 72, and for 1899 it was 72, a fall in prices due to the demonetization of silver throughout the world.

It will also be observed that the index number for 1889 and 1905 was 72; for 1908 it was 73, thus indicating a singular stability in the grand total of the world prices (London), since 1889, notwithstanding important intermediate variations.

Conceding that the volume of metallic money in the world, together with the law of supply and demand of other materials, are the determining factors fixing the average of world prices, it should be observed that the wonderful increase in the output of modern machinery as applied to all classes of products seems to have been about equaled by the output of metallic money, whose annual rate of gold output has approximately doubled since 1896.

This table also shows the effect upon world prices by the disturbance of commercial credits of the world by financial panic; the panic of 1893 being followed by the lowest world prices in a generation.

It would seem to follow that the lowering of prices stimulated purchases and exchanges and led to a corresponding reaction. The panic of 1907 was followed by an immediate reaction in world prices.

It is important to point out that, notwithstanding the increased output of merchantable articles, the increase of gold

circulation available for the use of the world markets has been very large, and that this probably accounts for the substantial stability of world prices since 1889. These figures are of intense interest when compared with the changes in prices which have taken place in the United States. Taking the tables of the Statistical Abstract of 1907, it will be seen that middling cotton which was 11.07 cents in 1890 was 11.5 cents in 1906, having reached a very low price of 6.94 cents in 1894, just after the panic, and a still lower point of 5.94 cents in 1898, just after the Dingley bill passed; while standard sheetings for 1890 was 7 cents, and 1906, 7.25 cents, reaching a low point of 5.11 cents in 1894, just after the panic, and its lowest point, 4.2 cents, in 1898, just after the passage of the Dingley bill.

In like manner standard drillings and other cotton cloths fluctuated similarly following the panic and following the Dingley bill.

Mr. President, I now submit a table (No. 202) from the Abstract of Our National Statistics (1907), giving the relative wholesale prices of raw and of manufactured commodities of 1890 to 1906 and per cent of increase in prices for 1906 over prices for each preceding year; and also Table 203, giving the relative wholesale prices of commodities from 1890 to 1906 and the per cent of increase in prices from 1906 over prices for each preceding year by group of commodities.

Great increase in prices under Dingley Act. Relative wholesale prices of raw and of manufactured commodities, 1890 to 1906, and per cent of increase in prices for 1906 over prices for each preceding year.

Calendar year.	Raw commodities.		Manufactured commodities.		All commodities.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding.
1890.....	115.0	9.5	112.3	8.3	112.9	8.4
1891.....	116.3	8.3	110.6	9.9	111.7	9.6
1892.....	107.9	16.7	105.6	15.2	106.1	15.4
1893.....	104.4	20.6	105.9	14.8	105.6	15.9
1894.....	93.2	35.1	96.8	25.6	96.1	27.4
1895.....	91.7	37.3	94.0	29.4	93.6	30.8
1896.....	84.0	49.9	91.9	32.3	90.4	35.4
1897.....	87.6	43.7	90.1	35.0	89.7	36.5
1898.....	94.0	33.9	83.3	30.3	83.4	31.0
1899.....	105.9	18.9	100.7	20.8	101.7	20.4
1900.....	111.9	12.5	110.2	10.3	110.5	10.8
1901.....	111.4	13.0	107.8	12.8	108.5	12.8
1902.....	122.4	2.9	110.6	9.9	112.9	8.4
1903.....	122.7	2.6	111.5	9.1	113.6	7.7
1904.....	119.7	5.2	111.3	9.3	113.0	8.3
1905.....	121.2	3.9	114.6	6.1	115.9	5.6
1906.....	125.9	121.6	122.4

NOTE.—From reports of the Bureau of Labor, Department of Commerce and Labor. This table summarizes wholesale prices of 258 staple commodities. The commodities designated as "Raw" are such as are marketed in their natural state and also such as have been subjected to only a preliminary manufacturing process; this group includes 50 articles. The commodities designated as "Manufactured" are such as have been subjected to more than a preliminary factory manipulation and in which the manufacturing labor cost constitutes an important element in the price; this group includes 208 articles. A relative price, or index number, as it is technically called, of any article is the per cent which the price of that article at any date is of the price of the same article at a date or period which has been selected as the base or standard. The base selected by the Bureau of Labor for this compilation is the average price for the ten-year period 1890 to 1899. The relative prices shown under each group are simple averages of the relatives of all articles included within the group. Average price for 1890-1899=100.

EXHIBIT 6.

Relative wholesale prices of commodities, 1890 to 1906, and per cent of increase in prices for 1906 over prices for each preceding year, by groups of commodities.

Calendar year.	Farm products.		Food, etc.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.
1890.....	110.0	12.4	112.4	0.2
1891.....	121.5	1.7	115.7	2.7
1892.....	111.7	10.7	103.6	8.7
1893.....	107.9	14.6	110.2	2.2
1894.....	95.9	28.9	99.8	12.8
1895.....	93.3	32.5	94.6	19.0
1896.....	78.3	57.9	83.8	34.4
1897.....	85.2	45.1	87.7	28.4
1898.....	96.1	28.6	94.4	19.3
1899.....	100.0	23.6	98.3	14.5
1900.....	109.5	12.9	104.2	8.1
1901.....	116.9	5.7	105.9	6.3
1902.....	130.5	11.3	111.3	1.2
1903.....	118.8	4.0	107.1	5.1
1904.....	126.2	2.1	107.2	5.0
1905.....	124.2	1.5	108.7	3.6
1906.....	123.6	112.6
1907.....	117.8

Calendar year.	Cloths and clothing.		Fuel and lighting.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.
1890.....	113.5	5.7	104.7	23.7
1891.....	111.3	7.8	102.7	26.1
1892.....	109.0	10.1	101.1	28.1
1893.....	107.2	11.9	100.0	29.5
1894.....	96.1	24.9	92.4	40.2
1895.....	92.7	29.4	98.1	32.0
1896.....	91.3	31.4	104.3	24.2
1897.....	91.1	31.7	96.4	34.3
1898.....	93.4	28.5	95.4	35.7
1899.....	98.7	24.1	105.0	23.3
1900.....	105.8	12.4	120.9	7.1
1901.....	101.0	18.8	119.5	8.4
1902.....	102.0	17.6	134.3	13.6
1903.....	105.6	12.6	149.3	13.3
1904.....	109.8	9.3	132.6	2.3
1905.....	112.0	7.1	128.8	1.5
1906.....	120.0	129.5

* Decrease.

Relative wholesale prices of commodities, 1890 to 1906, etc.—Continued.

Calendar year.	Metals and implements.		Lumber and building materials.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.
1890.....	119.2	13.4	111.8	25.3
1891.....	111.7	21.0	108.4	29.2
1892.....	106.0	27.5	102.8	36.3
1893.....	100.7	34.3	101.9	37.5
1894.....	90.7	49.1	96.3	45.5
1895.....	92.0	47.0	94.1	48.9
1896.....	93.7	44.3	93.4	50.0
1897.....	86.6	56.1	90.4	55.0
1898.....	88.4	56.5	95.8	46.2
1899.....	114.7	17.9	105.8	32.4
1900.....	120.5	12.2	115.7	21.1
1901.....	111.9	20.8	116.7	20.1
1902.....	117.2	15.4	118.8	17.9
1903.....	117.6	15.0	121.4	15.4
1904.....	109.6	23.4	122.7	14.2
1905.....	122.5	10.4	127.7	9.6
1906.....	135.2	140.1

Calendar year.	Drugs and chemicals.		House furnishing goods.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.
1890.....	110.2	8.2	111.1	0.1
1891.....	103.6	2.3	110.2	7
1892.....	102.9	1.7	106.5	4.2
1893.....	100.5	7	104.9	5.8
1894.....	89.8	12.7	100.1	10.9
1895.....	87.9	15.1	96.5	15.0
1896.....	92.6	9.3	94.0	18.1
1897.....	94.4	7.2	89.8	23.6
1898.....	100.6	5.1	92.0	20.7
1899.....	111.3	9.1	95.1	16.7
1900.....	115.7	12.5	106.1	4.6
1901.....	115.2	12.2	110.9	1
1902.....	114.2	11.4	112.2	1.1
1903.....	112.6	10.1	113.0	1.8
1904.....	110.0	8.0	111.7	1.6
1905.....	109.1	7.2	109.1	1.7
1906.....	101.2	111.0

Calendar year.	Miscellaneous.		All commodities.	
	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.	Relative price.	Per cent of increase in 1906 over each preceding year.
1890.....	110.3	9.8	112.9	8.4
1891.....	109.4	10.7	111.7	9.6
1892.....	106.2	14.0	106.1	15.4
1893.....	105.9	14.4	105.6	15.9
1894.....	99.8	21.3	96.1	27.4
1895.....	94.5	28.1	93.6	30.8
1896.....	91.4	32.5	90.4	35.4
1897.....	92.1	31.5	89.7	36.5
1898.....	92.4	31.1	93.4	31.0
1899.....	97.7	24.0	101.7	20.4
1900.....	109.8	10.3	110.5	10.8
1901.....	107.4	12.8	108.5	12.8
1902.....	114.1	6.1	112.9	8.4
1903.....	113.6	6.6	113.6	7.7
1904.....	111.7	8.4	113.0	8.3
1905.....	112.8	7.4	115.9	5.6
1906.....	121.1	122.4

* Decrease.

NOTE.—From reports of the Bureau of Labor, Department of Commerce and Labor. The group farm products includes 16 commodities; food, etc., 53; cloths and clothing, 75; fuel and lighting, 13; metals and implements, 38; lumber and building material, 27; drugs and chemicals, 9; house furnishing goods, 14; and the miscellaneous group, 13. Average price for 1890-1899=100.

I also submit Dun's tables showing the variations in prices in the United States.

It should be kept clearly in mind that the federal census is, to a very appreciable degree, influenced by the manufacturing industries of the country favorably to themselves, and this dif-

ference is demonstrated by Dun's tables, which show the increase of prices to be much larger in the United States than as shown by Census Abstract Tables 202 and 203 :

Leading classes of necessary articles of daily consumption—Prices, at primary markets, from July 1, 1890, to May 1, 1907.

[Index number, from Dun's Review.]

Date.	Bread-stuffs.	Meats.	Dairy and garden.	Other food.	Clothing.	Metals.	Miscellaneous.	Total.
	Dolls.	Dolls.	Dolls.	Dolls.	Dolls.	Dolls.	Dolls.	Dolls.
July 1—								
1890	20.530	8.973	12.662	8.894	22.439	25.851	15.842	115.101
1891	15.749	7.485	10.813	7.653	21.147	22.500	16.573	101.920
1892	18.057	7.150	13.406	10.987	28.413	23.207	17.290	118.510
1893	26.154	10.115	13.530	16.359	45.679	37.079	24.264	173.180
1894	45.616	15.685	26.053	27.303	73.485	59.192	31.653	278.987
1895	25.404	16.112	18.049	21.057	49.307	38.956	25.551	194.436
1896	31.471	17.153	23.472	20.821	45.377	41.762	27.922	207.978
1897	36.537	14.278	18.418	20.167	38.169	35.426	25.529	188.524
1898	38.416	13.210	23.614	19.720	35.694	27.385	24.786	182.825
1899	29.116	13.181	18.121	16.347	35.309	28.355	24.201	164.630
1870	25.322	14.161	16.112	13.308	31.480	26.612	21.786	148.781
1871	24.809	12.177	20.799	13.823	30.624	27.371	21.907	151.510
1872	22.171	11.055	16.019	14.845	32.427	32.643	21.319	150.479
1873	20.460	10.114	15.629	13.625	29.411	32.298	21.355	143.089
1874	25.657	11.560	19.142	13.678	27.260	25.254	19.582	143.133
1875	24.848	13.287	14.918	14.418	25.318	23.515	18.398	134.702
1876	18.777	10.726	15.912	12.914	21.747	20.452	15.951	116.479
1877	21.812	10.036	11.790	13.321	21.850	15.578	15.160	109.547
1878	15.672	8.181	10.608	11.346	19.836	15.789	14.836	96.268
1879	17.054	8.238	10.253	9.884	20.420	15.149	16.286	97.285
1880	17.461	9.236	12.594	11.539	21.984	18.708	17.139	108.655
1881	20.369	11.881	11.311	11.663	20.982	19.295	16.900	111.901
1882	25.494	13.740	14.685	11.627	21.202	19.832	16.650	123.230
1883	19.018	11.210	12.250	10.726	20.209	18.071	15.764	107.248
1884	17.871	11.172	11.869	9.323	19.014	16.272	14.685	99.706
1885	16.370	9.205	10.872	8.712	17.740	14.132	13.666	90.697
1886	15.311	8.906	10.241	8.570	18.063	14.466	13.669	89.226
1887	15.156	8.667	11.188	9.252	18.174	16.035	15.153	93.624
1888	16.984	9.416	11.849	9.917	17.447	15.366	14.155	95.134
1889	14.351	8.244	9.695	10.912	17.107	14.782	14.600	89.691
1890	14.867	8.036	10.711	9.749	17.264	15.506	15.416	91.549
1891	19.782	9.217	12.455	9.339	16.501	15.107	13.691	96.092
1892	17.426	8.700	10.403	8.733	15.648	14.827	14.252	90.105
1893	14.963	10.135	11.710	9.188	15.871	14.030	14.716	90.613
1894	15.115	9.389	10.394	8.478	13.860	12.015	14.041	83.292
1895	14.765	8.622	9.874	8.689	15.315	11.021	13.233	81.519
1896	10.504	7.058	7.872	8.529	13.602	13.232	13.820	74.317
1897—January 1	11.729	7.327	10.456	8.170	12.407	13.014	12.399	75.502
July (low)	10.587	7.529	8.714	7.887	13.808	11.642	12.288	72.455
1898—January 1	13.511	7.336	12.371	8.312	14.654	11.572	12.184	79.940
July 1	12.783	7.694	9.437	8.826	14.663	11.843	12.522	77.768
1899—January 1	13.816	7.520	11.458	9.096	14.150	11.843	12.540	80.423
July 1	13.483	7.988	10.974	9.157	15.021	15.635	12.969	85.227
1900—January 1	13.254	7.258	13.702	9.200	17.484	18.085	16.312	95.295
July 1	14.898	8.906	10.901	9.482	16.324	14.834	16.070	91.415
1901—January 1	14.486	8.407	15.556	9.504	16.024	15.810	15.881	95.668
July 1	14.904	9.430	11.030	9.086	15.098	15.344	16.617	91.509
1902—January 1	20.002	9.670	15.248	8.952	15.547	15.375	16.793	101.587
July 1	20.534	11.628	12.557	8.748	15.533	16.084	16.826	101.910
1903—January 1	17.104	9.327	14.613	9.418	15.938	17.185	16.578	100.356
July 1	17.473	9.269	13.083	9.186	17.136	16.544	16.765	99.456
1904—January 1	17.102	8.138	15.287	9.653	17.316	15.887	16.759	100.142
July 1	18.248	9.033	13.648	10.406	16.514	15.428	16.919	97.192
1905—January 1	18.778	7.950	13.948	10.699	16.319	16.188	16.936	100.318
July 1	18.831	8.614	9.982	9.922	17.986	15.916	17.061	98.312
1906—January 1	16.554	8.426	14.399	9.822	19.313	17.141	18.809	104.464
July 1	17.923	9.677	12.960	9.645	19.177	16.649	19.555	105.216
1907—January 1	16.079	9.350	14.965	9.760	19.637	18.087	19.386	107.264
May 1	18.165	9.641	14.661	9.824	20.098	17.524	19.242	108.955

NOTE.—In the above table the course of prices of commodities is shown, and in each case the price is multiplied by the annual per capita consumption, which precludes any one commodity having more than its proper weight in the aggregate. Breadstuffs include many quotations of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, beans, and peas; meats include live hogs, beef, sheep, and many provisions, lard, tallow, etc.; dairy and garden products embrace eggs, vegetables, fruits, milk, butter, cheese, etc.; other food includes fish, liquors, condiments, sugar, rice, tobacco, etc.; clothing covers the raw material of each industry, and many quotations of woolen, cotton, silk, and rubber goods, as well as hides, leather, boots, and shoes; metals include various quotations of pig iron and partially manufactured and finished products, as well as the minor metals, tin, lead, copper, etc., and coal and petroleum; miscellaneous includes many grades of hard and soft lumber, laths, brick, lime, glass, turpentine, hemp, linseed oil, paints, fertilizers, and drugs. The third decimal is given for accuracy of comparison.

There thus appears by Dun's more accurate tables an increase from 1896 to May 1, 1907, of 46.7 per cent on total average of prices of 1896, and on clothing the increase from January 1, 1897, to May 1, 1907, was 69 per cent, and on miscellaneous articles was 55 per cent.

The two tables from our own census contain overwhelming evidence of the injurious results of the Dingley bill upon labor; it shows, for example, Mr. President, that prices have been increased on raw commodities 25.9 per cent over the average prices from 1890 to 1900, and 49.9 per cent over the prices of raw commodities under the Wilson bill.

Our prices were already in 1906 much higher than in Europe, so that these increases are the more striking.

Mr. President, do not the manufacturing classes themselves see that such an enormous raise in prices of raw commodities is injurious both to their domestic and foreign trade? Do they not see it necessarily limits the consumption of the people, whose little salaries are fixed, whose little pension can not be increased in dollars and cents, whose purchasing power is limited to a fixed wage, a wage not exceeding, among the manufacturing laboring classes, \$160 per annum per capita?

The obvious result is to restrict consumption of goods, limit the output of goods, lower the factory output, and limit the demand for labor.

Mr. President, in like manner the increase of manufactured commodities in price, including a group of 208 articles, has been 35 per cent since the lower prices under the Wilson bill and an increase of 36.5 per cent upon all commodities above the more reasonable prices under the Wilson bill.

What corresponding increase of wages has labor received? Their wages are relatively less than they were ten years ago, both in relation to the output of labor and in relation to the purchasing power of the wage received; and the demand for labor has been necessarily diminished by preventing the consumption of manufactured and other commodities, because of prices which could not be paid out of the limited number of dollars the ordinary American has received. Such a policy is injurious to the manufacturer, to the wage-earner, to the common citizen consumer, to the business men of the entire Nation, and to our national growth and development.

And differentiating these increases of prices, it will be seen by Table 203 that the prices of 1906 for food are 34 per cent higher than they were in 1896 under the Wilson bill; the cloths and clothing have increased 31.4 per cent above the prices of 1896 under the Wilson bill; that fuel and lighting have increased 40 per cent since 1894 under the Wilson bill; that metals and metal implements have increased 56 per cent above the prices under the Wilson bill; that lumber and building material have increased 55 per cent over the prices under the Wilson bill; that house furnishings have increased 23.6 per cent above the lower prices of the Wilson bill; and miscellaneous articles of various kinds have increased 32.5 per cent above the more reasonable prices of the Wilson bill. Are the American people utterly oblivious to these striking and conclusive facts?

It is perfectly obvious from Sauerbeck tables of the prices of the world and from Dun's table of American (United States) prices that American (United States) prices have increased far beyond European prices since the low price of 1896, notwithstanding American (United States) prices were then much higher than they were in Europe. It therefore follows, beyond question, that the purchasing power of American wages, even of the starvation wages paid in the cotton and woolen mills, has been lowered in such a way as to greatly harm the American workmen, even in protected industries, and has harmed equally the entire American people, workmen, consumers generally, and even the manufacturers, who are severely taxing each other by high prices—the finished product of the one being the raw material of the other. The only people who have a net profit are those who own and control the successful monopolies.

Is the Finance Committee so committed to the demands of the representatives of organized greed in this country that they will refuse to deal justly by the American people?

Or do they believe that by making the rich richer and the poor poorer they will receive adequate political benefit at the hands of those whom they enrich?

I know, Mr. President, that it has been easy to finance Republican campaigns, and I know many good men have not stopped to think that this money was extorted from the misery and sweat of helpless men, women, and children.

Members of the Senate do not often visit the sweat shops; nor do they often see the sorrow and distress of the individuals who compose the weaker elements of our great Nation. I remind them that 500,000 die annually by our neglect, as shown by the comparison between the death rate of New Zealand and Australia, where better laws prevail, where the maxim of the law is "Better reduce want than increase wealth."

Mr. President, I feel charged with a solemn duty to make a record before the Senate of these conditions, and I deem it a great opportunity to have the privilege of submitting a prayer to the leaders of the Senate that they do not be unmindful or inconsiderate of the need and the rights of the inarticulate mass, and that they do not lend too complacent attention to the trained advocates of unsatisfied greed.

Senator Orville H. Platt, the late distinguished Senator from Connecticut, once said, in substance, in commenting on the faults of the American legislator, that "The American legislator should not be charged with incompetency. As a rule, he is fairly well qualified; neither can he be justly charged with dishonesty. There are a few who may be dishonest, perhaps, but they do not exercise any control of legislation. The fault of the American legislator is 'good-fellowship' and doing for a friend what under no other circumstances would the legislator for a moment consider. For that reason," said he, "I deem it the highest legislative virtue to be cross and crabbed to all the world, especially in the last ten days of the session."

It will be thus seen that, from Sauerbeck's tables, the increase of the world prices has been much lower than the increases of prices in the United States, and that this difference must be accounted for in some reasonable manner.

The most natural way in which to account for it is to show that the prices in the United States are artificially controlled by monopoly.

And this average high increase must be interpreted in the light of a great offset of the lowering of prices of all products produced by the American people of which monopoly controls the price. For example, crude oil is produced by Oklahoma in vast quantities—approximately 50,000,000 barrels per annum—which sells for less than 1 cent a gallon, while the refined product retails for over 11 cents a gallon. It costs half a cent a gallon to refine it. The low price is fixed by the Standard on the crude and the high price is fixed by the Standard on the refined. And the increase of all prices is in the face of the vital fact that monopoly fixes an extremely low price on the articles produced by the people of which the monopoly controls the price. *The average high price would be far higher except for the very low price fixed by monopoly on its purchases, as on crude oil.* This is not only true with regard to oil, but also is true with regard to cattle, hogs, sheep, hides, wool, various minerals, tobacco, and so forth. That this low price of articles bought by monopoly prevented the general average from reaching the high point which they would otherwise reach in the statistical tables is a factor of great importance.

Without regard to statistics, everybody knows that the prices are now very much higher than they have ever been.

The schedules of this bill are approximately 50 per cent on the value of proposed imports, and this is proof that the prices in the United States are 50 per cent higher than they are in Europe and abroad on the articles of these schedules by the open confession of the managers of this bill, and I therefore do not need to furnish further proof of this matter as the schedules confess that the prices in this country are approximately 50 per cent higher than they are abroad on articles affected by the present tariff law.

Mr. President, it is of great importance to observe these differences between our present prices and the increase of our present prices as compared with the increase of the prices of the world, because it thus enables us to determine to what extent local conditions have raised our prices above the level of the prices of the world.

WORLD PRICES AND PRICES IN THE UNITED STATES—RISE IN PRICES IN THE UNITED STATES NOT DUE TO INCREASE IN PER CAPITA CIRCULATION.

At first thought it might occur to some one that the higher prices in the United States were due to the larger per capita circulation, but this conclusion is impossible because, while our per capita circulation December 31, 1906 (Statistical Abstract, 1907, Table 269), was \$33.99 per capita, France had a per capita of \$40.88 and Germany \$25.03 and the British Empire \$28.12, with no substantial differences in competitive prices at London, thus exhibiting the interesting fact that this enormous increase of prices in the United States, and the fact that United States prices are much higher than the level of world prices, is not due to our increased circulating medium, but is due to the monopolies in this country which have for commercial purposes raised these prices in America far above the prices in the markets of the world.

That these high prices are not necessary for the maintenance of a reasonable profit is shown by the table of lower prices at which these same American goods are sold abroad by the protected monopolies in this country.

A few of these prices are submitted to prove that the prices in the United States under monopoly will average 50 per cent higher than in the markets of the world.

As evidence of this I submit a table from James G. Parsons showing the differences in discounts between export and home prices.

TABLE I.—Showing differences in discounts between export and home prices.

[By James G. Parsons, Senate Document No. 54, Sixty-first Congress, first session.]

Articles and description.	Export discount from list.	Home discount from list.	Per cent difference.
Auger bits:	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	
Irwin's solid center.....	60, 10, and 10	50 and 10	39
Snell's.....	70	60	33½
Snell's "King".....	60 and 10	50	39
Auger handles, Gunn's No. 5, adjustable and ratchet.....	35	15 and 10	18
Bells, Texas cow.....	50 and 10	50	11
Bird cages, Hendryx's brass.....	50	30	40
Bolt clippers, "New Easy".....	60, 10, and 5	50, 10, and 10	18
Bolts:			
Carriage, ¾ by 6 inches and smaller.....	80 and 10	75 and 10	25
Machine, ¾ by 4 inches and smaller.....	80 and 10	75, 10, and 5	19
Tire.....	80, 10, and 5	80	17
Borers, bunghole, Enterprise.....	40 and 2	25	27
Braces:			
Fray's genuine "Spoffords".....	70	60	33½
Fray's ratchet, Nos. 81-161.....	60 and 10	50	39
Fray's ratchet, Nos. 83-143.....	60 and 10	50	39
Fray's ratchet, No. 62.....	70	50	66½
Fray's ratchet, Nos. 66-166.....	60 and 10	50	39
Fray's sleeve, Nos. 207-214.....	60, 10, and 10	50	54
Fray's sleeve, Nos. 407-414.....	60 and 10	50	39
Fray's sleeve, Nos. 606-614.....	60 and 10	50	39
Fray's plain, No. 306-314.....	70	50	66½
Can openers, "King".....	25	0	33½
Cartridges, rim fire.....	60, 10, 10, and 6	50	64
Chains, kennel.....	60 and 10	60	11
Coffee mills, Enterprise.....	40 and 10	20 and 25	11
Door rollers and hangers, Lane's.....	60, 10, 10, and 5	60 and 10	17
Gauges, Disston's steel and center.....	45	25, 7½, and 10	12
Harness snaps:			
Covert's "Trojan".....	50 and 10	40	33½
Covert's "Yankee".....	50	30 and 2	37
Covert's "Derby".....	40 and 10	25	39
Lawn sprinklers, Enterprise.....	40 and 2	30	19
Levels, Starrett's bench and pocket.....	40 and 5	33½ and 5	11
Oilstones, "Lily White" and "Washita" No. 1.....	50	33½	33½
Plumbs, levels, etc., Disston's.....	70, 10, 10, 10, and 5	60 and 10	72
Sausage stuffers, Enterprise.....	40 and 2	25 and 7½	18
Saws:			
Disston's Nos. 7, 107, 107½, 3, and 1.....	45 and 7½	30 and 7½	27
Disston's combination.....	45 and 7½	30 and 7½	27
Disston's Nos. 12, 16, DS, 120, 76, 8.....	40 and 10	25 and 7½	28
Disston's compass and keyhole.....	40 and 10	25 and 7½	28
Disston's butcher.....	50	30	40
Disston's framed wood.....	50	25	50
Disston's band.....	70, 10, and 10	60	65
Scroll saws, Barnes's velocipede.....	30	20	14
Screw-drivers, Disston's electric.....	70, 10, 10, and 10	70	37
Smoked beef shavers, Enterprise.....	40 and 10	25 and 7½	28
Squares:			
Disston's try, rosewood handle.....	70, 10, 10, 10, and 5	60 and 10	72
Disston's steel.....	45	25, 7½, and 10	13
Traps, Lovell's rat and mouse.....	50	33½	33½
Trowels, Disston's brick.....	45 and 7½	25	47
Vises:			
Armstrong's plain and hinged.....	80 and 10	60	122
Armstrong's pipe.....	60	50	25
Bonney's.....	50	30 and 10	26

TABLE II.—Showing difference between export and home prices of certain specified articles.

Articles and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Difference.
Auger bits:			<i>P. ct.</i>
Irwin's solid center, 4-16..... per doz..	\$1.30	\$1.80	39
Irwin's solid center, 16-16..... do..	2.92	4.05	39
Auger handles, Gunn's No. 5..... do..	9.75	11.48	18
Bird cages, Hendryx's No. 316..... do..	13.00	18.20	40
Bolt clippers, "Easy" and "New Easy," No. 1..... each..	1.71	2.03	18
Bolts:			
Carriage, ¾ by 6 inches..... per 100..	.60	.75	25
Machine, ¾ by 4 inches..... do..	.57	.68	19
Tire, ¾ by 6 inches..... do..	.65	.76	17
Braces:			
Fray's genuine "Spofford," No. 107..... per doz..	6.30	8.40	33½
Fray's ratchet, No. 81..... do..	10.44	14.50	39
Fray's ratchet, No. 62..... do..	6.90	11.50	66½
Fray's sleeve, No. 207..... do..	7.13	11.00	54
Fray's sleeve, No. 606..... do..	7.56	10.50	39
Fray's plain, No. 306..... do..	3.60	6.00	66½
Bung-hole borers, Enterprise, No. 1..... do..	.74	.94	27
Can openers, "King"..... per gross..	4.50	6.00	33½
Coffee mills, Enterprise, No. 1..... each..	1.22	1.35	11
Files, Nicholson's:			
Mill and round bastard, 3 to 4 inch..... per doz..	.40	.64	60
Mill and round bastard 5-inch..... do..	.48	.68	45
Mill and round bastard, 6-inch..... do..	.59	.75	27
Flat bastard, 3 to 4 inch..... do..	.40	.79	98
Flat bastard, 5-inch..... do..	.48	.83	73
Flat bastard, 6-inch..... do..	.59	.92	56
Flat bastard, 7-inch..... do..	.75	1.03	37
Flat bastard, 8-inch..... do..	.88	1.13	28
Flat bastard, 9-inch..... do..	1.01	1.35	34

TABLE II.—Showing difference between export and home prices of certain specified articles—Continued.

Articles and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Difference.
Files, Nicholson's—Continued.			
Flat bastard, 11-inch..... per doz.	\$1.51	\$1.84	P. ct. 22
Flat bastard, 13-inch..... do.	2.11	2.52	19
Square bastard, 3 to 4 inch..... do.	.40	.81	102
Square bastard, 5-inch..... do.	.48	.88	83
Square bastard, 6-inch..... do.	.59	.98	66
Square bastard, 7-inch..... do.	.75	1.09	45
Square bastard, 8-inch..... do.	.88	1.18	34
Square bastard, 9-inch..... do.	1.01	1.41	40
Square bastard, 10-inch..... do.	1.26	1.58	25
Square bastard, 11-inch..... do.	1.51	1.94	29
Square bastard, 12-inch..... do.	1.82	2.18	20
Square bastard, 13-inch..... do.	2.11	2.67	27
Gauges:			
Disston's combined steel..... each.	.55	.62	12
Disston's center..... do.	.17	.19	12
Harness snaps:			
"Trojan," 1½ loop..... per gross.	2.70	3.60	33½
"Yankee," 1½ loop..... do.	2.90	3.98	37
"Derby," No. 733..... do.	2.70	3.75	39
Lamp chimneys:			
Macbeth's No. 502..... per doz.	.40	.68	70
Macbeth's No. 504..... do.	.50	.82	64
Lawn sprinklers, Enterprise, No. 2..... each.	1.76	2.10	19
Levels, Starrett's 24-inch bench..... do.	1.28	1.42	11
Plumbs and levels, Disston, No. 12..... per doz.	5.82	10.08	72
Pocketknife and tool kit, Utery's..... per set.	1.15	1.50	30
Rifles:			
Stevens's "Little Scout," No. 14..... each.	1.35	1.75	30
Stevens's "Maynard Jr.," No. 14..... do.	1.80	2.20	22
Stevens's No. 16..... do.	2.00	2.60	30
Stevens's "Little Krag," No. 65..... do.	2.50	3.00	20
Stevens's "Favorite"..... do.	3.47	4.50	30
Sausage stuffers, Enterprise, No. 5..... do.	2.20	2.61	18
Saws:			
Disston's hand, 30-inch, No. 7..... per doz.	13.74	17.48	27
Disston's hand, 30-inch, No. 16..... do.	15.39	19.98	28
Disston's combination, No. 43..... do.	15.25	19.42	27
Disston's butcher, 24-inch, No. 7..... do.	8.50	11.90	40
Disston's framed wood, No. 60..... do.	6.00	9.00	50
Disston's band, 2-inch, 18-gauge..... per foot.	.157	.26	65
Barnes's combined scroll and circular..... each.	28.00	32.00	14
Screws, flat-head iron wood:			
Size, ¼ inch, Nos. 1 to 4..... per gross.	.034	.073	115
Size, ½ inch, Nos. 1 to 4..... do.	.034	.073	115
Size, ¾ inch, Nos. 1 to 3..... do.	.034	.073	115
Size, 1 inch, No. 4..... do.	.038	.076	100
Size, 1½ inch, No. 4..... do.	.04	.079	97½
Screws, flat-head brass wood:			
Size, ¼ inch, No. 1..... do.	.072	.136	89
Size, ½ inch, No. 6..... do.	.084	.195	132
Size, ¾ inch, No. 6..... do.	.084	.211	151
Size, 1 inch, No. 6..... do.	.096	.227	136
Size, 1½ inch, No. 6..... do.	.108	.251	132
Screws, round-head iron wood:			
Size, ¼ inch, No. 1..... do.	.034	.087	156
Size, ½ inch, No. 6..... do.	.06	.112	87
Size, ¾ inch, No. 10..... do.	.10	.17	70
Size, 1 inch, No. 16..... do.	.228	.378	66
Size, 1½ inches, No. 18..... do.	.412	.67	63
Screws, round-head brass wood:			
Size, ¼ inch, No. 1..... do.	.072	.168	133
Size, ½ inch, No. 6..... do.	.16	.329	106
Size, ¾ inch, No. 10..... do.	.336	.776	131
Size, 1 inch, No. 16..... do.	.768	1.955	155
Size, 1½ inches, No. 18..... do.	1.24	3.046	194
Screw-drivers, Disston's electric, 12-inch..... per doz.	1.36	1.86	37
Ehoo dressing:			
Whittemore's "Gilt Edge"..... do.	1.20	1.75	46
Whittemore's "Baby Elite"..... do.	.60	.67	12
Shotguns:			
Stevens' No. 105..... each.	2.80	4.25	53
Stevens' No. 107..... do.	3.00	4.50	50
Stevens' No. 225..... do.	8.67	9.75	12
Smoked-beef shavers, Enterprise, No. 23..... do.	4.32	5.55	28
Squares:			
Disston's try, rosewood, 10-inch, No. 1..... per doz.	1.66	2.88	72
Disston's steel, 4-inch..... each.	1.10	1.46	13
Traps, Lovell's mouse and rat, metallic..... per gross.	5.50	7.33	33½
Trowels, Disston's brick, 8-inch, No. 1..... per doz.	4.07	6.00	47
Vises:			
Armstrong's hinged, No. 1..... each.	1.80	4.00	122
Armstrong's combination, with leg sockets..... do.	6.40	8.00	25
Bonney's No. 112..... per doz.	2.25	2.84	26
Watches:			
Elgin movement, 20-year gold-filled case..... each.	7.98	10.23	28
Elgin movement, silveroid case..... do.	3.04	4.47	47
Wrenches, Hawkeye "5 in 1"..... per doz.	3.60	4.50	25

(Senate Document No. 54, Sixty-first Congress, first session.)

It is thus seen that our own manufacturers, to obtain the protection from foreign competition, not only do not give American consumers the low prices they are entitled to, but they give all the benefit to foreigners. These tables demonstrate that the pretense of high tariff to protect themselves against the cheap labor of Europe is false; that our manufacturers can compete and do compete in the open markets of the world, and that they actually do give to foreigners the benefits they

deny to Americans, of whose patriotic self-sacrifice they take wrongful advantage.

Protection's favors to foreigners is strongly set forth in Senate Document No. 54, Sixty-first Congress, first session, prepared by James G. Parsons, and submitted by me to the Senate, and to which I refer for the most abounding evidence for the truth of my contention—that this bill and its immediate predecessors, the Dingley bill and the McKinley bill, were written under the color of serving the American laborer, when, in point of fact, it has done nothing of the kind, but, on the contrary, favors the foreigner at the expense of the American.

The defense of this indecent practice has been abundantly answered in Document 54, and I shall not take the time to further comment upon it.

A similar table, showing that our prices are 50 per cent higher than world prices, is submitted (Exhibit 12), prepared by Byron W. Holt, of New York.

Our great agricultural products have their prices fixed by the markets of the world, except where freight prevents.

The price of corn per bushel was 55 cents in 1892 and 53 cents in 1906, and wheat was 93 cents in 1891 and 82 cents in 1906, and exported cattle in 1891, \$81.25, and \$93.17 in 1906 under improved methods of feeding and transportation, while cotton was 10 cents in 1890 and 11 cents in 1906.

We have a right to expect cheapening of manufactured products because of the constant increasing improvements in machinery—and in this we are disappointed—and a rise in the price of agricultural products produced from an area necessarily limited, and in this we are not gratified.

The prohibitive tariff has increased the cost of living of the workman and of every other person in the United States, and, therefore, has diminished the purchasing power of the wages received.

I have submitted Table No. 202, Abstract of Census, 1907, page 577, which shows that raw commodities have increased since the Dingley bill went into effect 49.9 per cent, manufacturers' commodities have increased 32.3 per cent up to 1906, and all commodities have increased 35.4 per cent up to 1906, and still higher in 1909.

Mr. President, I now submit Tables 197 and 206, which show in detail the increase of price of food products, showing lard to have increased, since 1896, 38 per cent, corn meal 29 per cent, fresh pork 41 per cent, salt pork 55 per cent (Statistical Abstract of Census, 1907), and similar increases in other things required by the consumer.

LABOR IS HARMED BY THESE HIGH PRICES.

Mr. President, it is obvious that the laboring man who receives a fixed wage, or the laboring woman who receives a given number of dollars, whether in the factory, on the farm, in the mine, in the forest, or in domestic service, by an increase of 34 per cent in the price of all articles to be bought with wages received will be required to pay \$134 to buy the same amount of goods which cost \$100 in 1896 under the Wilson bill.

This means the equivalent of a flat loss of 25 per cent of the narrow wages received by the working people, and shows that the results of this tariff have been seriously injurious to the working people, because of these artificial prices.

HIGH PRICES INJURIOUS TO SALARIED PEOPLE.

Under these high prices it would take, in 1906, \$1,354 to buy as much as \$1,000 bought in 1896; in other words, a salaried man who received a salary of \$1,354 in 1896 could save out of it \$354, but to buy the same things in 1906 would take his entire salary of \$1,354, and leave him nothing saved.

The effect of these high prices on the salaried man is to diminish the purchasing power of his salary 25 per cent.

This is the probable reason why Congress raised the salaries of Members of Congress and of Senators 50 per cent; it was to keep the Senators and Members of Congress from suffering the injury which the Dingley bill inflicted on the balance of the country.

HIGH PRICES ARE INJURIOUS TO THE MANUFACTURERS.

High prices on raw material (and one manufacturer's raw material is the finished product of another manufacturer) has the effect of making it more difficult for American manufacturers to compete in the markets of the world, because their first cost on this very account is heavier than would be the case with their foreign competitors.

Our manufacturers do compete, however, on a considerable scale, because of the greater efficiency of the American workman and of American invention and improved processes, and because of rebates in foreign material bought and reshipped in manufactures.

In this way a market is afforded foreign material and denied our own materials unless they compete with foreign material at world prices.

But if the manufacturers could obtain a uniform cost of material 35 per cent less than it is now our commerce would be greatly multiplied, the activity of our factories wonderfully stimulated, all of America's laboring elements would be employed, and the productive energies of the Nation brought to the highest degree of activity and efficiency.

If lower prices should prevail, we would avoid the evil of underconsumption and need have no fear of overproduction.

The percentage of weekly earnings, retail prices, and the weekly earnings as measured by retail prices is shown by the Bureau of Labor bulletin, July, 1905:

	Weekly earnings per employee.	Retail prices.	Weekly earnings as measured by retail prices.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
1890.....	101.0	102.4	98.6
1891.....	100.8	103.8	97.1
1892.....	101.3	101.9	99.4
1893.....	101.2	104.4	96.9
1894.....	97.7	99.7	98.0
1895.....	98.4	97.8	100.6
1896.....	99.5	95.5	104.2
1897.....	99.2	96.3	103.0
1898.....	99.9	98.7	101.2
1899.....	101.2	99.5	101.7
1900.....	104.1	101.1	103.0
1901.....	105.9	105.2	100.7
1902.....	109.2	110.9	98.5
1903.....	112.3	110.3	101.8
1904.....	112.2	111.7	100.4

100 equals the standard prices averaged between 1890-1900.

It will be observed that even by these tables, coming from sources interested in putting the best face on the matter, the weekly earnings bought no more in 1904 than they did between 1890 and 1900, while they rose in 1896 to 104.2 from 96.9 in 1894, showing an increased purchasing power of over 7 per cent following the passage of the Wilson-lower tariff-Act.

Mr. President, the tables prepared by Edward Atkinson, of Boston (Exhibit 2), showing the relative number of persons who could be affected by a tariff as far as their wages are concerned in the so-called "protected or partially protected industries," should not be forgotten. It will be shown by these tables that 10,381,765 persons are farmers, planters, overseers, agricultural laborers, gardeners, florists, nurserymen, dairy men and women, and other agricultural pursuits; lumbermen and raftsmen, stock raisers, herders and drovers, turpentine farmers and laborers, and wood choppers, to which must be added all persons in professional service, 1,258,739; all persons in domestic and personal service, 5,580,657; and all persons in trade and transportation, 4,766,964; making a total of 21,788,125; and estimating those who are engaged in other services which could not be regarded as in any degree open to competition, it is found that out of a total of 29,074,117 there could not be exceeding 600,000 persons occupied in arts which would require a protective duty. This table is very carefully drawn and is convincing to a sincere and disinterested student. It therefore appears that very little over 2 per cent of the American people are employed in such a way as to really require any measure of so-called "protection," while 100 per cent of our people are taxed about 50 per cent on an average on all dutiable goods, to their very great injury, and without even benefiting the 2 per cent who are employees, mostly of foreign birth or parentage, in the so-called "protected industries," while nearly all of such industries are owned by monopolies who give their foreign employees the lowest wages in America and keep millions for themselves.

MONOPOLY.

This bill ought not to pass, because similar bills heretofore have established, and this bill will continue to maintain, monopoly, labor's chief oppressor, and will be followed by high prices, low wages, greater mortality to labor, increased crime, and extravagant and corrupt standards.

Mr. President, no man familiar with history of his country will seriously question that when the tariff has its schedules so high as to prevent competition from abroad it must engender monopoly at home.

The first step of triumphant monopoly is to cut off foreign competition; the next step is easily effected by any of a variety of successful expedients.

First. By the policy of placing a control of the stock of competing companies in the hands of a trustee for the purpose of preventing competition. This was nothing more nor less than a conspiracy in restraint of trade. The courts in due time

pronounced the so-called "trust" an unlawful combination. The reason why it was unlawful was because it violated the common law of the English-speaking people. *It violated the common law, which holds as void any contract in restraint of trade.* The common law of our States holds a man is entitled to buy at a price fixed in a free competitive market, and that any restraint of trade denying the citizen this common-law right is a fraud upon him. *The present tariff law and the proposed law is conspicuously guilty of this sin,* although its error has not yet been declared by the courts. A test case should be brought.

Indeed it is a form of robbery under the color of law and carried on under the safeguards of organized society; *it is a fraud to impose a prohibitive tax under the pretense of raising revenue, but in reality to protect monopoly.* It is a species of immoral conspiracy which ought not to be endured by any nation of intelligent and liberty-loving men.

The contracts putting the control of the stock of competing companies in the hands of a "trustee," being the first form in which organized monopoly became conspicuously bad, has led to the term "trust" being loosely and incorrectly used to describe any monopoly.

Second. Another expedient by which monopoly was established was "a gentleman's agreement," by which prices were fixed by verbal agreement and not by contract. This was nothing more nor less than a verbal conspiracy, and was no less a fraud and unlawful than if the verbal agreement had been a legal contract in writing. The only difference between the two was the greater difficulty of detection of the combination.

The gentleman's agreement usually proved inefficient, because men engaged in this character of fraud could not trust each other.

Third. Another form by which the American people have been defrauded by monopoly is where a giant corporation, like the Standard Oil Company, sets a fixed price on crude oil and a price on the refined products, and because of its power intimidates the independent refiner and compels the refiner through fear of destruction, in the crafty ways so fully described by Ida Tarbell in the history of Standard Oil, to recognize and maintain the prices so fixed. In this way the Standard Oil Company, through its subsidiary companies, sets the price of crude oil in Oklahoma of the best quality at 41 cents a barrel. No refiner wishes to violate this rule for fear of the Standard, and no refiner dares to offer to sell refined oil at less than the Standard price for fear of the Standard. It only costs one-half cent a gallon to refine petroleum, and crude oil costs 41 cents a barrel in Oklahoma. The people ought to get very cheap oil, but they do not get it, because the Standard Oil Company overshadows the land and controls the market, both of crude oil and of the refined products.

It is a common practice for the independent refiners to stand on the prices fixed by the Standard, both on crude and refined, for fear that they will be destroyed. The history of the past is strewn with the wreckage of companies who have ventured to cut the prices of the Standard Oil Company.

I think the Congress of the United States ought to impose a rule on interstate corporations using the mails and enjoying public protection that they shall not vary their price to the consumers of the United States, except in so far as the difference in freight justifies. In this way the Standard Oil Company could not put the price of refined below cost locally for the purpose of running out an independent competitor in a local field while the Standard at the same time raises the price in another field, with which to make the consumer pay the cost of this illegitimate warfare on a competitor. If the Standard were compelled to give the same price plus freight in all parts of the United States to the consumer, the Standard could not in that event afford to lower its local price for the purpose of killing off a petty competitor. And I appeal to the leaders of the Republican party in the Senate of the United States to bring in an amendment to this bill providing this remedy.

I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Finance will appreciate the force of this observation, and if he does not afford the country the relief which I invite him to do he at least shall have no complaint of me that he did not receive a wise and virtuous suggestion from Oklahoma. I assure him that if he will submit the proper amendment he can rely upon the Senators from Oklahoma giving him enthusiastic support in such a policy.

I pause to ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance whether he will bring in or support such an amendment.

I appeal to the leaders of the Republican party in the Senate of the United States to bring in an amendment to the bill providing this simple, effective remedy against monopoly. If we want to establish competition in the United States, if we hope

to maintain competition in the United States, we must protect the little competitor and not permit him to be killed off by ingenious processes. Otherwise we might as well recognize now that monopoly is fixed and is to be dealt with as monopoly. If we deal with it as monopoly, then a different process would be available, which I suggest to the Senate of the United States, and that is, conceding monopoly to be established, conceding that we can not control or that we will not control monopoly, I suggest that monopoly, having the power of taxation of the American people without limitations, shall be controlled by being limited in the dividends it may pay upon its invested capital, determined by physical valuation.

Fourth. But another and far more dangerous form of monopoly, skillfully drawn to avoid the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States with regard to contracts in restraint of trade, is the more recent successful plan of merging one corporation with another, such as illustrated in the United States Steel Corporation, by which all competitors of any importance were absorbed. It was organized in 1901, and at that time absorbed a number of gigantic concerns, to wit: Federal Steel, National Tube, American Steel and Wire Company, National Steel, American Tin Plate, American Steel Hook, American Sheet Steel, American Bridge, Shelby Steel Tube, The Carnegie Company, The Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mines, and acquired interests in numerous other companies, such as the Pittsburg Steamship Company, The Oliver Iron Mining Company, The National Steel Company, including The Sharon Steel Company, The Union Steel Company, The Donora Mining Company, The Republic Coke Company, The River Coal Company, The Sharon Coke Company, The Sharon Ore Company, The Sharon Sheet Steel Company, and a controlling interest in the companies of the Sharon Coal and Limestone Company and the Sharon Tin Plate Company, and directly and indirectly controlling the American Coke Company, The Continental Coke Company, The H. C. Frick Coke Company, The McClure Coke Company, The Southwest Connellsville Coke Company and the United Coal and Coke Company, consolidated under the title of H. C. Frick Coke Company, acquiring also the Clairton Steel Company in May, 1904, The St. Clair Furnace Company. This contract carried with it the stock of the Champion Iron Company, The Clairton Land Company, the St. Clair Terminal Railroad Company, and 51 per cent of the stock of the St. Clair Limestone Company; in April, 1905, the Heckler Coke Company was acquired. On April 15, 1907, by lease United States Steel obtained the control of the Great Northern Railroad Company ore properties through the Great Western Mining Company, a subsidiary company of the United States Steel Corporation, and so forth.

These gigantic mergers of the various companies, by which their competition with each other was effectually destroyed, formed the new company, which issued a total of stocks and bonds of about fourteen hundred millions, a large part of which was "watered," having no physical value corresponding with the face values of the stocks and bonds issued.

In 1907 this gigantic merger company took over the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company, which was itself composed of various companies merged together in the same fashion as the United States Steel Corporation, and was its only great competitor; under the control of this great merger company are various water-supply plants, natural-gas properties, pipe lines, ore docks, a multitude of iron mines, and some 25 railroad companies.

By these gigantic mergers competition is effectually controlled under the forms of law, and the resulting giant corporation has such a dominating and masterful position that smaller corporations dare not compete or cut the price or attempt to do so. Competition is thus utterly destroyed.

Moody's Manual for 1907, page 2320, gives over 1,000 companies absorbed or merged by or into other companies for 1907.

The smaller corporations engaged in the same business are indeed of some use to the giant monopoly, because the smaller corporation being in existence and doing business at the same prices fixed by the larger corporation, the greater concern can point to the smaller concern as evidence to the common people that there is active competition in the field. The common people may accept the testimony, but it will be a Barmecide feast when they test the prices.

When the people threaten to remove the monopoly tariff, which shelters monopoly, all of the agents of monopoly join in one mighty chorus in defense of the poor little independent man who will be utterly ruined if the tariff is lowered a particle. But the smaller concern is used as a highwayman might hold up a child to ward off a merited chastisement. It is, however, no chastisement and no injustice whatever to the monopoly to take down the tariff wall that shelters monopoly from reason-

able competition, but merely a just action in restoring the competition which never should have been interfered with.

The United States Steel Corporation, I am informed, permits no organized labor in its service. The thoughtlessness of this monopoly of its labor, and its forgetfulness of its moral obligation toward poor human beings engaged in its service has been shown with great force in a recent philanthropic investigation conducted under the Russell Sage Foundation in the "Pittsburg Survey." What these giant monopolies are capable of doing when not restrained by any other consideration than what is called "business" and the pressure for "dividends," "dividends," "dividends," is set forth in great detail in the Journal of Constructive Philanthropy, published by the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York; Robert W. deForest, president; J. P. Morgan, treasurer; Edwin T. Devine, general secretary, 105 East Twenty-second street, New York City, in "Charities and the Commons" in the issues of January, February, and March, 1909.

What a monopoly tariff does for its protected workmen is abundantly set forth in this wonderful report of the unspeakable conditions which have grown up under our system of government, where the beneficiaries of the tariff have forgotten manhood, and have forgotten womanhood, and even childhood in their insane pursuit of wealth and power.

Ida M. Tarbell, a critical and learned student of sociology, has described it in a few words in the American Magazine of May, 1909:

A TARIFF-MADE CITY—WHAT IT DOES FOR ITS WORKMEN.

The city of Pittsburg is the greatest monument in this country to the practice of high protection. For fifty years it has been the stronghold of the doctrine. For fifty years it has reaped, as no other center in the United States, the benefits of prohibitive duties.

The town lies at the heart of a district in which is produced from one-quarter to one-half of all the various kinds of American iron and steel, as well as a goodly proportion of all our tin, plate glass, and machine-shop products. All of these articles have for years had the American market practically to themselves. All of these articles have for years been exported and sold at less prices than the American consumer can buy them. All these industries have produced enormous fortunes. So many, so conspicuous are they, that a recognized American type in Europe and the United States is the "Pittsburg millionaire." Now, it is certain the tariff produced the Pittsburg millionaire, but that was not what the tariff was fixed for by the Congress of the United States. The tariff was laid to protect and help the Pittsburg workman. According to the protectionist argument, Pittsburg, as the bulwark and center of protected industries, should produce the happiest, most prosperous, and best conditioned workmen in the United States. How is it?

There has just been published in *Charities and The Commons* (now *The Survey*) one of the most significant pieces of investigation the country has seen. It is the result of a year or more of work on the part of a band of trained investigators commissioned by the Charities Publication committee. It gives a blueprint of Pittsburg—the place itself, the people, and their work. What does this blueprint show of the workingman under protection?

It shows him working twelve hours a day for seven days in the week, and once in two weeks filling a "long turn," or a twenty-four-hour shift. It is not simply the exceptional man who overworks in this cruel fashion. The twelve-hour day is the extreme of an "altogether incredible amount of overwork by everybody," so the Survey declares. Can you make a man by these hours? Is it any wonder that those who lived and walked among these men preparing this Survey report their saying: "Too tired to read—too tired to think. I work and eat and sleep." Any wonder that they report the God-fearing women crying out for the old country: "We might not have been able to live so well there; but, oh, man, we could have brought up the children in the fear of God and in a land where men reverence the Sabbath." Any wonder that those men who have not the restraining influence of a family drown fatigue at night in saloons and brothels?

And what do they earn for their toil? In the tariff-protected industries, steel and iron, the greatest number receive a wage, says the report, "so low as to be inadequate to the maintenance of a normal American standard of living—wages adjusted to the single man in the lodging house, not to the responsible head of a family." And this in industries where "to protect the workingman" this country has for years taxed itself millions upon millions of dollars. The estimated tariff profit in the steel trust alone in 1907 was \$80,000,000. Who got the money? Go look at the steel palaces and chateaux in New York and Paris. Go ask the Pittsburg millionaires who fill the glittering places of pleasure in the great cities of Europe and this country, who figure in divorce and murder trials, who are writing their names on foundations and bequests and institutions.

How does this "protected" workingman live? What kind of households are these "built on steel"? The reporter of the situation summarizes them: "Evil conditions were found to exist in every section of the city. Over the omnipresent vaults graceless privy sheds flouted one's sense of decency. Eerie rookeries perched on the hillsides were swarming with men, women, and children—entire families living in one room and accommodating boarders in a corner thereof. Cellar rooms were the abiding places of other families. In many houses water was a luxury, to be obtained only through much effort of toiling steps and straining muscles. Courts and alleys fouled by bad drainage and piles of rubbish were playing grounds for rickety, pale-faced, grimy children. An enveloping cloud of smoke and dust, through which light and air must filter, made housekeeping a travesty in many neighborhoods; and every phase of the situation was intensified by the evil of overcrowding—of houses upon lots, of families into houses, of people into rooms."

Among the worst illustrations of these typical conditions are certain properties owned by the very corporations who are reaping wealth from the tariff-protected products. These beneficiaries of the generosity of the American people, these gentlemen who, when they see the taxation in their interest threatened, hold up the laborer and his good as a reason for continuing it, what do they say when these conditions are pointed out to them: "We don't want to go into the housing business."

We are manufacturers, not real estate dealers. We may be forced to build houses in certain new districts in order to attract and hold labor, but in an old, settled community let the laboring man take care of himself. We don't believe in paternalism."

They have had no more interest in preserving the lives of the men who do the terrible toll necessary to their wealth than in giving them decent housing. For years the death rate from typhoid fever in Pittsburg has been the highest of any city in the civilized world. Everybody knew it. Everybody knew why. There was no supply of pure drinking water. A filtration plant was needed. Did any Pittsburg millionaire offer to build it—insist that the industries which called the vast army of labor to Pittsburg should build it? No; they left a corrupted city government to fight over the appropriations for the work and scattered in endowments and in institutions in other cities and other States many times the five millions needed in Pittsburg to save the lives of the workmen. They hold up to the world for admiration their love of great material problems—they argue with the American people that their skill in solving these problems is a good and sufficient reason for continuing general taxation in their favor. But a problem which worked out, would benefit nobody but the humble two-dollar-a-day man who sweats out his life in the heat of their profitable furnaces does not interest them. It might savor of paternalism!

Not even the child has touched them. The conditions under which the children of the poor are brought up in Pittsburg are such that babies die like flies. Of those along the river, a settlement worker told Samuel Hopkins Adams, when he was working on health conditions for the Survey: "Not one child in ten comes to us from the river-bottom section without a blood or skin disease, usually of long standing. Not one out of ten comes to us physically up to the normal for his or her age. Worse than that, few of them are up to the mental standard, and an increasing percentage are imbecile."

As to the schools, here is what an authority says: "The school buildings are in many cases crowded, dark, dirty, often of three stories, and bad fire risks. The condition of the children in these schools, good and bad, rich and poor, may be known by the large proportion having defective teeth, reduced hearing, imperfect vision. An excessively large number of them are mouth breathers, partially so because they are unable to breathe through their noses in the smoky air of Pittsburg, and a very considerable number are below the stature and the weight determined for the average child. In a large percentage the defects of teeth, nose, and throat bring them below the physical normal. These are the children that wear out in childhood."

Is it a wonder that this gentleman suggested: "Ought not the Pittsburg schools to be closed and the children repaired?"

This Pittsburg Survey is the most awful arraignment of an American institution and its resulting class pronounced since the days of slavery. It puts upon the Pittsburg millionaire the awful stamp of greed, of stupidity, and of heartless pride. But what should we expect of him? He is the creature of a special privilege which for years he has not needed. He has fought for it because he fattened on it. He must have it for labor. But look at him and look at his laborer and believe him if you can.

Justice takes a terrible revenge on those who thrive by privilege. She blinds their eyes until they no longer see human misery. She dulls their hearts until they no longer beat with humanity. She numbs their senses until they respond only to the narrow horizon of what they can individually possess, touch, feel. She makes, as she has in Pittsburg, a generation of men and women who day by day can pass hundreds of tumbled-down and filthy homes, in which the men and women who make their wealth live, and feel no shock; who can know that deadly fevers and diseases which are preventable are wiping out hundreds of those who do their tasks, and raise no hand. Little children may die or grow up stunted and evil within their sight and no penny of their wealth, no hour of their leisure, is given them. Women may pass hours of incessant toil and die, broken and unhonored, within their sight, and they raise no hand. Wealth which comes by privilege kills. The curse of Justice on those who will not recognize injustice is the sodden mind, the dulled vision, the unfeeling heart.

I. M. T.

I was interested after reading this distressing record of the misery and degradation of the employees in protected industries at Pittsburg, and their great poverty, to observe, in striking contrast, that Mr. H. C. Frick, one of the masters of the iron, steel, and coke monopoly, was reported by the public press as trying to buy an oil painting by Holbein from the Duke of Norfolk for \$350,000. I could not help thinking how scandalous it was to take the labor of these poor people and dissipate it in such folly.

The papers announce also that Mr. Schwab, another steel magnate, was successfully "bucking the tiger" at Monte Carlo, and gambling on a gigantic scale. No doubt he has millions which he may hazard at the gambling table and not feel the loss, but where does he get it? He gets it out of the grimy sweat of a labor so poorly paid that the women and children must, of necessity, suffer degradation and physical, social, and spiritual degeneration.

The morning papers state that a New York lady now suing her husband for divorce has spent in the last ten years \$770,000 in various interesting and fanciful extravagances, paying from \$500 to \$800 for dresses, having scores of servants to dance attendance and promote the wildest vagaries of fashion. One can not pick up a paper without reading the unseemly and indecent waste of the national resources by those beneficiaries who profit by monopolies sheltered under a noncompetitive tariff, one which prevents all competition, and gives them the power to combine at home for the purpose of fleecing the American people and picking their pockets wholesale by prices which are 50 per cent higher than the prices in the markets of the world. Side by side are babies dying like flies for want of proper food and air and decent environment. The omnipotent God will surely punish a nation or a party that sees these evils with callous heart and offers no remedy.

Some one might say that Ida Tarbell's picture is too graphic. I do not think it possible to convey in two pages the terrific arraignment of our civilization which is exhibited in the Pittsburg Survey.

But I submit another authority, whose calm and disinterested judgment and statement of the facts ought to command the attention of the entire nation.

RESULTS OF PITTSBURG SURVEY.

Prof. Edward T. Devine, of New York City, general secretary of the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York (see Vol. III, Amer. Sociological Soc., May 1, 1909), gives a sketch of the results of the Pittsburg Survey, describing what was found to be the actual fact at this great center of the protective industries. He says they found the following results:

I. An altogether incredible amount of overwork by everybody, reaching its extreme in the twelve-hour shift for seven days in the week in the steel mills and the railway switch yards.

II. Low wages for the great majority of the laborers employed by the mills; not lower than in other large cities, but low compared with the prices—so low as to be inadequate to the maintenance of a normal American standard of living; wages adjusted to the single man, not to the responsible head of a family.

III. Still lower wages for women, who receive, for example, in one of the metal trades in which the proportion of women is great enough to be menacing, one-half as much as unorganized men in the same shops and one-third as much as the men in the union.

IV. An absentee capitalism, with bad effects strikingly analogous to those of absentee landlordism, of which also Pittsburg furnishes noteworthy examples.

V. A continuous inflow of immigrants with low standards attracted by a wage which is high by the standards of southeastern Europe, and which yields a net pecuniary advantage because of abnormally low expenditures for food and shelter, an inadequate provision for sickness, accident, and death.

VI. The destruction of family life, not in any imaginary or mystical sense, but by the demands of the day's work, and by the very demonstrable and material method of typhoid fever and industrial accidents, both preventable, but costing last year in Pittsburg considerably more than a thousand lives, and irretrievably shattering many homes.

VII. Archaic social institutions such as the aldermanic court, the ward school district, the family garbage disposal, and the unregenerate charitable institution, still surviving after the conditions to which they were adapted have disappeared.

VIII. The contrast—which does not become blurred by familiarity with details, but on the contrary becomes more vivid as the outlines are filled in—the contrast between the prosperity on the one hand of the most prosperous of all the communities of our western civilization, with its vast natural resources, the generous fostering of government, the human energy, the technical development, the gigantic tonnage of the mines and mills, the enormous capital of which the bank balances afford an indication, and, on the other hand, the neglect of life, of health, of physical vigor, even of the industrial efficiency of the individual. Certainly no community before in America or Europe has ever had such a surplus, and never before has a great community applied what it had so meagerly to the rational purposes of human life. Not by gifts of libraries, galleries, technical schools, and parks, but by the cessation of toil one day in seven, and sixteen hours in the twenty-four, by the increase of wages, by the sparing of lives, by the prevention of accidents, and by raising the standards of domestic life, should the surplus come back to the people of the community in which it is created.

The details of this tragic condition is found in the January, February, and March numbers of Charities and Commons, 1909, published in New York.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest doubt that the great and powerful city of Pittsburg, supplied as it is with some of the best brains and best men in the world, will correct, or at least abate, in some degree these conditions. I have no doubt that public sentiment throughout the United States will so influence our great commercial monopolies that they themselves will be led to a more considerate treatment of their laborers and cease to regard them as machines of iron or wood, to be worn-out in production and renewed by others. I have the confidence in the patriotism and good sense of the leaders of both of the great parties of our country to believe that they will not endure the prolonged continuance of these conditions.

THE PROFITS OF MONOPOLY.

The Senator from Iowa gave us a graphic description of the unreasonable profits of the United States Steel upon its watered stock. Its net earnings after paying interest on bonds of subsidiary companies and the accounts of miscellaneous expenditures and charges amounted to one hundred and fifty-six millions. Its products for 1906 amounted to 13,511,149 tons of ingots, out of which was produced 10,578,433 tons of finished products.

Its assets for 1906 are stated (Moody's Manual, p. 2282) at \$1,681,309,769; its net profits for dividends 1906 were \$98,219,088, exceeding \$9 a ton on 10,578,433 tons of product, not counting profits to subordinate corporations.

Its profit on the finished product has exceeded \$9 a ton, collected from the consumers of the United States under a tariff which prohibits the consumer buying elsewhere, and thus

enables this gigantic corporation and its independent allies to exercise a complete monopoly of all our people.

The proposed schedule in this bill of 31.65 per cent average tariff upon all metal and all manufactures of metal operates not for the benefit of labor, but to establish monopolies which control labor, compel it to disorganize, imposes cruelty and extraordinary conditions upon labor, and, together with other monopolies, established in like manner, pick the pockets of the laboring men and of all other men from the Atlantic to the Pacific by artificial prices, which the retailer and jobber is compelled by penalties to observe, so that the wages received by labor is craftily and fraudulently taken out of his pockets by these stealthy organizations, whose lobbyists now infest this capital and falsely advise Senators and Members with regard to their duty in the premises.

Side by side with these abnormal developments will be found hundreds of thousands of honest companies, working at reasonable profits, engaging in legitimate competition, content with the ancient maxim of—

Live and let live,

and who are also victimized by the exactions of monopoly in greater or less degree as the case may be.

The prices which are lowered in the United States by legitimate competition are so far offset by the unreasonable high prices of monopoly that the general average has gone far above the markets of the world, as I have heretofore shown.

Mr. President, several Senators have shown on the floor the enormous profits made by various monopolies.

The authoritative record can be found in Moody's Manual of 1907, a volume of twenty-five hundred pages, giving the accounts of the corporations doing business in the country, but not by any means all of the monopolies. In these tables will be found the enormous profits which have been advertised to the public stating what they have made. The record does not tell the entire story by any means, but it tells enough. The manner in which the people of the United States are unjustly taxed by these artificial high prices in the interest of monopoly is shown by sugar.

Our record shows that the people of the United States consume 2,993,979 tons of sugar per annum. The London price is 2 cents a pound less than the New York price, so that the people pay about \$40 a ton for sugar in excess of the London price—approximately one hundred and thirty millions of dollars—while the duty collected is only sixty millions, leaving a profit of seventy millions to the monopolies and interests protected by the tariff, amounting in this one item to about \$5 per annum for every family in the United States.

In similar manner will be shown the profits to the trusts on pig iron, on steel billets, on steel rails, as compiled by the Actuary of the Treasury. (S. Doc. 45, 61st Cong., 1st sess.)

PIG IRON.		Per ton.
United States	-----	\$17.75
United States duty	-----	4.00
United States price, less duty	-----	13.75
Germany	-----	11.21
France	-----	11.25
Belgium	-----	11.75
England	-----	11.00

United States production of pig iron, 1907, 25,781,361 tons; duty, \$4 per ton; tax on consumer, \$103,125,444; government revenue, 1907, \$1,466,825.

BILLETS, STEEL.		Per ton.
United States	-----	\$24.71
United States duty	-----	6.72
United States value, less duty	-----	17.99
Germany	-----	14.88
France	-----	15.00
Belgium	-----	15.50
England	-----	15.14

United States production, 1906, 23,398,136 tons; duty, \$6.72 per ton; tax on consumers, \$157,235,474; government revenue, 1906, \$590,663.

RAILS, STEEL.		Per ton.
United States	-----	\$25.41
United States duty	-----	7.84
United States price, less duty	-----	17.57
Germany	-----	17.84
France	-----	17.99
Belgium	-----	18.59
England	-----	18.14

Average of above—Europe

United States price	-----	18.14
United States price	-----	25.41

Difference

	-----	7.27
--	-------	------

United States production of steel rails, 1907, 3,977,872 tons; difference in price, home and abroad, \$7.27; tax on consumer, \$28,919,129; government revenue, 1907, \$30,670.

NAILS.		Per ton.
United States	-----	\$47.13
United States duty	-----	11.20
United States price, less duty	-----	35.93
Germany	-----	33.60
France	-----	34.60
Belgium	-----	33.00

United States production, wire nails, 1906, 512,800 tons; United States duty, \$11.20 per ton; tax on consumer, \$5,743,360; government revenue, 1907, \$91; cost to the people for each dollar collected by the Government, \$63,114.85.

RÉSUMÉ.			
	United States revenue.	People pay additional.	Cost to the people for each \$1 tax collected by the Government.
Sugar	\$60,135,181.00	\$70,641,821.00	\$2.17
Pig iron	1,466,825.00	103,125,444.00	71.23
Steel billets, etc.	590,663.00	157,235,474.00	267.05
Steel rails	30,670.00	28,919,129.00	943.91
Nails, wire	91.00	5,743,360.00	63,114.85

Census Bulletin No. 57, 1905, points out the confessed profits on various manufacturing enterprises, a few of which I give.

CENSUS PROFITS ON WOOL MANUFACTURING, CLOTHING, AND TILE.

Census Bulletin No. 57, 1905, gives the following statistics on woolen and worsted goods and clothing manufactures, and so forth, from which the profit can be calculated:

Number of establishments	8,873
Expenses:	
Salaries paid 28,454 officials and clerks	\$30,015,521
Wages paid 394,893 workmen	163,503,042
Miscellaneous expenses	98,564,867
Cost of materials	514,002,738
Total expenses	806,086,168
Value of product	911,399,841
Profit	105,313,673
Capital	529,892,740
Approximately 20 per cent.	

MEN'S CLOTHING.

Number of establishments	4,504
Expenses:	
Salaries paid 13,210 officials and clerks	\$13,703,162
Wages paid 137,190 workmen	57,225,506
Men over 16	58,769
Women over 16	75,468
Children under 16	2,963
Miscellaneous expenses	57,695,240
Materials	185,793,436
Total expenses	314,417,344
Value of product	355,796,571
Profit	41,379,227
Capital	153,177,500
About 27 per cent.	

WOMEN'S CLOTHING.

Number establishments	3,351
Salaries paid 10,920 officials and clerks	\$9,975,944
Wages paid 115,705 workmen	51,180,193
Men over 16	42,614
Women over 16	72,242
Children under 16	849
Miscellaneous expenses	24,349,282
Materials	130,719,996
Total expenses	216,225,415
Value product	247,661,560
Profit	31,436,145
Capital	73,947,823
About 42 per cent.	

BRICK AND TILE.

Number of establishments	4,634
Salaries paid 3,690 officials and clerks	\$3,530,474
Wages paid 66,021 workmen	28,646,005
Miscellaneous expenses	6,969,161
Cost of materials	16,316,499
Total expense	55,462,139
Value product	71,152,062
Profit	15,689,923
About 22 per cent.	

The profit on men's clothing amounts to 27 per cent, on women's clothing 42 per cent, and yet side by side with this manufacturer's profit the sweating system is in full force (an interesting account of which will be found in H. Rept. No. 2309, 52d Cong., 2d sess.), with ruinous conditions under which oppressed labor earns its miserable bread; industrious young

women, twelve hours a day in the shops of unremitting industry, and increasing speed, earning \$4, \$5, and \$6 a week. For a \$10 suit 85 cents is paid for the making of a coat, 25 to 35 cents for the pants, and 20 to 25 cents for the vest; for a \$15 suit \$1.50 is paid for making the coat, and so on. It is no wonder, of course, people living in abject wretchedness of the sweat shops

exhibit a very great mortality as compared with other people, and develop tuberculosis and other diseases.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1909, gives a table of some of the profits of the cotton mills of the country, submitted by Senator SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

Statistics relative to cotton-mill stocks as investments.

Name of company.	Date of incorporation.	Capital.	Surplus.	Debt.	Earnings per share, 1907.	Dividends, 1907.	Total dividends for eight years.	Average dividends for eight years.	Book surplus per share.	Capitalization per spindle.	Par value.
Amoskeag.....	1831	\$5,760,000.00	\$3,720,691.00	\$1,425,000.00	\$21.30	\$16.00	Per cent. 125	Per cent. 15.75	\$64.59	\$10.76	\$100.00
Androscooggin.....	1860	1,000,000.00	1,123,864.00	16,559.00	24.91	10.00	75	9.37	112.38	13.93	100.00
Bates.....	1852	1,200,000.00	1,376,361.00	117,565.00	41.87	35.00	130	16.25	114.61	14.61	100.00
Border City.....	1880	1,000,000.00	333,598.00	500,000.00	37.50	23.50	119	14.37	33.35	12.51	100.00
Richard Borden.....	1871	1,000,000.00	502,174.00	541.00	32.62	20.00	*101	12.62	50.21	10.37	100.00
King Philip.....	1871	1,500,000.00	851,765.00	150,431.00	25.65	6.00	168½	21.25	59.78	11.10	100.00
Dartmouth.....	1895	600,000.00	685,105.00	470,529.00	82.50	66.00	158	19.75	114.19	5.00	100.00
Dwight.....	1841	1,200,000.00	1,299,219.00	735,740.00	103.94	12.00	100	12.50	108.26	5.45	500.00
Great Falls.....	1823	1,500,000.00	960,000.00	338,603.00	21.33	12.00	117	14.62	64.00	11.36	100.00
Laurel Lake.....	1881	600,000.00	184,251.00	None.	28.24	14.00	*190½	23.75	37.08	10.03	100.00
Massachusetts Cotton.....	1839	1,900,000.00	1,431,690.00	2,160,763.00	41.30	5.00	100	6.25	79.53	14.13	100.00
Lawrence.....	1881	1,250,000.00	787,000.00	500,000.00	25.27	8.00	122	15.25	62.96	12.50	100.00
Pacific.....	1853	3,000,000.00	6,332,354.00	None.	550.00	320.00	124	15.50	2,110.95	-----	1,000.00
Pepperell.....	1899	2,556,000.00	1,628,487.00	117,940.00	-----	12.00	158	19.75	68.71	10.27	100.00
Sagamore.....	1879	900,000.00	355,693.00	607,899.00	48.53	30.00	85	10.63	39.52	9.80	100.00
Troy.....	1814	300,000.00	474,294.00	2,816.00	335.00	67.00	189	23.63	794.90	6.31	500.00
Union.....	1879	1,200,000.00	584,044.00	None.	46.00	35.50	183	22.87	48.67	10.89	100.00
Whitman.....	1895	1,500,000.00	945,411.00	474,245.00	29.76	8.00	58½	7.25	63.02	11.35	100.00

* In addition to which a 25 per cent dividend was paid.

For eight years average annual dividends for group, 15.65 per cent.

† In addition to which a 100 per cent dividend was paid.

The merger in the capital of earnings is not shown, nor in plant improvements out of earnings, which would make the earnings still larger. W. Irving Bullard, of Danielson, Conn., a great cotton manufacturer, is quoted as saying at Boston April 16, 1908:

A summary of 100 cotton mills in Oldham district, in England, shows the following remarkable facts: Capital invested, \$30,501,230; net earnings, \$6,605,785; average earning per mill, \$66,055; dividend, 15½ per cent.

The average dividend disbursements for these 100 mills was 15½ per cent, while the net earnings show an average of 35½ per cent.

The indecent treatment of helpless labor by organized capital is not confined to America, but we ought to lead the world in the conservation of human life and unrewarded toil by laws wisely and humanely drawn.

The recent giant monopolies, engendered and sheltered by the prohibitive tariff, are responsible for the unrest of the country.

The American Tobacco Company, which has become sufficiently powerful to fix the price of all tobacco raised in the United States, advertises its assets for 1906 at \$278,628,564. By merger and otherwise it controls the American Cigar Company, American Stogie Company, the Havana Tobacco Company, with various subcompanies, the American Snuff Company, the Lorillard Company, and so forth. The impatience and violence of the tobacco raisers in Kentucky and Tennessee, known as the "Night Riders," is due directly to the tyranny of this company, which, being strong enough to control prices, is enabled to exercise its will on the tobacco growers, who have been making a blind effort to protect themselves by force. In like manner the crushing effect of extreme poverty, due to the processes which I have described, is leading to actual crime in many ways and is responsible for the growth of radical socialism and anarchism throughout the world.

DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

In The Social Unrest, John Graham Brooks, on page 161, quoting Thorold Rogers (Oxford Economy), says:

In a vague way they (the laborers) are under the impression that the greater part of the misery which they see is the direct product of the laws enacted and maintained in the interest of particular classes. And on the whole they are in the right.

Quoting Professor Smart, of Glasgow:

But when machinery is replacing man and doing the heavy work of industry, it is time to get rid of that ancient prejudice that men must work ten hours a day to keep the world up to the level of the comfort it has attained. Possibly, if we clear our minds of cant, we may see the reason why we still wish the laborer to work ten hours a day is that we, the comfortable classes, may go on receiving the lion's share of the wealth these machines, iron and human, are turning out.

So Professor Cairnes, an economist noted for ability and caution, in his Leading Principles (ibid., 162), says:

Unequal as is the distribution of wealth already in the country, the tendency of industrial progress—on the supposition that the present separation between industrial classes is maintained—is toward an

inequality still greater. The rich will be growing richer; the poor at least relatively poorer. It seems to me, apart altogether from the question of the laborers' interest, that these are not conditions which furnish a solid basis for a progressive social state; but, having regard to that interest, I think the considerations adduced show that the first and indispensable step toward any serious amendment of the laborer's lot is that he should be, in one way or another, lifted out of the groove in which he at present works and placed in a position compatible with his becoming a sharer in equal proportion with others in the general advantages arising from industrial progress.

Spahr's table for the distribution of wealth in the United States, taken from his work, "The Present Distribution of Wealth in the United States," when our national wealth was \$60,000,000, is as follows:

Class.	Families.	Per cent.	Average wealth.	Aggregate wealth.	Per cent.
Rich.....	125,000	1.0	\$263,040	\$32,880,000,000	54.8
Middle.....	1,362,500	10.9	14,180	19,320,000,000	32.2
Poor.....	4,762,500	38.1	1,639	7,800,000,000	13.0
Very poor.....	6,250,000	50.0	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	13,500,000	100.0	4,800	60,000,000,000	100.0

The inequalities have been steadily growing worse, and when a single person's fortune is estimated at a thousand millions and is gathering in \$50,000,000 per annum of the net proceeds of the products of the labor of this country, while millions of human beings can not lay aside \$50 apiece per annum, what must be the inevitable result? It is this condition, half understood, that is developing rapidly a sentiment of radical socialism, discontent, and social unrest.

Moody's Manual of 1907, page 30, presents a "General Summary" of corporations offering stocks and bonds for sale to the stock exchanges and recorded by him in great detail in a volume of nearly 3,000 pages, as follows:

	Total stocks and bonds.
Steam railroad division.....	\$15,436,758,000
Public utilities division.....	8,130,464,000
Industrial division.....	10,156,332,000
Mining division.....	2,525,173,000

36,248,668,000

Page 10, Report (1907) Comptroller of the Currency, resources national banks..... 8,390,328,402

Page 35, Report (1907) Comptroller of the Currency, resources other banks and trust companies..... 11,168,511,516

In addition to this enormous volume of corporate wealth, which comprises a registered one-third of our national wealth, there is an unregistered volume of corporations which are close corporations which do not sell stock, which are personal corporations, amounting to thousands of millions of dollars.

I respectfully call your attention to the Statistical Abstract of 1907, Table 244, which sets forth the wealth of the United

States, which shows clearly where its approximate ownership may be found, to wit:

Table 24, Statistical Abstract, 1907.

Total wealth in United States	\$107,104,211,917
Real property	62,341,492,134
Live stock	4,073,791,736
Farm implements and machinery	844,989,863
Manufacturing machinery, tools, etc.	3,297,754,180
Railroad equipment	11,244,752,000
Street railway, shipping, waterworks	4,840,546,909
Agricultural products	1,899,379,652
Manufactured products	7,409,291,668
Imported merchandise	495,545,685
Mining products	326,851,517
Clothing and personal ornaments	2,000,000,000
Furniture, carriages	5,750,000,000
Total for United States	107,104,211,917

Where do the city laborers under protection come in as joint heirs of modern prosperity?

What part of this wealth created by labor is theirs?

They have no real estate, no live stock, farm machinery, manufacturing machinery, railroads, or under any visible classification. The only thing that they can have under this tabulation is clothing and a little personal property.

And yet the products of the labor in our specified manufacturing industries of 1905 reached a total of \$14,802,147,087, for 5,470,321 wage-earners, whose product was therefore worth \$2,708 per capita.

These people received \$2,611,540,532 in wages (Stat. Abst. U. S., 1907, p. 144), or \$479 per capita.

This \$479 each must feed and shelter and clothe and educate and provide leisure and the joyous participation in the common providences of God for an average of three people, on about \$160 each per annum, or about an average of \$13.33 per month.

There can hardly be much margin of saving under the circumstances for sickness, ill health, accident, or loss of employment.

In New York City, with over four millions of people, less than 1 in 40 has any real estate.

LESS THAN 100,000 OWN CITY.

[From the New York Times.]

Lawson Purdy, president of the board of taxes and assessments, in a speech at the City Planning Municipal Art Exhibition, said that the value of the taxable property in New York City is now estimated to be about \$6,800,000,000. Two-thirds, or 67 per cent, of this property, he added, is land. Mr. Purdy said that it is estimated that less than 100,000 persons own every particle of the land.

Our wealth increases over \$4,500,000,000 every year over and above our expenses. What proportion does labor, the creator of wealth, retain net out of its own creation?

A beggarly part, Mr. President. Our national policy can be improved; our national policy should be changed.

We ought not to persist in a policy artfully designed to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

FALSE STANDARDS OF LIFE.

Piling up enormous wealth in few hands is setting false standards of life and making classes whose sympathies are very far apart.

One can not help but be struck with the enormous cost of hotel services, for example, in the New York hotels conducted expressly for the patronage of the rich; \$15 to \$20 a day for a bedroom, sitting room, and bath is nothing unusual; \$15 for a dinner for two persons is not regarded as extravagant; and side by side with this will be found families who can not save \$30 net out of their labor of a year's time.

This may seem unimportant; I regard it as a matter of very great importance, illustrating the grossly unequal distribution of the proceeds of human labor; a condition which pampers one class and starves another; a condition which ought not to be encouraged by a nation which desires to preserve its liberties.

TIPPING.

The whole tipping system which in sections where these differences of wealth are most pronounced is an evidence offering itself on every hand to show that the servants who render service are not properly paid, and that the well-to-do class ought voluntarily to pay the servants for every little act. This system degrades the servant and puts him in an attitude of a beggar—a beggary which the giver of tips encourages in spite of himself. The whole practice which universally prevails in Europe emphasizes the relation of master and servant, of master and dependent, in which the servant is to be thankful for gifts, and it is injurious both to the one who gives and the one who receives and illustrates the false standards of living which are being established in this country. Men who serve ought to be properly paid in the first instance and not compelled to be put in the attitude of beggars in order to make a living. It lowers the moral tone of the American Republic.

MONOPOLIES' EVIL AND DANGEROUS METHODS.

Mr. President, piling up stupendous wealth in a few hands is dangerous to the welfare of the country. The Senator from

Wisconsin, in his remarks on Senate bill 3023 a year ago, pointed out that practically 100 directors, interlocked with each other, controlled all of the great corporations of transportation, telegraph, telephone, express, and industrials in the United States. He gave their names and the corporations which they controlled in part.

In the remarks which I had the honor to submit on February 25, 1908, upon this bill (S. 3023), I pointed out the ability of a few men in New York to create a panic whenever they wanted to, and I pointed out how they could profit by it.

A few men control the management of the banks in New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago, with associate banks throughout the country, and can make the stock market go up or down as they please by the simplest of all processes, to wit:

BY RESTRICTING CREDITS

when they want the market to go down—

BY EXTENDING CREDITS FREELY

when they want the market to go up.

The panic of 1893 was an artificial panic, because it was brought about in this manner for the purpose of putting an end to the talk of remonetizing silver, and as a political argument, ingeniously and powerfully exerted, it did finally put an end to it.

I was in the banking business myself at that time, and received a circular letter from New York pointing out the mischievous character of the discussion favoring remonetization of silver; that it was driving gold abroad. Several letters followed along the same line, and, I am informed, and believe, that these circulars were sent out at the instance of a committee representing banks belonging to the New York clearing house; that it was the definite and predetermined policy then and there to constrict credits; and that, finally, these banks struck the crowning blow by "calling," in June, 1893, the large volume of demand loans then on the street for immediate payment, when the usual credit accommodations were already quite cut off by these banks and their associate institutions and other associated financiers.

When this panic was over the weaker elements of the financial world by thousands had been compelled to give up their properties to the financial masters, who had accumulated cash for the purpose of taking over the property of less farsighted and powerful operators.

I pointed out in my remarks February 25, 1908, the astonishing manner in which these forces had caused the stock market to go up and down by which the unwary have been fleeced of their property during the preceding ten years.

The panic of 1907 was an artificial panic, brought about by conspiracy, in my opinion, of men discussed by President Roosevelt as "malefactors of great wealth."

I think his description was precise and apt, and I think that the Senate ought never to be content until a proper inquiry has been made into the panic of 1907, to determine who the beneficiaries were of that artful, crafty, far-reaching, and terrible conspiracy, which has thrown millions of men out of employment and brought tears and grief to the unnumbered women and children in this land who have suffered the consequence of that financial panic.

I was informed with regard to what might be expected to happen nearly a year before it did happen.

The panic of 1907 was brought about by a prolonged bull movement, free extension of credits, maintaining stocks and bonds at a high figure until in sufficient volume they were loaded upon the unwary, to whom money was freely loaned on a proper margin, and then began the process of restricting credits, slowly, steadily, firmly, the masters of the market, the high priests of monopoly, having accumulated an immense volume of cash and cash credits, to be used when the market struck bottom. This they did, with the most magnificent results, making unnumbered millions out of the weaker elements who had been led into the trap of obtaining credits.

It is true that the panic resulted in paralyzing productive energies of the American people, disturbing credits throughout the whole world, and throwing millions of men out of employment and causing unspeakable suffering to many millions of women and children. But monopoly had its reward, if the accumulation of money beyond the needs of a human being can be called a reward; if a callous heart and deadened sensibilities to the sufferings of human kind can be called a reward.

I wish to say to the chairman of the Committee on Finance that his committee is, in my judgment, honor bound to determine who the beneficiaries of that financial panic were and to take steps against the possibility of its repetition. There was a double purpose in this panic. One was that the very powerful financially might double their holdings of property by smashing values, accumulating cash and cash credits, and buying

in the stocks and bonds of weak financiers who could not stand the storm.

Another purpose was to discredit Theodore Roosevelt, whose heart had been moved by a resolute purpose to protect the people against such sinister forces.

In his message of January 31, 1908, he said:

WHO COMMIT HIDEOUS WRONG.

The attacks by these great corporations on the administration's actions have been given a wide circulation through the country, in the newspapers and otherwise, by those writers and speakers who, consciously or unconsciously, act as the representatives of predatory wealth—the wealth accumulated on a giant scale by all forms of iniquity, ranging from the oppression of wage-workers to unfair and unwholesome methods of crushing out competition, and to defrauding the public by stockjobbing and the manipulation of securities. Certain wealthy men of this stamp, whose conduct should be abhorrent to every man of ordinary decent conscience and who commit the hideous wrong of teaching our young men that phenomenal business success must ordinarily be based on dishonesty, have during the last few months made it apparent that they have banded together to work for a reaction. Their endeavor is to overthrow and discredit all who honestly administer the law, to prevent any additional legislation which would check and restrain them, and to secure, if possible, a freedom from all restraint, which will permit every unscrupulous wrongdoer to do what he wishes unchecked provided he has enough money. The only way to counteract the movement in which these men are engaged is to make clear to the public just what they are seeking to accomplish in the present.

The absurd fluctuations of stocks controlled by these high financiers, I set forth at the time, illustrate the unspeakable folly of any citizen trusting himself upon a market capable of such uncontrolled manipulation. Monte Carlo is perfectly innocent by the side of this gigantic gambling house with its wonderfully improved modern machinery for misleading the judgment of the ordinary citizen, with its secret pitfalls and ingenious traps by which to defraud our people.

The spirit of monopoly—the idea of getting something for nothing—has done a great harm to the American people. Hundreds of thousands of people are the beneficiaries of it and many millions are the victims of it. Those who are enriched by it set new standards of extravagant living, of wasteful expenditure, and of false pride and bad example, the imitation of which has made the American citizen notorious throughout the whole world.

This bill, Mr. President, is a taproot from which monopoly partly draws its power, fattens, grows strong, and overshadows the land like an evil tree killing and impairing the life of those who stand beneath.

The violent manner in which the monopolists of this country juggle the stock market subjects it to tremendous changes from time to time, as shown in the following quotations:

These ranges are since 1900, and will be found in the New York Times Weekly National Quotation Review, page 13, of October 21, 1907:

	High.	Low.
Adams Express.....	315	114
Allis Chalmers Co.....	27	4
Amalgamated Copper.....	130	33
American Beet Sugar Co.....	36	9
American Cotton Oil.....	57	24
American Express.....	272	142
American Grass Twine.....	62	3
American Hide and Leather.....	13	2
American Ice Securities.....	94	20
American Linseed Co.....	30	5
American Snuff Co.....	250	26
American Steel Foundries.....	18	3
American Woolen Co.....	48	7
Aetehison, Topeka and Santa Fe.....	110	18
Baltimore and Ohio.....	125	55
Delaware, Lackawanna and Western.....	500	171
Denver and Rio Grande.....	53	16
Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic.....	24	4
General Electric.....	334	109
Great Northern preferred.....	348	140
Iowa Central.....	57	11
Kanawha and Michigan.....	76	10
Kansas City Southern.....	39	7
Knickerbocker Ice.....	85	8
Lake Erie and Western.....	76	12
Manhattan Beach.....	23	4
Missouri, Kansas and Texas R. R.....	43	9
National Biscuit Co.....	86	23
New York, Chicago and St. Louis.....	76	11
New York Central.....	174	99
Norfolk and Western.....	97	22
Northern Pacific.....	700	45
Northern Central.....	250	150
Ontario Mining.....	13	1
Pennsylvania Railroad.....	170	110
Peoria and Eastern.....	50	5
Pere Marquette.....	106	20
Pullman Co.....	268	148
Reading.....	164	15
Tennessee Coal and Iron.....	166	25
United Railways Investment.....	98	9
United States Cast Iron.....	53	6
United States Express.....	100	45
United States Leather.....	20	6
United States Steel.....	55	8

I call attention to some of these figures, however: Adams Express went from 114 to 315, about 300 per cent; the Allis-Chalmers Company went from 4 to 27, over 600 per cent. Amalgamated Copper, one of the giant concerns of this country, from 33 to 130, 400 per cent. And so it goes on through the list.

The monopoly protecting tariff shortens the life of labor and exposes it to greater mortality.

Mr. President, in the last forty years the world has wonderfully improved in medical knowledge. It has wonderfully improved in inventive processes, which have led to increased conveniences of life, which have developed the most important economies of production, manufacture, and distribution.

All of these things have tended to the prolongation of human life where people could receive the full benefit of them; so much so, that it is probably no excessive estimate to say that the average of human life in the well-to-do classes has been increased by a period of ten years. It has been one of the wonderful developments of increasing modern intelligence.

It is a grievous thing, therefore, to observe that notwithstanding these great benefits, which ought to be a common heritage of the human race, and notwithstanding the increasing longevity of the well-to-do classes, the entire average of life shown by the mortality tables has not been improved. The number of persons who die per thousand is substantially the same.

Mr. President, I submit the comparative mortality statistics of our country and the other civilized nations of the world.

The mortality statistics exhibit the remarkable fact that just in degree as poverty obtains and governments permit monopoly, without protecting the weaker elements from dangerous exposure, just in that degree the number of deaths from all causes rises in the annual average.

It is a very important matter, and it shows that just in degree as thoughtful men write their laws for the preservation of human life to that degree is human longevity extended; to that degree there is the conservation of the best of all national resources—the lives of the children, the lives of the workingmen and working women of the country.

The following table gives the number of people per thousand who died in the following countries from 1903 to 1906 (p. 28 of the Mortality Statistics of the Census Office for 1907):

Country.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
Ceylon.....	25.9	24.9	27.7	34.3
Hungary.....	26.1	24.8	27.8	24.8
Roumania.....	24.8	24.4	25.4
Spain.....	25	25.8	25.9	26.2
Austria.....	23.8	23.7	25
Italy.....	22.4	21.1	21.9	20.8
Japan.....	20	21.2	21.9
France.....	19.3	19.4	19.6	19.9
German Empire.....	20	19.6	19.8
United States.....	16.1	16.6	16.2	16.1
Netherlands.....	15.6	15.9	15.3	14.8
Norway.....	14.8	14.3	14.8	13.7
Denmark.....	14.7	14.1	15	13.5
United Kingdom.....	15.8	16.5	15.5	15.6
Australasia.....	11.8	10.8	10.5	10.6
New Zealand.....	10.4	9.6	9.3	9.3

There is no table which has ever been read in this body that has such vital significance as that table, which shows that if the people of the United States took the same pains to preserve the life of the Nation that New Zealand has done, we would save over six to the thousand; and, measured by our 80,000,000 people, it would mean a saving to this country of over 500,000 lives annually. Pittsburg is no exception in the exposure of human life to bad conditions. It is merely illustrative.

The policy of New Zealand is expressed in their great motto, "Better reduce want than increase wealth;" and when you reduce want, even if it be at the expense of increasing wealth, you prolong human life. You make life worthy to be lived, and you raise the standard of men physically, morally, and spiritually.

Let our national standard be "Men first, then wealth." New Zealand has abolished monopoly and given a more even distribution of the opportunities of life to willing labor than any other country in the world, and it offers to the United States an example of how to care for its people, because the difference of these vital statistics of an average of 9.9 deaths per annum out of a thousand and 16.3 per thousand, makes a difference of 6.4 per thousand, or the vast multitude of 512,000 people who annually die in the United States in excess of the deaths that would occur under more favorable conditions of life. Are they not worth preserving as fully as we agree on the conservation of our other national resources?

The death rate in our cities, especially the industrial cities, seems to run still higher than the general average; for example, the annual average number of deaths from all causes, per thousand population for 1901 to 1905, was as follows (id., pp. 91 and 92):

In Massachusetts:	
Boston	18.8
Fall River	20.3
Lowell	20.2
Providence, R. I.	18.8
New York City	19.0
Pittsburg, Pa.	20.7
Philadelphia	18.2
Norristown, Pa.	24.5

Notwithstanding the fact that the cities with their opportunity of cooperation in improved water supply, sewerage, hospital service, and sanitary supervision ought to have better health than those less favorably situated. The heavy death rate in cities is due to the extreme high death rate among the very poor, who are compelled to live in insanitary places and are otherwise exposed, while the more favored population of the cities would show a better rate than the average.

TABLE 21.—Death rates from all causes per 1,000 population in registration States in 1900.

Connecticut	16.977
Maine	17.493
Massachusetts	17.736
Michigan	18.867
New Hampshire	17.979
New Jersey	17.378
New York	17.921
Rhode Island	19.078
Vermont	16.962

Table 95, Abstract of the Census, 1900, shows a heavy mortality in manufacturing cities and in cities where negroes live. For example, per thousand, from all causes:

Augusta, Me.	26.4
Baltimore, Md.	21.0
Biddeford, Me.	23.2
Boston, Mass.	21.1
Cincinnati, Ohio	19.1
Hoboken, N. J.	21.1
Jersey City, N. J.	20.7
Pittsburg, Pa.	20.0
Philadelphia, Pa.	21.2

Census Bulletin No. 77 gives an interesting account of 42 of the so-called "dusty trades," showing, for example, that of polishers who die between 25 and 34 years, 56 per cent of such deaths are due to consumption. The per cent of like deaths due to consumption in each age group is very high; for example, between the ages of 25 and 34 years, 70 per cent of the grinders who die, die of consumption; 59 per cent of the tool makers, 50 per cent of the gold-leaf makers, 50 per cent of brass workers, 56 per cent of printers, 66 per cent of compositors, 61 per cent of engravers, 52 per cent of stone workers, 50 per cent of marble workers, 56 per cent of glass blowers, 46 per cent of glass cutters, 44 per cent of plasterers, 49 per cent of paper hangers, 62 per cent of lithographers, 68 per cent of the hosiery and knitting mill employees, 50 per cent of spinners, 53 per cent of weavers, 50 per cent of rope makers, 55 per cent of cabinetmakers, 62 per cent of wood turners, 55 per cent of hatters, 52 per cent of silk-mill employees, 58 per cent of upholsterers, showing that workers in these dusty trades are very liable to die of tuberculosis.

This table shows that the exposure of human life to dust and hard conditions leads to the destruction of human life by tuberculosis in a serious way. I think these tables are of interest.

Mr. President, I deem it my duty to call the attention of the country to the fact that this death rate stands in startling contrast to the death rate of New Zealand, where the average for 1901 to 1906 was less than 10 deaths per thousand. It is equally important, in considering the reason for the greater security of life in New Zealand, to remember that in New Zealand the people take great care to prevent the destruction of human life by the extremes of poverty.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in New Zealand great pains are taken to protect the people against monopoly, against the appropriation of everything in heaven and on earth, everything visible or invisible by men, because they happen to have piled up available credit at their command. In New Zealand they believe that the land was made for the use and benefit of the living generation, who make it desirable to live in. Therefore they control monopoly in that great republic. We have copied them before in their political processes when we adopted the greatest of all means for the control of fraud in elections by the adoption of the Australian ballot, and we will do well to imitate them in other matters, where they protect the living generation against the uncontrolled and natural ambition and greed of man for wealth and power.

BETTER REDUCE WANT THAN INCREASE WEALTH.

In New Zealand they do not impose a tariff tax artfully drawn to make the poor poorer and the rich richer. In New Zealand they do not establish a tariff under the false pretense of raising revenue, where the legislator openly or secretly intends the tariff rate not to raise revenue, but to prevent importation, to prevent competition, and to protect monopoly in the home market.

THE PURPOSES OF TAXATION.

Constitutionally, a tax can have no other basis than the raising of a revenue for public purposes, and whatever governmental exaction has not this basis is tyrannical and unlawful. A tax on imports, therefore, the purpose of which is not to raise a revenue, but to discourage and indirectly prohibit some particular import for the benefit of some home manufacture, may well be questioned as being merely colorable, and therefore not warranted by constitutional principles. (Cooley, Prin. Con. Law, 57.)

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the Topeka case, said: "To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called 'taxation.' This is not legislation; it is a decree under legislative forms." (20 Wall., 664, in Loan Asso. v. Topeka.)

New Zealand pursues the policy

BETTER REDUCE WANT THAN INCREASE WEALTH

and imposes a 10 per cent inheritance tax on estates of one hundred thousand and more, and imposes also an income tax.

New Zealand does not hesitate to protect her working units from excessive house rent, providing concrete houses at a low rate of interest.

I am not unaware of the fact that this latter suggestion will furnish occasion to the clamorous advocates of special privileges to burst into a chorus of denunciation against New Zealand, that this is socialism. It is true that it is socialistic. But no wise policy should be condemned by a mere epithet "socialism," for our post-office system and common-school system, and municipal waterworks, sewers and streets system are "socialistic." New Zealand believes that the land upon which the New Zealanders live and move and have their being ought not to be monopolized by the very rich, nor used by them through the acquirement of titles to dictate terms upon which the New Zealanders shall be allowed to live.

The New Zealanders must be a very foolish people. They actually believe that the land upon which they live should be controlled in the interest of the living generation of men who cultivate it and make it beautiful. I understand that this foolish doctrine is contrary to the fundamental canons of monopoly.

It violates the fundamental law of continental Europe and of Great Britain. It would overthrow the idea of the good old days of William the Conqueror when he took charge of Britain and parceled the lands among his warlike leaders.

These titles have thence come down in the good old way, and the dukes and princes of England, and of Germany, of Austria, and of Russia still hold the titles and in measure still impose their will upon the inhabitants thereof. It is also true that this special class of landed nobles, who exercised monopoly of the land, having finally learned that they could only eat so much and only wear so much and only occupy a given number of palaces, were obliged to throw out the younger brothers of each succeeding family, and, human selfishness having become satiated in princely and luxurious living, have turned themselves to some extent to the service of their fellow-men. But they have had the wisdom and been compelled to limit the extortion which their legal rights made possible.

Indeed, they had a great example in France, which was serviceable in teaching them not to go too far. It was this monopoly of land—the Senator from New York [Mr. DEFEW] to the contrary notwithstanding—which caused the French revolution, sending the land monopolists to the guillotine, and resulted in the minute subdivision of the lands of France among those who tilled the soil and made it productive.

Mr. President, one might be misunderstood in discussing the greed of modern times. I do not blame an individual for exhibiting the natural tendency of human life. I do not blame a man for becoming greedy for wealth and power; all of us have these impulses; but I do blame the laws which persist in sheltering him at the expense of those who are entitled to protection in the constitutional right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I wish to call attention to what is the effect of monopoly. Monopoly is worse in Europe than in our country because under the rule in Europe the land was monopolized in the first place by imperial power, and the control of the land was handed down to dukes, princes, and various others, and those people who come to our shores and are willing to submit to any kind of treatment do so because they come from conditions of monopoly more severe than those which we have in our own country.

It was the monopoly of land which led to the French revolution, notwithstanding the comments of the Senator from New York, who attributed it to other reasons. Thomas Jefferson, when minister to France in 1785, pointed out the terrific effect of land monopoly in that Empire. He said:

The property of France is absolutely concentrated in a very few hands, having revenues of from half a million of guineas a year downward. These employ the flower of the country as servants, some of them having as many as 200 domestics, not laboring. They employ also a great number of manufacturers and tradesmen, and, lastly, the class of laboring husbandmen. But, after all, there comes the most numerous of all the classes; that is, the poor, who can not find work. I asked myself what could be the reason that so many should be permitted to beg who are willing to work in a country where there is a very considerable proportion of uncultivated lands? Those lands are undistributed only for the sake of game. It should seem, then, that it must be because of the enormous wealth of the proprietors, which places them above attention to the increase of their revenues by permitting these lands to be labored.

I have always felt sorry for the French nobility, for the so-called "flower of France," and have wondered why it was they were incapable of realizing the fatal danger which their greed, their extravagance, and their frivolity engendered. They played with a powder magazine of human passion which finally exploded.

Our laws should protect the people in the peaceful enjoyment of life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and of the fruits of their own industry. If the laws fail, there will be built up in this country a powder magazine of human passion that may some day explode with fatal consequences.

A safety valve has been furnished, for possible danger to the land monopolist and other thence engendered monopolists of continental Europe, by modern transportation, which has permitted their great surplus of population to go to other parts of the world and build up homes by their peaceful labor, where they would not be subject to princes or potentates or to tyranny in any form, whether governmental, religious, or plutocratic; and our forefathers came to this land to free themselves from this tyranny and to establish a government whose fundamental doctrine was that the precious privileges of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were inalienable. That is to say, Mr. President, the individual could not deprive himself of them if he would; that he had no right to deprive himself of these things.

It has remained for the representatives of the people in Congress to permit the dangers of monopoly to grow up by special privileges granted by statute, by building up a monopoly breeding tariff, by which foreign competition has been cut off and home competition controlled and commercial mastery of our people established by the organization of trusts, by secret agreements, and by gigantic mergers, which embraced in one corporate body every competitor.

Mr. President, there is no evil to a free people more dangerous in every way than financial and commercial monopoly.

When a monopoly is organized strong enough to dictate the prices of the product of labor, or to dictate the prices of the necessities of life to the laborer and the entire people, there has also been established a *commercial master on the one side and a commercial slavery on the other*. The Standard Oil Company, which fixes the price of crude oil to the producer and fixes the price of kerosene and gasoline to the consumer, regardless of values either to one or the other, exercises a commercial mastery that differs in degree, but does not differ in kind, with the mastery which Pharaoh exercised over the Egyptians when he established a monopoly in corn in Egypt.

Mr. President, under the advice of Joseph, Pharaoh and his captains stored all the surplus corn of Egypt during seven years of plenty. They exercised their legal rights. During the seven years of drought which followed they had the richest monopoly recorded in history.

The price of corn went up; the price of corn went sky-high under this monopoly of the home market. The Holy Bible advises us that, in exchange for enough of this monopolized product—

Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought.

And when money failed in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, all the Egyptians came unto Joseph and said, "Give us bread, for why should we die in thy presence? for the money falleth."

And Joseph said, "Give your cattle; and I will give you for your cattle, if money fail."

And they brought their cattle unto Joseph, and Joseph gave them bread in exchange for horses, and for the flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and for the asses.

And the Egyptians then gave up to this triumphant monopoly all of their land in exchange for corn for bread.

And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh, for the Egyptians sold every man his field because the famine prevailed over them, so the land became Pharaoh's.

Then Joseph said unto the people, "Behold I have bought you this day, and your land for Pharaoh: lo, here is seed for you, and ye shall sow the land.

"And it shall come to pass in the increase, that ye shall give the fifth part unto Pharaoh, and four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your households, and for food for your little ones."

Mr. President, we probably in this day of greater liberty and greater enlightenment would rise in revolution against the dictation of Pharaoh in this form, but the practice upon which Pharaoh acted, the principle upon which he established a monopoly in a necessary of life by the exercise of his legal rights and thereby acquired, by mastery of prices, all of the property of the Egyptians and made them his commercial servants and slaves, are in full play in this Republic under the operation of a thousand varieties of monopolies, dictating prices upon all of the necessities of life and gradually absorbing—I may say, Mr. President, rapidly absorbing—all of the property of this Republic.

Pharaoh and his captains gave the Egyptians four-fifths of what they produced. The present masters of monopoly do not give to labor so large a part of what it produces. I have demonstrated by Exhibit 1 the wages paid as compared to the value of the gross product, and have demonstrated by those tables that taking the raw materials at the factory and calculating the additional value created directly by labor, it does not receive one-half of the value it actually creates, much less four-fifths, which was the rule established by Pharaoh.

Mr. President, it may seem austere to recall the monopoly of Pharaoh, but I think it very important that the Senate of the United States should consider and feel itself more actively responsible for the development and care of the interest of the productive masses of the Republic. I have no desire to hold the leaders of the Republican party responsible for the drift of modern times. I shall be content to see them exert themselves to retain its good features and restrain its bad features.

I am willing to exculpate them. I will be very glad to see them take advantage of a great opportunity to make themselves permanently the representatives of the people if they will only give those things to the people which they are in honor bound to give to enable them to enjoy life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and the fruits of their own industry, which are now filched from them by prices 50 per cent higher than the prices of the world.

WHO IS GETTING ALL THE NET PRODUCTS OF LABOR IN THIS COUNTRY?

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious to thoughtful men that the tremendous accumulation of wealth in a few hands is leading to the rapid monopolization of every natural opportunity. Nearly all of our national transportation is so controlled. There is obvious control by monopoly of telegraph, telephone, the express, of lumber, of building material, of coal, of cotton manufactures and woolen manufactures, of farm machinery, of oil, of iron, of steel and their products; and on the other hand we have a rather pitiful condition of extreme poverty exhibiting itself in all of our great cities, side by side with this enormous concentration of wealth.

Mr. President, I believe we have the best people in the world; that even our masters of monopoly have shown a greater measure of liberality in their gigantic benefactions to the people from whom their fortunes have been drawn than any men in the history of the world. I rejoice in their benevolence. I know that they are neither hard-hearted nor lacking in generous impulse; they have simply been following the rules of business established by a rigorous commercial age, where "dividends" were emblazoned on every battle flag and "success"—"financial success"—was the only standard. It is no wonder that the weak and the poor and the inarticulate mass have been forgotten in the fierce contest for wealth and power.

We have a wonderful country and a great and magnificent people. We have a great mass of the middle classes of people, who are not in penury, have neither riches nor poverty, but comprise the bulwark of this Republic, whose patriotism, whose wisdom, whose penetrating intelligence can be perfectly relied upon; and the petty larceny of the two millions of our revenue by the sugar trust, to which they pleaded guilty in New York within the last few days, being but a trivial circumstance beside the universal plundering of the national pocketbook by the wholesale fraudulent prices fixed by the monopolies of this country, our great middle class, conservative and sound, will soon correct these evils at the ballot box.

I am deeply disappointed that the party in power has apparently lost its opportunity to serve the people by removing the tariff wall sheltering monopoly and by lowering prices in the United States.

MONOPOLY HAS SUBJECTED LABOR TO IRREGULAR EMPLOYMENT.

The panic of 1907 was caused by monopoly and by the dangerous plutocracy our system has erected in the United States, as I fully set forth on February 25, 1908. This panic threw out of employment millions of men, two millions of whom are out of employment now, according to the recent report of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, from whose report I quote:

Permit me to call attention to this: At the beginning of December, 1908, I sent out a circular letter to the executive officers of a number of international trade unions of America and got from them a report as to the state of employment and unemployment, and from the reports which were made to me within fifteen or twenty days I culled the following information:

The blacksmiths report during the past year about 50 per cent of the trade unemployed; those employed averaging about four days a week.

- Boiler makers and iron-ship builders, 30 per cent unemployed.
- Boot and shoe workers, 25 per cent unemployed.
- Bridge and structural-iron workers, 25 per cent unemployed.
- Carpenters and joiners, 40 per cent unemployed.
- Wood carvers, 30 per cent unemployed.
- Cement workers, 30 per cent unemployed.
- Cigar makers, 10 per cent unemployed.
- Commercial telegraphers, 15 per cent unemployed.
- Coopers, 15 per cent unemployed; two-thirds of the employed working half time.
- Elevator constructors, 40 per cent unemployed.
- Steam and hot-water fitters, employment in the West fair; in the East fully 40 per cent unemployed and working about one hundred and eighty days a year.
- Freight handlers, about 30 per cent unemployed.
- Glass-bottle blowers, about 20 per cent unemployed. On account of conditions of the trade, no work is performed during July or August.
- Window-glass blowers, 20 per cent unemployed.
- Granite cutters, about 15 per cent unemployed.
- Hatters, men working about three-fourths time.
- Hod carriers and building laborers, 60 per cent unemployed.
- Hotel and restaurant employees, 30 per cent unemployed.
- Machinists, 20 per cent unemployed.
- Railway maintenance-of-way employees, 25 per cent unemployed.
- Butcher workmen, 40 per cent unemployed.
- Coal miners, work about two hundred days during the year.
- Painters and decorators, 70 per cent unemployed.
- Pattern makers, 30 per cent unemployed.
- Pavers and rammer men, 25 per cent unemployed.
- Printing pressmen, 20 per cent unemployed.
- Shipwrights, joiners, and calkers, 50 per cent unemployed.
- Tile layers, "state of employment very poor."
- Tin-plate workers, 40 per cent unemployed.
- Tobacco workers, working on two-thirds time.
- Iron molders, 70 per cent unemployed.

I am sure it is not an exaggeration to say that there are now in our country, and have been with little variation since October, 1907, nearly 2,000,000 of wage-earners unemployed.

Secretary STRAUS. Do you mean by that that before that period those 2,000,000 were employed?

Mr. GOMPERS. I do, sir.

Secretary STRAUS. Are there not always some unemployed?

Mr. GOMPERS. In some trades, some callings, and seasons, yes, sir; but up to October, 1907, and for a few years just prior thereto, it was a practical fact that any man who could work could find work to do. I refer to the condition now of the men who want to work and who can find no work to do.

It is probably one of the greatest tributes that can be paid to all our people—and I think in a great measure that credit belongs to the organized workers, organized labor—that during that whole period of nearly eighteen months, and two winters, with so vast a number of unemployed, life and property have been secure and public order has been maintained; and I know of no force in all our country so potent as a conservator of the public peace as the much-abused and maligned labor organizations. In this morning's papers we read of a demonstration of the unemployed in Berlin yesterday, where the sabers of the soldiery were drawn to disperse hungry crowds. It is set forth in the cablegrams that the unemployed there proposed socialistic remedies for relief. I do not know of what those remedies or propositions for relief consisted. I take it that any proposition coming from the poor crowd of fellows who want work or relief would be regarded as extremely radical. But the American workmen ask for no relief that can at all be construed as socialistic. The relief which we ask for the men and women of our country who have been walking the streets in idleness for eighteen months we ask upon high patriotic, practical, and humane grounds, and for good economic reasons. I know, of course, that we are often met, when these matters are presented, with the statement that they are paternalistic, and that our form of government does not admit of the Government undertaking projects that would smack of paternalism. Yet in the great calamity which overtook the people of Italy quite recently the Government of our country generously and promptly appropriated \$800,000 as the direct gift of the American people as a whole—this in addition to the many generous contributions of our people in their individual capacity. No word of adverse criticism has been indulged in. On the contrary, the appropriation of this vast sum of money was looked upon as a duty which in common humanity the people of our country owed to a stricken people. It is only referred to to illustrate the thought that the lingering hunger and misery due to the unemployment of our people, brought about by forces entirely beyond their control, should receive consideration at the hands of our government, both national and state.

THE MONOPOLY PROHIBITIVE TARIFF HAS EXPOSED AMERICAN LABOR TO TYRANNY.

Mr. President, the monopolies established under the prohibitive tariff have almost entirely destroyed the organizations of labor among their employees and have driven out in large measure the liberty-loving Americans and have introduced in their place foreigners who know but little of liberty—Slovaks, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Poles, Greeks, Italians.

The American workman has been subjected to foreign pauper competition; he has been refused the right to organize for his own protection.

He has been denied his political liberty. He has been compelled to march in political parades against his will.

He has been compelled to vote against his conscience under the threat of being discharged or denied the opportunity of working for his living.

THE DEFENSE OF THESE SCHEDULES UNSOUND.

Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, on June 4, made the only defense which has been offered of these high schedules, and in discussing the matter he said:

In general, it may be stated that the wages of textile operatives in America are double those of England, France, and Germany. A very exhaustive inquiry has recently been made into the subject of wages by the British Board of Trade, which shows that in Germany the wages of cotton weavers run from 16s. 6d. to 19s. 6d., or from \$4.12 to \$4.87 per week; that in France the wages run from 16s. 10d. to 19s. 2d., or from \$4.20 to \$4.79 per week; that in Great Britain the wages run from 16s. to 24s. 11d., or from \$4 to \$6.22 per week.

For the United States the Bureau of Labor, in Bulletin No. 77, July, 1908, shows that the average wages of all cotton weavers for the year 1907 was \$9.74. In addition, I may state that in many of the fine yarn mills of New England making high-priced fancy fabrics the weavers earn from \$11 to \$13 per week.

Many of the fabrics that will be dutiable under these provisions are valued at a dollar a pound. The cost of the cotton is 20 cents a pound at the outside, leaving 80 cents a pound for cost of labor in various forms in this country. Suppose that that labor costs twice as much in the cotton-manufacturing States of the United States as it does in our competing countries abroad, it is easy to see by a mathematical calculation that 50 per cent ad valorem, to say nothing about 45 per cent, will not equalize the conditions on these various high-priced goods between our own and competing countries.

If this was an original proposition, and we were to submit to the Senate rates which were protective and adequate, in view of the difference in the cost of production, we could not make them any lower than those fixed in these specific rates which we have asked the Senate to adopt.

The chairman takes the wages of the cotton weavers of Germany, France, and Great Britain for 1905, reported by the British Board of Trade to Parliament, just after the panic, and compares these wages with the weavers in the United States for 1907, and withholds the statement made in the report from which he quotes that the wages of ribbon weavers at St. Etienne, France, was twice as great in 1906 as in 1905 and 50 per cent higher in 1907 than in 1905.

The chairman does not point out that the spinners, both male and female, in the United States, by these same tables, were paid less wages in the cotton industry in the United States than they were in Germany or France. The male spinners received \$4.12 a week in the United States, \$5.91 in France, and \$6.57 in Germany, and the spinners in the woolen industries were paid \$6.52 in the United States, \$6.22 to \$6.81 in France, and \$7.20 to \$7.79 in Germany. The foreign weavers were paid less than our weavers and the foreign spinners were paid more than our spinners, and the chairman of the Committee on Finance withholds this important fact.

It is impossible to follow a leadership that is either careless or inaccurate in making statements for the guidance of the Senate. The chairman has withheld information from this body, and the quotations he offers, being a partial truth, are wholly untrustworthy and misleading.

Mr. President, this is the only defense that has been made, and in effect it amounts to this, that a pound of fabric of cotton costs 20 cents a pound for the cotton and 80 cents a pound for the cost of labor.

The chairman proves too much; he leaves nothing for capital. The statement is obviously false. He leaves nothing for capital, for the enormous dividends paid by the cotton mills of his State.

He is flatly contradicted by the census, which shows that the total labor cost in the entire textile industry is 19.5 per cent of the gross value of the product.

He is flatly contradicted in his contention by the census reports as to every schedule.

He is flatly contradicted by Carroll D. Wright's report on relative labor cost in 446 individual cases.

The aggregate value of the products of cotton mills for 1900 was \$332,806,156 (vol. 10, Table 14). The materials used cost \$116,108,879 (Table 13), and the total wages (Table 9) amounted to \$86,689,752, and for cotton small wares amounted to \$63,194.

Total cost	\$332,806,156
Material cost	\$116,108,879
Total wages	\$86,689,752
Per cent of labor to gross product	26
Average per cent of tariff rate fixed by the Senate bill	47.14

Approximately twice as much as the total wages paid the American workmen, thus sheltering the manufacturer in monopoly by excluding foreign goods.

The chairman of the Committee on Finance, in the face of these census reports, rises in his place as an expert and tells

this Senate that the labor cost of these manufactures is 80 per cent, when the truth is 26 per cent, and he justifies the cotton schedules upon this gross and indefensible error.

Granting that foreign goods have no labor cost whatever, 26 per cent is the maximum schedule to protect the American workmen; 26 per cent is the maximum average rate required if the Republican platform is to be carried out of providing the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

If the labor cost abroad is one-half the labor cost in the United States, the rate required to prevent the foreign manufacturer from having the advantage in cheaper labor would be 26 per cent, the American cost, less 13 per cent, the European cost, or a net rate of 13 per cent.

The difference in the labor cost at home and abroad would therefore be 13 per cent and not 47 per cent, as the schedule is written.

Mr. President, the gross error, to use the mildest terms possible, of the Committee on Finance and the advocates of a pro-

hibitive tariff runs in like manner through other schedules, the proof of which I submit. Taking the table of the committee itself in print No. 3 of April 12, 1909, page 68, I place side by side with the proposed ad valorem rate the total percentage of labor cost to the value of the product, the proof of which will be found in Exhibit 1, taken from the census reports, and in the volumes on manufactures, of census, 1900, and is verified by the figures of the Committee on Finance giving wages and the value of products in columns 8 and 9.

I ask attention to the recapitulation compiled by the Committee on Finance April 12, 1909, and ask permission to print that table with an interlineation which I have placed in it showing, from the figures submitted by the chairman of the Committee on Finance in that table, what is the percentage of wages to value of product as shown in 1904.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Estimated revenues.

RECAPITULATION.

[Compiled by Committee on Finance, April 12, 1909. The ad valorems are based on the dutiable values.]

Schedules.	Value of merchandise (dutiable and free).	Revenue under—		Equivalent ad valorems.		Volume IX, Census 1900. ^a	Census of manufactures, 1905 ^a (calendar year 1904).		Percentage of labor cost to value of products, including custom work and repairing.	Percentage of labor cost to value of products, as shown, 1904. ^b
		Present law (act of 1897).	Proposed bill (H. R. 1438).	Present.	Proposed.		Wages.	Value of products, including custom work and repairing.		
A—Chemicals, oils, and paints.....	\$42,067,649.85	\$11,187,405.69	\$11,754,112.86	Per ct. 27.62	Per ct. 28.20	8	\$44,258,256	\$572,848,476	7.5	
B—Earths, earthenware, and glassware.....	31,306,008.97	15,350,019.67	15,247,487.70	49.03	48.70	37.1	154,652,719	420,944,049	36.7	
C—Metals, and manufactures of.....	68,016,829.55	21,812,195.72	21,523,869.22	32.44	31.65	12.7	652,109,633	3,130,253,195	20.8	
D—Wood, and manufactures of.....	24,493,810.90	3,705,024.34	2,723,068.08	15.12	11.21	-----	378,461,021	1,393,489,978	27.1	
E—Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of.....	92,784,081.69	60,358,523.31	59,635,940.54	65.03	65.30	-----	23,536,189	413,333,428	5.6	
F—Tobacco, and manufactures of.....	29,859,081.79	26,125,067.41	25,113,185.29	87.20	87.18	18.9	62,640,303	331,117,681	18.9	
G—Agricultural products and provisions.....	63,925,575.89	19,151,915.96	20,594,283.57	30.16	32.28	5.7	100,839,004	2,194,833,894	4.5	
H—Spirits, wines, and other beverages.....	23,083,420.03	16,318,120.14	20,518,168.77	70.69	88.89	8.9	43,924,676	474,487,379	9.2	
I—Cotton manufactures.....	51,869,814.07	14,291,026.65	15,023,742.16	44.84	47.14	26.0	217,955,322	1,014,094,237	21.4	
J—Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of.....	114,172,202.94	49,900,580.31	50,353,163.25	43.67	44.07	13.3	27,223,574	185,094,092	14.6	
K—Wool, and manufactures of.....	62,818,797.81	26,554,815.89	26,554,815.89	58.19	58.19	19.7	135,069,063	767,210,960	17.6	
L—Silks and silk goods.....	38,816,839.20	20,313,706.39	23,531,936.60	52.33	60.76	22.6	20,767,943	133,288,072	20.0	
M—Pulp papers and books.....	20,005,025.62	4,136,029.42	4,042,076.14	20.67	21.88	16.2	123,903,633	548,957,239	22.5	
N—Sundries.....	135,821,484.06	29,896,513.49	31,307,603.27	22.50	23.06	19.9	\$340,596,182	\$1,954,228,027	18.3	
Total from customs.....	779,140,621.87	329,110,914.39	338,973,303.34	-----	-----	-----	\$2,331,938,518	\$13,534,180,743	-----	
Net increase.....	-----	-----	9,862,388.95	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Total luxuries, articles of voluntary use, dutiable.....	289,411,904.28	149,837,286.47	160,454,103.74	52.48	55.47	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Total necessities, dutiable.....	489,728,717.59	179,273,627.92	178,519,199.60	36.77	36.69	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Total entries for consumption, dutiable and free.....	1,415,402,284.78	-----	338,945,001.07	-----	23.95	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Total necessities, dutiable and free.....	1,125,990,380.50	-----	178,519,199.60	-----	15.85	-----	-----	-----	-----	

^a Industries grouped to conform as nearly as possible with the articles enumerated in the respective schedules of the tariff law. Industries with products named in two or more schedules are credited to the schedule which includes the major product. The value of products for each group is the sum of all products of all industries in the group, and hence includes a large amount of duplication due to the product of one industry serving as material for another.

^b Should be \$56,796,143; addition erroneous.

^c Should be \$273,959,320 (see page 67).

^d Should be \$2,277,838,543.

^e Should be \$767,401,417; addition erroneous.

^f Should be \$1,495,686,437 (see page 67).

^g Should be \$13,270,192,088.

^h Percentage of wages to value of product calculated and inserted by R. L. OWEN.

SCHEDULE A—CHEMICALS, ETC.

Mr. OWEN. This table shows that the percentage of labor to the value of the product in Schedule A, for example, by the very figures given by the Finance Committee itself, is only 7.5 per cent, while the proposed schedule is 28 per cent—four times as high as the entire labor cost involved in the product.

SCHEDULE B—GLASSWARE, ETC.

In like manner in Schedule B the total labor cost is 36 per cent. The total labor cost in Europe, if it were half as much, would leave the net difference in labor cost only 18 per cent, while the proposed tariff is 43 per cent for Schedule B.

SCHEDULE C—METALS, ETC.

In like manner Schedule C exhibits a total labor cost of 20 per cent. The difference in this labor cost and the European labor cost, accepting the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Finance that the labor cost in Europe is only half as much, would be 10 per cent, and the difference in labor cost for which the protection might be required would not exceed 10 per cent, but the proposed rate is 31 per cent—three times as high as it ought to be for protective purposes.

SCHEDULE D—WOOD, ETC.

In Schedule D the total labor cost is 27 per cent, and the difference in labor cost in this country and abroad would be 13½ per cent, not counting freight, which would be as much more in favor of this heavy material; and here the proposed rate is 11 per cent, and this schedule ought to be absolutely free in order to protect our forest and conserve our natural resources otherwise, as well as supply our people with cheap building material and our publishers with cheap paper.

SCHEDULE E—SUGAR, ETC.

In Schedule E, sugar, and so forth, the labor cost is 5.6 per cent; the difference in labor cost would be less than 3 per cent, which would be more than offset by freight, and here the proposed duty is 65 per cent, giving a complete monopoly to the sugar trust, which takes nearly all the profit, leaving a small fraction of the profit to the sugar planter.

SCHEDULE F—TOBACCO, ETC.

The total percentage of labor cost in tobacco manufactures is 18.9 per cent. The difference in this country and abroad, taking the word of the chairman of the Committee on Finance,

would be approximately 9½ per cent; the ad valorem rate of the Senate bill is 87 per cent.

SCHEDULE G—AGRICULTURAL, ETC.

Here the labor cost is 4.5 per cent; the difference in labor cost could not possibly equal the freight, and these products might as well be free, with some very minor exceptions, even from a standpoint of absolute protection.

But instead of corresponding with the rate required to protect, the rate is put at 32 per cent, which is perfectly silly, and should not deceive the most stupid man that ever plowed a furrow. For example, the tariff on corn is 15 cents a bushel (par. 227), and the total amount imported in 1907 was 9,000 bushels, and the amount raised was 2,595,320,000 bushels.

And the farmers of the country are flattered with 15 cents a bushel tax to keep the pauper labor of Europe from running them out of their cornfields. The American farmer who does not see the hypocrisy of this schedule and the profound contempt which it exhibits for his intelligence is assuredly incapable of reason.

SCHEDULE I—COTTON MANUFACTURES.

The labor cost in cotton manufactures, according to the figures of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, is 21.4 per cent. The difference in the labor cost in the United States and abroad would be between 10 and 11 per cent. The schedule is put at 47 per cent.

SCHEDULE J—FLAX, ETC.

In like manner the difference in the cost of labor in the production of flax, hemp, and jute goods is 7 per cent. The schedule is 44 per cent.

SCHEDULE K—WOOL, ETC.

The difference in the cost of production measured by labor in this country and abroad is about 8 per cent. The tariff is 58 per cent.

SCHEDULE L—SILK, ETC.

Silk and silk goods: The difference in labor cost of production is 10 per cent, but the proposed tariff is 60 per cent, so as to insure a monopoly.

SCHEDULE M—PAPER, ETC.

Pulp, paper, and books: In this schedule the difference in the labor cost of production at home and abroad is between 11 and 12 per cent. The tariff schedule is 21 per cent.

SCHEDULE N—SUNDRIES.

And, finally, in sundries the difference of labor cost in this country and abroad is 9 per cent, while the Committee on Finance imposed an equivalent ad valorem of 23 per cent.

I challenge the chairman of the Committee on Finance to answer this exhibit, and invite him to use all of his experts, and to put on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his answer, where it may be critically examined by the scholars of the country.

I charge him before the country and before the eyes of civilized mankind with writing these schedules, under the pretense of protecting the American workingman, far above the total cost of the labor in the gross product, which would not be justified even if the percentage of labor cost in similar articles abroad was absolutely nothing. But granted that the labor cost abroad is one-half what it is in the United States, I put in this table the maximum average rate, thus measuring the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and call the attention of the country to it.

The defense of these monopoly protecting schedules has been as remarkable as the schedules themselves. To my inquiry as to why the rates were not adjusted to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, the first defense was that of the Senator from New Hampshire, that the inquiry as to what was the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad was absurd.

Mr. President, I have demonstrated that the answer of the Senator from New Hampshire is itself absurd, if it were offered in perfect good faith, as I am sure it was.

The next answer would appear to come from the Senator from Massachusetts, who, having explained a question I did not ask, saw fit to suggest he could not give the Senator from Oklahoma the understanding with which to comprehend, and when I succeeded in enabling him to understand my question he confessed that he was not prepared to answer it.

The Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, whose genuine good temper at least I always admire, suggested as a proper answer to my inquiry that I was "new to the Senate," a polite way of suggesting a lack of learning and understanding which is commonly practiced by the managers of the committee on committees when they can not answer intelligently an embarrassing question.

The Senator from Montana, another one of the able defendants of this totally indefensible bill, with its monopoly-protecting schedules, thought it a sufficient answer to suggest that the Senator from Oklahoma could not expect to be furnished with intelligence.

Mr. President, I invite the defenders of this bill to put upon the face of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an answer to these tables which I have submitted, showing the relative labor cost of our manufactures and the gross disparity of the schedules they submit in comparison with the lower rates which would properly measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

The proponents of these schedules, in my opinion, can not answer my objections without putting themselves to utter confusion, if they answer in a spirit of perfect moral and intellectual integrity and frankness, because it contains a multitude of items which are practically prohibitive, which produce no revenue worth mentioning, and has resulted necessarily in the exclusion of foreign competition, followed by combinations in restraint of trade and the establishment of monopoly prices—charging the people too much for what they buy from monopoly and paying them too little for what they sell to monopoly. This is why the Republican organization pledged itself to revise the tariff and made the people believe it would be a downward revision.

I give a table of examples of these prohibitive duties, together with the paragraph of the bill, duty, the revenue, and the table from which the information is drawn.

These are but a few of the items which might be multiplied indefinitely.

EXHIBIT 14.

It should be remembered that in products of wholesale international use our imports may be prevented by a small tax where it makes the imports unprofitable, so that the prohibitive rates which average just high enough to prevent competition, as shown by the table below, serve as a great check to international commerce and lower the amount of revenue which we ought to receive under a system of liberal imports and exports.

The trivial reductions claimed to have been made by the Senate bill as amended are of no consequence, because the rates lowered were so far above the prohibitive point that lowering the rates leaves them still prohibitive and reminds me of the quotation of my colleague from Macbeth:

Then be these juggling fiends no more believed,
Who palter with us in a double sense,
Who keep the word of promise to our ear,
And break it to our hope.

TAXING RAW MATERIALS INJURIOUS TO AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS AND NATIONAL COMMERCE.

Mr. President, when we tax by the tariff the materials needed by our manufacturers, whether such materials are raw materials or partly in the process of manufacture, we put our American manufacturers at a serious disadvantage in competing with foreign manufacturers in the markets of the United States and obstruct our own commercial expansion.

Foreign countries provide their manufacturers in large degree with free raw material, and therefore with cheaper materials needed for manufacture. Foreign manufacturers have, therefore, this advantage over our manufacturers in competing for the markets. Taxing raw materials used by our manufacturers will, for this reason, limit our foreign exports of manufactured goods. This means limiting the production of American factories. This means restricting the number of our workmen, lessening the demand for their labor, lowering their wages; and, what is more, means also a smaller output and a consequent greater cost to the consumer (over and above the increased cost imposed by higher raw materials), for the reason that the greater the output the more economic the production.

Cheaper material means a greater foreign market for American productions; it means increased demand for American labor; it means higher wages for American labor; and it means cheaper prices for American consumers, always believing, as I believe, that the artificial prices now fixed by monopoly will be in due season abated.

American manufacturers are at a further disadvantage because they sell to foreigners the goods needed in more advanced manufactures cheaper than they do to each other within our own borders. Because of this, millions of capital created by American labor is going abroad to get the advantage of these cheaper prices and to employ, not American workmen, but foreign workmen. (See North's report.)

ANY OBSTRUCTION TO COMMERCE LIMITS THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE LEGITIMATE EMPLOYMENT OF BOTH CAPITAL AND LABOR.

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious, that having provided a tariff high enough to equal "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad," so as to put our manufacturers

on a perfect level with the manufacturers of foreign lands in the cost of production, that any further tax upon our imports or our exports, or upon their imports or exports is merely a barrier to a free interchange of commerce, limiting both our commerce and their commerce.

There is a very important factor in commerce separate and apart from the question of equality of cost. We import woolen goods, cotton goods, silk goods, and we export goods of the same material to the very countries from which we import such goods. The factor entering into this proposition is not one of cold economy alone, for it obviously would be more economical to buy our woolen goods in our own country and save the difference of freight and the same thing would be true for the Europeans—that it would be better for them to keep their goods at home from a standpoint purely of economy.

But the question of economy is not the only factor controlling or guiding exports and imports. It is a question of taste and of personal fancy that causes Americans to buy French, Scotch, or English goods, and which causes the Scotch, English, and French to buy American goods. We enlarge their markets by buying their stuff. They enlarge our markets by buying our stuff. We increase the demand for their labor; they increase the demand for our labor; and we export no more than we import, for the volume of our exports is determined by the volume of our imports (using these terms to cover credits and expenditures).

VOLUME OF EXPORTS CONTROLLED BY VOLUME OF IMPORTS.

This question can be reduced to a mathematical demonstration, properly interpreted. It is only necessary to take the unit of the export or of the import to determine this question. When the American exports \$100,000 worth of goods in any form, whether in cotton bales or in cotton cloth, he receives from his foreign customer a hundred thousand dollars in money, or credit, which he may convert at his will into cash or into goods, and his export will be balanced with an import or its mercantile equivalent in cash, in credit, or expenditure abroad, or with work performed, as in carrying freights, and so forth.

A vast multitude of such transactions do not alter this substantial truth. It merely enlarges and emphasizes it, and it may be taken as a sound commercial maxim that our exports are balanced by our imports and our imports are balanced by our exports, and when we obstruct our imports we obstruct our exports, and thereby diminish the world's demand for the goods of our manufacturers; we thereby diminish the world's demand for the products of American labor; we thereby diminish the demand for American labor; we thereby diminish the employment of American labor and lower the wages of American labor.

BALANCE OF TRADE.

[Giffen Essays in Finance, 161.]

Tables showing the balance of trade are apt to mislead men. For example, our statistics will exhibit in one column our imports, in another column our exports, and the balance is called the "balance of trade." If we have exports more than we have imports in these tables the balance of trade is said to be in our favor.

This conclusion of the balance being in our favor is unmitigated nonsense. Whenever we ship goods from the United States we get what our citizens regard as the equivalent, in cash, credits, or other property.

He who attempts to draw any conclusion whatever as to a nation's wealth or poverty from the mere fact of a favorable or unfavorable balance of trade has not grasped the first fundamental principle of political economy. (R. T. Ely, Problems of To-day, p. 28.)

The plain truth is our statistics, showing merely "exports" and "imports," do not and can not take into account our credits abroad or the credits of foreigners in the United States.

They do not and they can not take into account the payment by the United States of exceeding \$100,000,000 annually for ocean-going freight and passengers carried exclusively in foreign bottoms. These tables can not take into account expenditures of citizens of the United States abroad, which probably exceed \$100,000,000 per annum.

These tables do not take into account millions of dollars shipped abroad by foreigners working in the United States.

These tables do not take into account numerous foreign investments made by citizens of the United States in foreign lands and by foreigners in our land.

These tables do not take into account even the transfer of great estates from the United States abroad by international marriages.

The plain truth, which can not be disputed without stultification, is this, that for every export we receive its equivalent in cash or credit, and for every import we pay in cash or credit.

The available gold in the world, which is the basis of what we call "cash," is a comparatively small amount. The total gold in the United States amounted to one thousand five hundred

and ninety-three millions December 31, 1906. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1907, pp. 742.)

The annual production of gold in the world amounted to four hundred millions in 1906. Germany had over a thousand millions in gold, and France about a thousand millions in gold, and the British Empire about a thousand millions in gold in 1906, and all of the gold money on earth combined did not exceed seven billions.

No thoughtful man will pretend that we can pursue a policy by which our exports would be paid in gold and not paid in the goods and credits and properties of foreign countries. It can therefore be taken as true that our exports are paid for by imports, and that when we limit our imports we limit our exports and our national commerce under a law as fixed as the law of gravitation.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire made a single defense with regard to these schedules which I desire to answer, and it is the only defense, outside of that of the chairman, so far as I have observed in the Record, that I regard as meeting the matter in any degree, and that is the statement, in effect, that by lowering these schedules we would invite into this country the imports of other countries, which would throw out of employment our own laborers.

This theory, Mr. President, is not sustained by the theory of economic teaching which shows that inevitably exports are always paid for by imports and imports are paid for by exports. If we examine into the individual transactions of which the aggregate is composed, we will observe that when any American ships abroad any export, whether it be cotton or cotton goods of any kind, he is immediately paid in cash or cash credits or its equivalent, and therefore there comes back to the United States the immediate equivalent of that which the American exports. That individual export is instantly balanced. Since the whole must be composed of its several parts, it follows that exports are paid for by imports and imports are paid for by exports, and when we reduce the tariff and invite into our country foreign exports in effect we stimulate American industries; we enlarge the productive power of the American factory; we increase the demand for labor and the employment of capital; and we put ourselves in the attitude of shipping abroad more things than we now ship and enlarging both our exports and imports in like volume. I think the reason why our imports and our exports compare so unfavorably with the other nations of the earth is largely because we have followed the Chinese method of excluding, in large measure, the products of other lands.

I wish to call attention to our status as to imports and exports per capita.

COMPARISON OF THE COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

We plume ourselves on our tremendous commerce in exports and imports when, in point of fact, our rank among other nations of the world in the quantity of our foreign commerce per capita is entirely discreditable to us. In the quantity of our exports and imports we rank far inferior to every highly civilized country in Europe, as the following table will exhibit, taken from the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1907, page 738:

Imports and exports per capita of countries, 1906.

Country.	Imports.	Exports.
United States.....	17.30	22.10
Argentina.....	34.87	54.87
New Zealand.....	70.23	85.70
Australia.....	53.77	79.70
Belgium.....	93.90	75.30
Canada.....	45.08	39.84
Costa Rica.....	22.53	29.25
Chile.....	21.25	29.89
Cuba.....	62.31	66.03
Denmark.....	64.82	55.55
France.....	25.86	24.77
German Empire.....	28.05	22.56
Netherlands.....	184.36	143.01
Norway.....	36.22	21.91
Sweden.....	29.23	22.98
Switzerland.....	81.97	59.97
United Kingdom.....	68.45	42.49
Uruguay.....	21.13	38.34

The imports of the German Empire, of France, United Kingdom, of the Netherlands, of Norway and Sweden, of Switzerland, exceed their exports by hundreds of millions, but the exports of Siam, Egypt, Peru, British Indies, Haiti, Cuba, Mexico, Russia, Santo Domingo, and the Kongo have their exports exceeding their imports, and we are not in a good class if civilization and intelligence are considered.

We are in the activity of our foreign commerce, however, decidedly ahead of the Kongo Free State, Persia, Peru, Paraguay, India, Siam, and Turkey. Our country can feel but little pride in the school of political economy, if organized blind greed can be called a school of political economy, controlling the United States and its pitiful comparison with the foreign output of the other intelligent nations of the world. Let us at least equal Great Britain, which has learned the economic truth that prohibitive tariffs obstruct and do not promote commerce, and let us act upon that policy, retaining our tariff for revenue, high enough for honest incidental protection and no higher.

Our patriotic citizenship has been grossly misled by the leaders of the party in power as to our comparative commercial activities.

The growth of our exports and imports show a small relative increase:

Our total imports:	
1881.....	650,000,000
1890.....	773,000,000
1900.....	830,000,000
1907.....	1,415,000,000
Our total exports:	
1881.....	883,000,000
1890.....	845,000,000
1900.....	1,370,000,000
1907.....	1,853,000,000
Population in—	
1881.....	58,000,000
1890.....	62,000,000
1900.....	75,000,000
1907 (estimated).....	88,000,000

It will be seen from these tables that notwithstanding the tremendous improvement in modern machinery and the increased output from that source, and the wonderful growth of seagoing vessels and their freight-carrying capacity, our exports and imports have about doubled in twenty-six years and have not increased much faster than our population. This is a discreditable showing to the intelligence of the American people.

It will thus be seen, Mr. President, that our exports and imports are small compared to the exports and imports of nations whom we have been taught to believe inferior to us; but in the building of a nation we are ourselves vast consumers of our own products, and this must stand to our credit.

It will also be seen that our exports and imports have not grown in the last quarter of a century much more rapidly than our population, which shows in fact that we have not kept pace in foreign exports with the enormous productive capacity of modern machinery and invention.

These are facts worthy of consideration, which tend to show the natural consequences of obstructing our imports by prohibitive taxes, by vexatious and difficult regulations; and the present bill is peculiarly unwise because instead of providing a substantial reduction on the prohibitive tariff rates and removing the obstructions to our commerce it has utterly failed to do so. On the contrary, it has increased many items and the average of all items, and the crowning absurdity is offered in proposing to penalize foreign countries, who are already largely excluded from our markets, by threatening them with a 25 per cent advance on rates now largely prohibitive unless they promptly remove within the year the tariff obstructions which are obnoxious to us, and thus we invite the retaliation of the nations of all the world. Nations are composed of individuals, and the law of human nature which governs the individual will govern nations to a substantial degree.

OUR NATIONAL PROSPERITY IS NOT DUE TO A PROHIBITIVE TARIFF, BUT IN SPITE OF IT.

Mr. President, it has been a common practice for the advocates of the high tariff to claim that the prosperity of the people of the United States and the employment of its people is due to the so-called "protective tariff;" nothing could be more utterly fallacious.

Modern prosperity is due to the dissemination of human knowledge through the printing press, inventions of labor-saving machinery, hundreds of thousands of inventions under the reward of personal patents granted by the United States, granted by Great Britain, by Germany, by France, by Norway and Sweden, by Italy, by Japan, by every civilized country in the world.

The United States has granted over 900,000 different patents covering art in manufacture, but the art to which we are chiefly indebted for our modern prosperity is the development of paper making and the printing presses, by which the learning and the knowledge of all men is made the common property of every man and enriched him beyond all computation.

Out of these inventions have sprung the incredibly cheap manufacture of cloth and fabrics of every description; of metals in a multitude of forms, from Bessemer steel to the Waterbury watch, made by machinery and distributed to man at an in-

credibly cheap price. The telegraph, the telephone, the modern railway, the mail service, and every agency of civilization have been brought into service by the wonderful increase of the intelligence of man. China has just completed its first railway built by Chinese engineers and workmen, and soon will be the joint heir of the wonderful increase in human knowledge.

All of the nations of the world prosper in this magnificent development of the human race, due to the increased intelligence of man, due to modern processes, springing chiefly, and above all, from the great invention of Gutenberg.

Mr. President, not long since I stood upon the banks of the Niagara River. Down the canal below the great falls I saw a great wood yard, and saw two men passing pieces of wood to an endless belt. I followed it down the bluff nearly 200 feet; below a giant penstock of 7 feet in diameter delivered a column of water upon a turbine wheel developing over 1,000 horsepower, which caused to spin with lightning speed French burr wheels, against which these pieces of wood were placed and pressed by hydraulic pressure.

They melted almost instantly, and the macerated fiber by an endless belt, passing immediately to the paper factory on top of the bluff, was automatically delivered into a circular vat with moving arms; adjacent was a man engaged in putting into this vat sizing; the prepared mixture was fed upon an endless belt, porous—the water dripped through, the sheet of wet paper emerged, passing through a series of rolls, the last ones heated by steam, and at the end of the comparatively small room the material which a few minutes before had been logs of wood appeared as rolls of news paper ready for the Hoe press.

At Herald square, New York, I saw these same rolls being fed like lightning into giant printing presses and emerging a modern newspaper, a miracle of design; hundreds of thousands of copies turned out in a few short hours, full of learning, literature, art, full of business, full of wit and humor, full of the news of the whole world gathered together by the ablest men with the aid of the telephone and telegraph; filled with beautiful illustrations and photographs of everything conceivable.

Mr. President, where is the advocate of the prohibitive tariff so lacking in common sense or intellectual integrity that he will assert that these great advances of the human race, which are common to all the civilized nations, whether they have or whether they have not a protective tariff, nevertheless enjoy all of these things. Let those who believe that these things are due to the protective tariff support this bill and applaud it. But those that see that these things are due to the development of the human race and to the providence of God can be misled by no such shallow sophistry.

Mr. President, England has been very prosperous; she is the mistress of the seas; the sun never sets upon her dominions; her wealth is enormous. The prosperity of England is not due to the protective tariff, but to the policy of the greatest freedom of international commerce.

France and Germany have the protective tariff and are likewise prosperous, but they are prosperous in spite of the protective tariff and not because of it. The prosperity of the whole world is due to the increasing intelligence of the human race, its mastery over the forces of nature, its substitution of machinery for the labor of man.

"Protectionists justly contend that the high tariff of 1897 has not ruined the foreign trade of the United States, which on both its import and export sides has exhibited a great advance." Undoubtedly this contention is true, but the obstructions interposed in commerce has not served to make the imports and exports of the United States contrast favorably with the exports and imports of other nations. The imports and exports of the United States do not compare favorably with those of the civilized nations of the world, as I have already shown.

One thing should be settled for all time, and that is such prosperity as we have can not be due to the artificial obstruction of our international commerce.

HOW THE PRESENT SYSTEM WAS ESTABLISHED.

It would seem incredible that the monopoly engendering policy could be established and persisted in against the will of the people, and I shall endeavor to show how this has occurred and its proper remedy.

In 1856 both parties were agreed on a low revenue-producing tariff. For fifteen years everybody had been content with the low Walker tariff of 1846. The exigency of the civil war required a high tariff for the extra revenues demanded at that time.

Like all tariffs this Morrill tariff of 1861 raised the prices on the consumer and gave the American manufacturer a special opportunity to make money at the expense of the consumer.

When the war was over the question of lowering the tariff began to be considered.

The Protective Tariff League was thereupon organized, with far-reaching affiliations, powerful press agencies, with an educational bureau which instructed every boy who approached the voting age throughout the United States in the sophistry of a high tariff, appealing to his patriotism to stand by American labor. This policy has had abundant success, but it could not have succeeded except for the political changes in party administration which had taken place prior to the war.

This change to which I refer was the transfer of the power directly from the people through the agencies of precinct conventions, nominating delegates to county conventions, county conventions composed of delegated delegates to select delegates for the state convention, state conventions composed of delegates delegated by delegated delegates.

These political functionaries were thrice removed from the people, the state delegates being delegated by county delegates, the county delegates being delegated by precinct delegates, and the precinct delegates probably delegated by the local representatives of what is known as the "machine politician" and his petty circle.

In machine politics the precinct manager will call a primary at some place convenient for his control and probably inconvenient for the attendance of the people. He will notify his strikers in advance and be sure of a sufficient number to put through a slate and plan agreed upon. In this manner the machine can evade a wholesome public opinion and manipulate the delegates to the county convention, and with this machine county convention a machine state convention is assured.

In this manner any person having an important material interest to serve, such as establishing or maintaining a policy of government, permitting some people to tax other people for their benefit, have a political opportunity.

All that the Protective Tariff League and its commercial and political allies had to do under this system of government was to have a proper bureau established, see to it that representatives of the system were in place to manage the machine politics; and in this way they have been able to control nominating conventions—county, State, and national—and the will of the great body of the people could not make itself freely felt, being unorganized and not clearly realizing the manner in which the monopoly-producing system was taxing them.

The Protective Tariff League and the representatives of selfish commercial interests, the beneficiaries of the manipulations of our statutes, have intertwined and interwoven themselves with the organization of the Republican party in such a manner as to be inextricable. They have successfully appealed to the well-known patriotism of the great body of Republican citizens and skillfully trained them to believe as true, things which were not true in fact, and were sophistical in reason and unsound in conclusion. This process has gone on until it has become impossible to separate the political and patriotic impulse from the commercial, so that men of high character and upright purposes find themselves used against their will and are more often used in total unconsciousness of the fact that they are being used by commercial interests under the color of patriotism and party pride. The machine method of politics is a bad method and ought to be abated.

BOTH PARTIES HAVE BEEN AFFECTED BY THIS EVIL.

It is this method which sometimes sends to the Senate of the United States representatives who would not be the choice of the people at a popular election.

It is natural therefore that the election of Senators by direct vote, or the nomination of Senators by direct vote, should not be approved by those who have been or might expect to be indebted to machine politics hereafter for their own preferment.

It was a recognition of this abuse, which has grown up in our country, that led the Democratic party at Denver, which, I freely confess, is not entirely purged of this evil of machine politics, to put the query to the people of the United States, Shall the people rule?

The true remedy for this condition is not by an inconsequential debate with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, who has spent months and years over these schedules without ever touching the only question of importance, to wit, the difference in the cost of the production at home and abroad, but it is to be found by reducing the political machine to innocuous desuetude and the restoration of the people's rule by the direct primary, allowing each citizen, regardless of party, to

nominate and elect his representative in county, State, and Nation, and to establish an "initiative and referendum," with its salutary check on the representatives of the people.

Machine politics glorifies organization and forgets that the best safeguard of society is to allow the actual sentiment of the majority of the people having appreciable education to rule and not take that power out of their hands by clever machine manipulation.

When we follow delegation of power from the citizen to the primary delegate, from the primary delegate to the county delegate, from the county delegate to the nominee for the legislature, from the member of the legislature to the United States Senate, a Senator chosen in this manner is four degrees removed from the people.

Through machine politics selfish interests can exercise an undue influence in our parties and in our administration of government. I can not but feel that the influences of monopoly in this country are in present control; that this bill is written to serve their purposes; to make the rich richer and the poor poorer; to benefit the few at the expense of the many.

In making this comment I do so with the profound conviction that this condition can not be greatly prolonged, but that the American people will in a short time cause the laws to be so amended as to promote the greatest of all modern needs—the more equitable distribution of the proceeds of human labor.

Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate longer. I have taken some pains to show that in the protected industries the labor of the country is not paid as well as in the unprotected industries; that labor has continued to receive a diminishing part of the proceeds of labor; that labor has not received a fair share of its own product. I have undertaken to show how labor was naturally oppressed by the upbuilding of gigantic monopolies in this country, whose policy was to close up factories, to pay labor as small a wage as possible, to raise prices, and to limit the output; to tax the people as high as they thought the "traffic would bear," and to control their wage-earners, both commercially and politically. That is a very natural thing for them to do. They are not greatly to blame if the law permit. The lawmaker is greatly to blame if the law continues to permit.

But I have also demonstrated that our census shows, in the most overwhelming and convincing manner, that this bill has paid no attention whatever to "the difference in cost of production at home and abroad;" that that difference, even if the foreign manufacturer paid nothing whatever for his labor, could not exceed nineteen and a fraction per cent for pure protective purposes, while many of the rates in this bill exceed 100 per cent. Having shown this, having pointed out what the effect has been upon the wages and general conditions of labor and upon the mortality of human life under this system of government which we have been following; having submitted the suggestions for the amendment of these conditions, in the hope that perhaps in the future they may be of some use to future students of these questions, I am done.

I have called attention to the policy of New Zealand, which protects human life first, which has controlled monopoly, in order that the poorer and the weaker elements of society may have a better opportunity to live. I have called attention to what the necessary result is of gigantic fortunes piling up until the fortune of a single individual will reach nearly a thousand millions; that its only effect upon this country must be to absorb all of the transportation and transmission companies, all the coal mines, all of the purchasable lumber and ores, all of the purchasable real estate, all of the things visible and invisible desired by men and generally grouped together and called the "opportunities of life."

There can be but one result, and the Senate is in honor bound to consider this and to find a way to control it and correct it, in order to protect the children and the women, as well as the men of this country.

I can do nothing more than appeal to the Senate and to call their attention to their responsibility in this matter. Having done so, I have discharged the only duty which it is possible for me to discharge. I have given many days of hard labor to this question, and of unremitting industry, in a desire to place upon this record the truth, and nothing but the truth, in the hope that it might appeal to the leaders of the Senate, and, if it did not, that it might appeal to the people of the United States.

APPENDIX.
EXHIBIT 2.

Tables prepared by Edward Atkinson, of Boston, showing the relative number of employees in the so-called "protected or partially protected industries." (S. Doc. 46, 61st Cong., 1st sess.)

CLASS I.

Persons occupied for gain who are free from the competition of an import from a foreign country:

(We sell to Canada twice the quantity of the products of agriculture and of manufactures that we import. In ratio to numbers the Canadians are now our best foreign customers, and there is little opposition to the treaty of reciprocity.)

Free of foreign competition in agriculture or listed under that title.

Farmers, planters, and overseers	5,674,875	
Agricultural laborers	4,410,877	
Gardeners, florists, and nurserymen	61,788	
Dairy men and women	10,875	
Other agricultural pursuits	5,530	
		10,163,945
Lumbermen and raftsmen		72,020
Stock raisers, herders, and drovers		84,988
Turpentine farmers and laborers		24,737
Wood choppers		36,075
		10,381,765

Less the number subject to competition removed to Class III

200,000

10,181,765

Also free of foreign competition.

All persons in professional service	1,258,739
All persons in domestic and personal service	5,580,657
All persons in trade and transportation	4,766,964

21,788,125

Free from foreign competition in manufactures and the mechanic arts.

Persons occupied in building trades	1,212,528
Oil wells and employees	24,626
Brick and tile makers (with a few exceptions)	49,933
Miners and quarrymen (with a few exceptions)	563,866
Bakers	79,188
Butchers	113,956
Confectioners (with a few exceptions)	31,194
Millers	40,548
Blacksmiths	226,477
Iron and steel workers (with a few exceptions)	290,611
Steam boiler makers	33,046
Stove, furnace, and grate manufacturers	12,473
Wheelwrights	13,505
Boot and shoe makers (with a few exceptions)	208,912
Leather curriers and tanners (with a few exceptions)	42,671
Bottlers and soda-water manufacturers	10,519
Cabinetmakers (with a few exceptions)	35,619
Coopers	37,200
Saw and planing mill operatives	161,624
Other woodworkers	111,273
Paper-box makers	21,098
Charcoal, coke, and lime burners	14,448
Model and pattern makers	15,073
Rubber factory operatives (with a few exceptions)	21,866
Upholsterers	30,821
Small miscellaneous industries (with a few exceptions)	471,300
Printers, lithographers, and pressmen (with a few exceptions)	155,147
Fishermen and oystermen	68,177
Less the small number in deep-sea fisheries transferred to Class III numbering not over	8,000
	60,177
Engineers and firemen	223,495
Less the proportion probably occupied in arts in Classes II and III in part or fully subject to foreign competition	23,495
	200,000
	4,289,697

CLASS II.

Persons occupied for gain who would be practically free from foreign competition if materials of foreign origin used in their processes were free of duty:

Chemicals (other than oil wells and oils)	14,814
Glass workers (subject to a few exceptions)	49,998
Marble and stone cutters (subject to a few exceptions)	54,460
Potters (mostly making tiles, drainpipes, etc.) (subject to a few exceptions)	16,140
Butter and cheese (subject to a few exceptions)	19,241
Food preparations (subject to a few exceptions)	28,782
Machinists (subject to a few exceptions)	283,145
Tool and cutlery makers (subject to a few exceptions)	28,122
Wire-workers (subject to a few exceptions)	18,487
Harness and saddle (subject to a few exceptions)	40,101
Trunk and leather case (subject to a few exceptions)	7,051
Brewers and maltsters (subject to a few exceptions)	20,962
Distillers and rectifiers (subject to a few exceptions)	3,144
Brass workers (subject to a few exceptions)	26,760
Clock and watch makers (subject to a few exceptions)	24,120
Gold and silver workers (subject to a few exceptions)	26,112
Tin plate and tinware (subject to a few exceptions)	70,505
Other metal workers (subject to a few exceptions)	56,602
Bookbinders (subject to a few exceptions)	30,278
Engravers (subject to a few exceptions)	11,151
Paper and pulp mills (subject to a few exceptions)	86,328
Textile industries	567,065
Less those occupied in the finer and fancy fabrics, say, removed to Class III	67,065
	500,000
Tailors, seamstresses, milliners, shirt makers, and makers of other clothing	907,466
Less those who are on the finest articles of fancy and fashion	7,466
	900,000

Engineers and firemen	23,495
Glove makers	12,271
Less removed to Class III	2,271
	10,000
Broom and brush makers	10,220
Photographers (with a few exceptions)	26,941
Tobacco and cigars (with a few exceptions)	131,452
Manufacturers and officials	243,082
Less transferred to Class III	3,082
	240,000

Deducting for the few exceptions in fine and fancy cut and plate glass; Italian marble; fine and hand-decorated china; Stilton, Roquefort, and other fancy cheeses; Scotch marmalade and the like; worsted combers and other machinery in which there is much hand work; fancy cutlery; English saddles and harnesses of high cost; handmade trunks, boots, and shoes; foreign beer and ale of special brands; fine wines and liquors; hand work in brass, copper, gold, and silver; a few watches; finely bound and printed books, engravings, and photographs; fancy paper; handmade brushes; and a few other articles not specifically transferred to Class III, estimated in number at

2,708,411

There remains in Class II free of competition

2,396,295

CLASS III.

Subject to foreign competition—	
In agriculture	200,000
In deep-sea fisheries	8,000
Textile operatives	67,065
Clothing	7,466
Glove makers	2,271
Manufacturers and officials	3,082

Add from tabulation of Classes I and II as per previous list of exportations

287,884

Probable number subject to foreign competition

312,116

That number comprises all who, in the judgment of the compiler, could be subject to foreign competition of an adverse or urgent kind if no duty, even for revenue, were maintained. A moderate duty for revenue purposes would incidentally protect them.

RECAPITULATION.

Class I.—Persons who can not be subjected to foreign competition, but who pay their proportion of duties on imports and of the enhancement of prices brought into effect by protection	26,077,822
Class II.—Persons not subject to foreign competition, whose industry in many branches would be promoted by the abatement of duties on materials of foreign origin used by them	2,396,295
Class III.—Persons occupied in arts which would require a readjustment if all duties were suddenly removed, which no one proposes	600,000
Total	29,074,117

In all these arts there is, and probably always will be, an import of the fine and fancy fabrics or of articles chosen for style or fashion, all of which are suitable subjects for revenue duties. These imports rather set a standard for domestic manufacturers to emulate than subject them to competition in the great bulk of their products, which are for the use of the millions rather than the millionaires. Tobacco will always be subject to revenue duties. Under existing conditions there is no justification for duties on machinery, pig iron, copper, coal, ores, or other metals, which are the materials and tools of our domestic industry. We are exporting the highest types of metallurgy and machinery, while the tax on special machinery of other kinds which we import, and upon coal, ores, hay, potatoes, fish, beeves, and other necessities are burdens upon industry of the most obnoxious kind.

I have also assumed the abatement of duties on wool, hides, drugs, dyestuffs, and chemicals, from which about \$15,000,000 of revenue are now derived. So long as these taxes exist the manufactures of textile fabrics, boots, shoes, and leather goods, paper, and many other articles are restricted and their exports are much lessened.

Under Class II, subject only in small part to foreign competition, are also listed glass, pottery, chemicals, tools, brewers, clocks, watches, gold and silver ware, tailors, milliners, photographers, and machinery. I have made allowance by exceptions in these arts to the best of my judgment.

In all these arts there is, and probably always will be, an import of the fine and fancy fabrics or of articles chosen for style or fashion, all of which are suitable subjects for revenue duties. These imports rather set a standard for domestic manufacturers to emulate than subject them to competition in the great bulk of their products, which are for the use of the millions rather than the millionaires. Tobacco will always be subject to revenue duties. Under existing conditions there is no justification for duties on machinery, pig iron, copper, coal, ores, or other metals, which are the materials and tools of our domestic industry. We are exporting the highest types of metallurgy and machinery, while the tax on special machinery of other kinds which we import, and upon coal, ores, hay, potatoes, fish, beeves, and other necessities are burdens upon industry of the most obnoxious kind.

If anyone takes exception to this division, and now justifies the continuance of a tariff for "protection with incidental revenue," let him carry over as many as he honestly can from Classes I and II into Class III, giving reasons for such changes. I think it will prove impossible for any sincere student of the subject to designate 1,000,000 persons out of the 29,000,000 now occupied for gain whose industry would be seriously or adversely affected, even if all duties on foreign products of like kind were at once removed—an act which no one proposes. If all duties on materials were removed, the number would be lessened far below a million.

On the other hand, there are proportionately in agriculture from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 out of 10,000,000 who rest upon exports for the disposal of their surplus products. There are about as many persons occupied even in manufacturing and in the mechanic arts only, whose products are exported, as there are in all the same arts which are now or can be protected by duties on imports. Out of 29,000,000 persons occupied for gain, not over 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 are or can be directly affected by tariff legislation, either by the obstruction of exports or imports in consequence of duties on imports. Twenty-five million are engaged in arts necessary to the existence of society and which can neither be promoted nor retarded by duties on imports, except so far as the cost of their living is increased by an ill-adjusted or injudicious system of taxation.

EXHIBIT 3.

Distribution of employees for the year ending June 30, 1907, by groups.

[Statistics of railways in United States, 1907, Interstate Commerce Commission.]

Territory covered.	General administration.		Maintenance of way and structures.		Maintenance of equipment.		Conducting transportation.		Unclassified.	
	Number.	Per 100 miles of line.	Number.	Per 100 miles of line.	Number.	Per 100 miles of line.	Number.	Per 100 miles of line.	Number.	Per 100 miles of line.
Group I.....	2,728	33	22,517	276	13,282	163	47,069	577	73	1
Group II.....	12,905	54	101,183	424	89,965	377	197,476	827	196	(a)
Group III.....	7,458	29	73,698	283	56,484	217	106,362	409	57	(a)
Group IV.....	4,238	32	25,011	192	17,848	137	34,083	262	603	5
Group V.....	6,396	24	45,714	176	35,441	136	62,415	240	764	3
Group VI.....	12,606	25	99,734	195	57,470	112	124,588	244	270	1
Group VII.....	2,043	17	22,654	190	10,838	91	19,386	162
Group VIII.....	7,331	23	66,563	210	30,491	96	59,998	190	102	(a)
Group IX.....	3,587	22	29,800	181	16,293	99	25,574	156	697	4
Group X.....	5,516	29	51,129	267	24,069	126	36,514	191	855	4
United States, 1907.....	64,808	28	538,003	236	352,181	155	713,465	314	3,617	2
United States, 1906.....	57,054	26	495,879	223	315,952	142	649,820	292	2,650	1
United States, 1905.....	54,141	25	448,370	207	281,000	130	595,456	274	3,229	1
United States, 1904.....	48,746	23	415,721	196	261,819	123	566,798	267	3,037	2
United States, 1903.....	45,222	22	433,648	211	253,889	124	576,881	281	2,897	1
United States, 1902.....	41,071	20	399,592	200	228,280	114	518,390	259	1,982	1
United States, 1901.....	38,816	20	343,717	176	206,418	105	479,111	245	3,107	2
United States, 1900.....	36,451	19	324,946	169	197,799	103	450,063	234	8,394	4
United States, 1899.....	34,170	18	287,163	153	180,749	96	417,508	223	9,334	5
United States, 1898.....	32,431	18	261,866	142	171,600	93	398,907	216	9,754	5
United States, 1897.....	31,871	17	244,873	134	160,667	88	378,361	206	7,704	4

^a Less than 1.

Comparative summary of average daily compensation of railway employees for the years ending June 30, 1907 to 1897.

[Average daily compensation in dollars.]

Class.	United States.										
	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.	1897.
General officers.....	11.93	11.81	11.74	11.61	11.27	11.17	10.97	10.45	10.03	9.73	9.54
Other officers.....	5.99	5.82	6.02	6.07	5.76	5.60	5.56	5.22	5.18	5.21	5.12
General office clerks.....	2.30	2.24	2.24	2.22	2.21	2.18	2.19	2.19	2.20	2.25	2.18
Station agents.....	2.05	1.94	1.93	1.93	1.87	1.80	1.77	1.75	1.74	1.73	1.73
Other station men.....	1.78	1.69	1.71	1.69	1.64	1.61	1.59	1.60	1.60	1.61	1.62
Enginemen.....	4.30	4.12	4.12	4.10	4.01	3.84	3.78	3.75	3.72	3.72	3.65
Firemen.....	2.54	2.42	2.38	2.35	2.28	2.20	2.16	2.14	2.10	2.09	2.05
Conductors.....	3.69	3.51	3.50	3.50	3.38	3.21	3.17	3.17	3.13	3.13	3.07
Other trainmen.....	2.54	2.35	2.31	2.27	2.17	2.04	2.00	1.96	1.94	1.95	1.90
Machinists.....	2.87	2.69	2.65	2.61	2.50	2.36	2.32	2.30	2.29	2.28	2.23
Carpenters.....	2.40	2.28	2.25	2.26	2.19	2.08	2.06	2.04	2.03	2.02	2.01
Other shopmen.....	2.06	1.92	1.92	1.91	1.86	1.78	1.75	1.73	1.72	1.70	1.71
Section foremen.....	1.90	1.80	1.79	1.78	1.78	1.72	1.71	1.68	1.68	1.69	1.70
Other trackmen.....	1.46	1.36	1.32	1.33	1.31	1.25	1.23	1.22	1.18	1.16	1.16
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen.....	1.87	1.80	1.79	1.77	1.76	1.77	1.74	1.80	1.77	1.74	1.72
Telegraph operators and dispatchers.....	2.26	2.13	2.19	2.15	2.08	2.01	1.98	1.96	1.93	1.92	1.90
Employees—account floating equipment.....	2.27	2.10	2.17	2.17	2.11	2.00	1.97	1.92	1.89	1.89	1.86
All other employees and laborers.....	1.92	1.83	1.83	1.82	1.77	1.71	1.69	1.71	1.68	1.67	1.64

Comparative summary of average daily compensation of railway employees for the years ending June 30, 1907 to 1897, by groups.

GROUP I.—NEW ENGLAND.

[Average daily compensation in dollars.]

Class.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.	1897.
General officers.....	13.34	12.76	12.58	11.92	11.32	10.91	10.92	10.70	10.53	9.75	9.42
Other officers.....	5.72	5.65	5.89	6.22	5.79	6.01	5.58	5.80	5.67	6.15	6.18
General office clerks.....	2.13	2.06	2.08	2.04	2.05	2.06	2.07	2.08	2.08	2.11	2.12
Station agents.....	2.03	1.99	1.96	1.93	1.88	1.84	1.82	1.80	1.81	1.79	1.79
Other station men.....	1.91	1.89	1.84	1.83	1.78	1.74	1.77	1.79	1.76	1.77	1.76
Enginemen.....	3.78	3.62	3.60	3.55	3.51	3.50	3.48	3.48	3.45	3.48	3.45
Firemen.....	2.20	2.08	2.07	2.02	2.00	1.98	1.98	1.97	1.96	1.97	1.95
Conductors.....	3.26	3.19	3.12	3.09	3.01	2.94	2.96	2.97	2.94	2.93	2.89
Other trainmen.....	2.32	2.17	2.12	2.09	2.02	1.96	1.94	1.94	1.91	1.92	1.88
Machinists.....	2.61	2.45	2.44	2.41	2.34	2.26	2.31	2.29	2.26	2.26	2.17
Carpenters.....	2.25	2.15	2.13	2.11	2.07	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.04	2.03	2.00
Other shopmen.....	2.02	1.95	1.93	1.88	1.86	1.85	1.85	1.86	1.87	1.89	1.82
Section foremen.....	2.24	2.17	2.14	2.13	2.10	2.07	2.04	2.03	1.96	2.00	2.00
Other trackmen.....	1.55	1.52	1.50	1.49	1.46	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.43	1.43	1.40
Switch tenders, crossing tenders, and watchmen.....	1.68	1.65	1.60	1.57	1.54	1.53	1.53	1.48	1.46	1.48	1.49
Telegraph operators and dispatchers.....	2.15	2.07	2.01	1.94	1.86	1.80	1.82	1.84	1.76	1.75	1.78
Employees—account floating equipment.....	2.22	2.17	2.13	2.10	1.85	1.70	1.70	1.71	1.65	1.64	1.63
All other employees and laborers.....	1.85	1.80	1.76	1.72	1.68	1.65	1.64	1.66	1.63	1.70	1.65

Comparative summary of average daily compensation of railway employees for the years ending June 30, 1907 to 1897, by groups—Continued.

GROUP VI.—WISCONSIN, ILLINOIS, IOWA, MINNESOTA—continued.

Table with 12 columns: Class, 1907, 1906, 1905, 1904, 1903, 1902, 1901, 1900, 1899, 1898, 1897. Rows include Machinists, Carpenters, Other shopmen, Section foremen, Other trackmen, Switch tenders, telegraph operators, and All other employees and laborers.

GROUP VII.—NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, MONTANA, WYOMING, NEBRASKA.

Table with 12 columns: Class, 1907, 1906, 1905, 1904, 1903, 1902, 1901, 1900, 1899, 1898, 1897. Rows include General officers, Station agents, Firemen, Conductors, Other trainmen, Machinists, Carpenters, Other shopmen, Section foremen, Other trackmen, Switch tenders, telegraph operators, and All other employees and laborers.

GROUP VIII.—MISSOURI, ARKANSAS, OKLAHOMA, KANSAS, COLORADO.

Table with 12 columns: Class, 1907, 1906, 1905, 1904, 1903, 1902, 1901, 1900, 1899, 1898, 1897. Rows include General officers, Station agents, Firemen, Conductors, Other trainmen, Machinists, Carpenters, Other shopmen, Section foremen, Other trackmen, Switch tenders, telegraph operators, and All other employees and laborers.

GROUP IX.—LOUISIANA, TEXAS, NEW MEXICO.

Table with 12 columns: Class, 1907, 1906, 1905, 1904, 1903, 1902, 1901, 1900, 1899, 1898, 1897. Rows include General officers, Station agents, Firemen, Conductors, Other trainmen, Machinists, Carpenters, Other shopmen, Section foremen, Other trackmen, Switch tenders, telegraph operators, and All other employees and laborers.

GROUP X.—PACIFIC STATES, ARIZONA, NEVADA, UTAH.

Table with 12 columns: Class, 1907, 1906, 1905, 1904, 1903, 1902, 1901, 1900, 1899, 1898, 1897. Rows include General officers, Station agents, Firemen, Conductors, Other trainmen, Machinists, Carpenters, Other shopmen, Section foremen, Other trackmen, Switch tenders, telegraph operators, and All other employees and laborers.

EXHIBIT 4.

Labor wages in building trades where not protected but duly organized.

[Prepared by Wm. T. Spencer, Secretary Building Trades Department, American Federation of Labor.]

Name of city.	Masons and bricklayers.	Structural iron setters.	Ornamental iron setters.	Plasterers.	Lathers.	Hoisting engineers.	Tile setters.	Plumbers.	Steam fitters.	Steam fitters' helpers.	Remarks.
Albany, N. Y.	Cents. 60	Cents. 45	Cents. 45	Cents. 60	Cents. 45	Cents. \$3.00	Cents. 40	Cents. 50	Cents. 43½	Cents. 43½	Roofers work 10 hours; other trades, 9 hours.
Atlanta, Ga.	45	44½	44½	40	29½	\$3.00	40	40	\$3.50	\$1.25-\$2.00	
Baltimore, Md.	b 56½ c 62½	50	31½-43½	62½	50	62½	50	43½	43½	25	Slate and tile roofers, 50 cents. Rate of wages is the maximum.
Boston, Mass.	60	50	50	60	45	70	60	55	53	25	
Buffalo, N. Y.	b 50 c 55	50	30	50	d \$2.25	e \$3.00	56½	43½	43½	e \$1.50	All trades work 9 hours.
Burlington, Vt.	40-45			40-45	e \$2.50			e \$3.00	e \$3.00	e \$1.50	
Birmingham, Ala.	62½	62½	62½	56½	37½	50	62½	62½	62½	31½	Roofers and ornamental iron setters, 9 hours.
Chicago, Ill.	62½	60	56½	68½	62½	62½	62½	65	59½	30	Painters, 55 cents, January 1, 1909.
Cincinnati, Ohio.	62½	50	50	62½	52½	50	50	60	37½	23	Marble cutters and setters work 9 hours.
Cleveland, Ohio.	60	60	50-60	56½	e 4	50	43½-50	61½	50	25	Columbus, Ohio.
	b 50 c 62½	60	40	56½	d \$2.00	e \$3.00-3.60	40	50	45-50	e \$1.50	
Denver, Colo.	b 62½ c 75	50	30-50	68½	e 4½-6	50	50-56½	62½	62½	31½	Detroit, Mich.
	50-60	25-37½	e \$2.50-\$3.00	a \$4.00-4.50	40	e \$2.00-2.25	50	e \$3.00-3.75	e \$2.50-3.75	e \$1.50-2.00	
Duluth, Minn.	b 60 c 65	45	45	62½	50	45	50	62½	60	31	Erie, Pa.
	b 45 c 60	45		40	e 3			37½	37½		
Grand Rapids, Mich.	b 40-55 c 55	50	50	50	45	e \$2.00-2.50	50	38½	38½	e \$2.00	Galveston, Tex.
	75			75	e 3½-4		75	62½	62½	25	
Indianapolis, Ind.	65	50	50	50	45	50	50	50	50	25	Jersey City, N. J.
	65			65	62½	62½	62½	56½	56½	37½	
Kansas City, Mo.	b 60 c 70	50	50	68½	50	50	62½	62½	62½	25	Louisville, Ky.
	b 55 c 60	30-40	22-30	62½	50	/ \$10	50	50	43½-50	15½-17½	
Milwaukee, Wis.	60	50	50	60	45	50	56½	56½	50	2	Minneapolis, Minn.
	60	50	45	62½	e 4	40	35-50	50	50	25	
Montreal, Canada.	b 40 c 50	20-25	22½-27½	33½-40	30	25	25	35	35	e \$1.25	Memphis, Tenn.
	70	50		62½	e 3	50	56½	50	50		
New Orleans, La.	62½	50	50	50-65	50	50	62½	56½	56½	17½	New York City, N. Y.
	70	56½	56½	68½	56½	a \$5.50	62½	62½	62½	37½	
Newark, N. J.	65	43½-56½	55-62½	65	55	60	50	50-55	50	25	Omaha, Nebr.
	62½	47½	47½	62½	43½	37½	50	62½	56½	25	
Portland, Oreg.	b 56½ c 81½	37½-40	37½-40	68½	d \$1.75		62½	56½-62½	56½-62½		Pittsburg, Pa.
	60-65	50	50	52½	40	50	50-55	56½	50		
Providence, R. I.	b 45 c 55	35	40	55	40	37½	55	50	37½	21½	Philadelphia, Pa.
	b 50 c 62½	50	30	59½	48½	50	55	43½	30-37½	18-25	
Rochester, N. Y.	57	50	50	57	e \$4.00	e \$3.00	37½	40½	40½	e \$1.50	Seattle, Wash.
	75	55	50-55	75	62½	50-62½	62½	81½	81½		
St. Paul, Minn.	b 50 c 60	50	50	56½	e 3 3/4 e 4 5	f 40 f 45	37½-50	42½-56½	45	32½	San Francisco, Cal.
	87½	62½	62½	87½	62½	75	75	75	75	37½	
St. Louis, Mo.	b 56½ c 65	60	65-70	75	62½	62½	56½	66½	68½	37½	Salt Lake City, Utah.
	\$6.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$2.50	
Scranton, Pa.	b 45 c 55	50	50	50	50	30	50	47	40	25	Syracuse, N. Y.
	55	50		55	d \$2.25	40		50	50		
Toronto, Canada.	50	25-30	30-35	50	42	35	50	40	40		Tacoma, Wash.
	62½	55	55	75	d \$2.25 e 5	43½	70	70	70	31	
Toledo, Ohio.	60	40	25	50	45	30		43½	37½	50	Wheeling, W. Va.
	60	50	50	43½	43½	45	50	46½	46½	15	
Washington, D. C.	62½	50	50	62½	a \$2.25-2.50	50	50	50	50	e \$2.20	Wilmington, Del.
	b 45 c 51	50	50	50	35	40	45	40	40	35	

a Per day.
b Masons.

c Bricklayers.
d Per thousand.

e Per yard.
f Per week.

g Pine.
h Metal.

i Hoisting.
j Swing.

k Cutters.

Labor wages in building trades where not protected but duly organized—Continued.

Name of city.	Gas fitters.	Carpenters.	Stone cutters.	Marble cutters and setters.	Painters.	Sheet-metal workers.	Electricians.	Roofers.	Cement finishers.	Laborers and hod carriers.	Remarks.
Albany, N. Y.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	
Atlanta, Ga.	a \$3.00	a \$2.50-3.50	45 50	50	a \$2.50-2.75	a \$3.00	a \$3.00	a \$1.75	50 45	a \$1.25	Roofers work 10 hours. Other trades 9 hours.
Baltimore, Md.	43½	34½-43½	b 45 c 50	37½-50	31½-37½	37½	43½	25-35	50	d \$1.50 e 31½	Slate and tile roofers, 50 cents. Rate of wages is the maximum.
Boston, Mass.	45	43½	50	45	39½	43½	45	f 37½ g 45½	50	h 25	
Buffalo, N. Y.	43½	40	50	50½	37½	37½	40	22½-30	40	i 15-22	
Burlington, Vt.	a \$2.75	a \$2.75	37½		a \$2.50		a \$2.50			a \$1.50-1.75	All trades work 9 hours.
Birmingham, Ala.	62½	40	45	62½	47½	47½	43½	25	56½	a \$1.25	Roofers and ornamental iron setters, 9 hours.
Chicago, Ill.	65	50½	56½	56½	50	56½	62½	52½	55	35	Painters 55 cents, Jan. 1, 1909.
Cincinnati, Ohio	37½	45	56½	a \$4.00	45-47½	25-40	40½	37½	40	e 40	Marble cutters and setters work 9 hours.
Cleveland, Ohio.	56½	42½	50	f 31½-43½ g 50	37½	37½	43½	25-40	50	25-28½	
Columbus, Ohio.	35	40-45	50	50	35	a \$2.50-3.00	37½-40	31-40	35	d 20 e 34½	
Denver, Colo.	62½	55	56½	f \$3.00-3.50 g 55	50	56½	50	40	37½-56½	34½-37½	
Detroit, Mich.	c \$2.50-3.50	30-40	50	a \$2.00-3.00	25-40	25-35	a \$2.50-3.00	f 30-35 g 20-30	a \$2.50-3.50	a \$1.50-2.00	
Duluth, Minn.	62½	45	56½	50	45	47½	46½	45	50		
Erie, Pa.		30	45	45	35	25-30	30½		40	20-25	
Grand Rapids, Mich.	38½	35	45	50	35	27-30	27-40	a \$2.25-3.00	a \$2.50-3.00	11½-22½	Nearly all trades work 9 hours. Rate of wages paid same as 1907.
Galveston, Tex.	62½	45			45	40	45	45	75	25	Rate of wages paid same as 1907.
Indianapolis, Ind.	40	40	50	40-75	30-37½	40	25-37½			d 25 e 25-31½	Rate of wages paid same as 1907.
Jersey City, N. J.	56½	50	62½	62½	45	50	50	50	62½	37½	
Kansas City, Mo.	62½	40	56½	56½	45	42½	40-50	35	50	d 25-30 e 35	
Louisville, Ky.		37½-40	50	f 33½ g 44½	37½	30½	37½-43½		30-40	a d \$1.75 a e \$2.50	Marble and sheet metal workers, 9 hours; cement finishers and iron setters 10 hours.
Milwaukee, Wis.	56½	37½	50	56½	37½	37½	40	40	50	30	
Minneapolis, Minn.	40	42½	56½	30-50	42½	42½	31½-37½	25-30	30-35	20	Wages same as in 1907.
Montreal, Canada.	35	22½-30	26-40	25-30	25-30	30-35	22½-30	22½	30	15-20	All trades work 9 hours per day.
Memphis, Tenn.	50	45	62½		40	41½	40	41½	20-50	30	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
New Orleans, La.	50	35-45	45-50	45-50	37½	35-45	45	30	40-50	20-27½	Plasterers' hodcarriers, 35 cents.
New York City, N. Y.	62½	62½	62½	62½	a \$3.50	56½	56½	h \$4.75 i \$3.00	62½	a \$2.80	
Newark, N. J.	50	50	60	56½	47½	50	50	43½-50	35-40	35	
Omaha, Nebr.	56½	30-43	50	45	45	40-50	40	52	50	25-30	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Portland, Ore.		37½-43½	56½	43½	37½-43½	50	37½-43½		28-44½	30-40	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Pittsburg, Pa.	56½	43½-50	50	50	42½	37½-42½	50	50	40-50	25-37½	
Providence, R. I.	40	41	50	50	35	40	37½	25		21-28	
Philadelphia, Pa.	30-37½	45	50	50	40	40	40	40	45	i 18½ j 30-35	Marble laborers, 25 cents. Fresco painters, 47½ cents.
Rochester, N. Y.		40½	57	37½	\$3.00	37½	37½	37½	37½	21-23	Iron setters' helpers, \$2.50 per day.
Seattle, Wash.	81½	50-62½	62½	62½	50	50-62½	50	50	62½	25-31½	
St. Paul, Minn.	40-56½	35-45	56½	f 30-40 g 37½-50	40	40	41½	k 41½ l 50	32½	15-25	Roofers work 9 hours per day; engineers and laborers, 10 hours.
San Francisco, Cal.	75	62½	62½	62½	56½	68½	62½	m 68½ n 75	75	i 37½ j 50	Cement laborers, 50 cents.
St. Louis, Mo.	66½	60	56½	56½	50	56½	65	62½		42½-45	
Salt Lake City, Utah	\$5.00	\$4.50	\$4.00	\$6.00	\$4.50	\$4.50	\$3.50-4.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$4.50	Rate scale is by the day.
Scranton, Pa.	47	37½	45	45	37½	45	37½	40	50	25	
Syracuse, N. Y.		40	50	43½	43½	37½	43½		50	20	
Toronto, Canada.		30-35	50	30-35	35	32½-35	30	25-30	30-40	25	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Tacoma, Wash.	70	45	70	40	45	62½	50	62½	50	31-45	
Toledo, Ohio.	50	35	50	50	35		37½	25	35	25	
Wheeling, W. Va.	46½	37½	50	50	42½		37½	40	37½	40	Rate of wages paid same as in 1907.
Washington, D. C.	50	50	50	56½	43½	50	50	50	50	a d \$1.50 a e \$2.50	
Wilmington, Del.	40	40	50	50	40	35	35	35	55	35	

a Per day.
b Hard stone.

c Soft stone.
d Laborers.

e Hod carriers.
f Cutters.

g Setters.
h Composition.

i Per week.
j Hoisting.

k Slate.
l Metal.

EXHIBIT 5.
[From Bulletin 77, United States Bureau of Labor, 1907.]
CARPETS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
	Burlers, female:			
North Atlantic.....	59.02	58.87	\$0.1434	\$0.1467
Dyers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.56	58.49	.1586	.1623
Loom fixers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.98	59.11	.2777	.2817
Spoolers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.68	58.62	.1285	.1311
Twisters, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.48	58.53	.1116	.1239
Weavers, brussels and wilton, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.29	58.24	.3004	.3048
Weavers, ingrain, male:				
North Atlantic.....	59.75	59.88	.1593	.1575
Weavers, ingrain, female:				
North Atlantic.....	57.16	59.46	.1567	.1501
Winders, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.47	58.59	.1250	.1378

Protected by a tariff of from 50 to 114 per cent. (Pars. 380 to 390.)
Work people in trade poorly organized in some localities; it is prohibited by employers.
Average labor percentage of all textiles is 19.5.

CLOTHING—FACTORY PRODUCT.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
	Buttonhole makers, machine, male:			
North Atlantic.....	56.25	56.75	\$0.2469	\$0.2450
South Atlantic.....	55.54	55.70	.2641	.2487
United States.....	55.78	56.09	.2583	.2473
Buttonhole makers, machine, female:				
North Atlantic.....	53.50	53.38	.1282	.1428
South Atlantic.....	53.10	53.77	.1688	.1271
North Central.....	54.27	54.43	.1692	.1350
South Central.....	55.22	56.00	.1217	.1212
United States.....	54.21	54.46	.1487	.1317
Cutters, hand, male:				
North Atlantic.....	52.10	52.51	.3672	.3697
South Atlantic.....	53.77	53.62	.3192	.3203
North Central.....	48.61	48.63	.4131	.4326
South Central.....	57.14	57.14	.2255	.2380
United States.....	51.15	51.37	.3761	.3846
Cutters, machine, male:				
North Atlantic.....	50.00	50.54	.4267	.4300
South Atlantic.....	54.18	54.35	.3616	.3757
North Central.....	48.07	48.09	.4382	.4262
United States.....	49.27	49.14	.4244	.4198
Examiners, male:				
North Atlantic.....	52.08	52.84	.2858	.2904
South Atlantic.....	53.74	56.15	.2388	.2358
North Central.....	50.95	50.51	.3247	.3217
United States.....	51.95	52.56	.2921	.2921
Examiners, female:				
North Atlantic.....	53.57	52.93	.1447	.1468
South Atlantic.....	55.14	55.38	.1159	.1195
United States.....	54.36	54.07	.1303	.1341
Finishers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	55.13	54.88	.1161	.1301
South Atlantic.....	57.88	56.78	.1155	.1278
North Central.....	54.00	54.00	.1346	.1377
South Central.....	56.14	55.91	.1015	.1051
United States.....	55.63	55.16	.1201	.1286
Pressers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.87	54.06	.2152	.2285
South Atlantic.....	59.25	56.96	.2116	.2149
North Central.....	54.08	54.06	.2676	.2675
South Central.....	56.95	56.76	.2071	.1975
United States.....	55.04	54.70	.2280	.2369
Sewing machine operators, male:				
North Atlantic.....	54.94	55.12	.2188	.2243
South Atlantic.....	53.71	55.88	.2579	.2349
North Central.....	54.02	54.03	.3103	.3161
South Central.....	57.50	56.75	.2791	.2809
United States.....	55.50	55.16	.2320	.2351

CLOTHING—FACTORY PRODUCT—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
	Sewing machine operators, female:			
North Atlantic.....	53.75	53.70	\$0.1330	\$0.1378
South Atlantic.....	56.26	56.63	.1373	.1407
North Central.....	54.10	54.09	.1939	.1885
South Central.....	54.59	54.95	.1302	.1317
United States.....	54.41	54.53	.1420	.1454

Protected by tariff of from 70 per cent to 118 per cent. Paragraphs 376 to 399.
Work people in trade making brave endeavors to organize.
Average percentage of labor in all textiles 19.5 per cent.

COTTON GOODS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
	Carding machine tenders, male:			
North Atlantic.....	59.20	58.62	\$0.1242	\$0.1333
South Atlantic.....	65.38	63.51	.0875	.1046
South Central.....	63.35	63.17	.1053	.1115
United States.....	61.25	60.47	.1127	.1263
Dyers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.00	58.27	.1413	.1549
South Atlantic.....	64.73	62.79	.0966	.1124
United States.....	60.71	58.96	.1346	.1484
Loom fixers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	59.27	58.10	.2171	.2448
South Atlantic.....	65.27	63.39	.1434	.1560
South Central.....	64.32	64.51	.1642	.1633
United States.....	60.73	59.56	.1999	.2228
Spinners, frame, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.82	58.29	.1199	.1333
South Atlantic.....	65.82	64.16	.0899	.0909
United States.....	61.18	59.99	.1098	.1210
Spinners, frame, female:				
North Atlantic.....	59.05	58.38	.1120	.1290
South Atlantic.....	65.59	63.50	.0761	.0904
South Central.....	64.27	64.31	.0668	.0710
United States.....	60.96	60.09	.0999	.1146
Spinners, mule, male:				
North Atlantic.....	59.37	59.07	.1978	.2328
Weavers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.48	58.55	.1698	.1940
South Atlantic.....	65.56	63.54	.1117	.1270
South Central.....	65.00	64.82	.1105	.1127
United States.....	60.89	60.21	.1498	.1719
Weavers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.85	58.67	.1483	.1668
South Atlantic.....	65.76	63.44	.0958	.1129
South Central.....	62.89	62.98	.0950	.0955
United States.....	60.17	59.73	.1366	.1531

DYEING, FINISHING, AND PRINTING TEXTILES.

Bleachers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.47	58.36	\$0.1282	\$0.1368
Calenders, male:				
North Atlantic.....	59.02	58.85	.1435	.1472
Color mixers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.98	58.74	.1333	.1417
Dyers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.66	58.53	.1460	.1501
Engravers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	57.72	56.86	.4534	.4520
Printers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.20	58.27	.4476	.4477

Protected by tariff of from 17 per cent to 61 per cent (par. 313 to 314-315-317) and on cotton threads from 20 per cent to 78 per cent (par. 310).
Work people making brave endeavors to organize.
Average percentage in all textiles, 19.5.

FOUNDRY AND MACHINE SHOP.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Blacksmiths, male:				
North Atlantic.....	57.70	57.30	\$0.2962	\$0.3068
South Atlantic.....	55.17	55.13	.2887	.3062
North Central.....	56.51	56.40	.3094	.3115
South Central.....	56.06	56.65	.3435	.3541
Western.....	54.39	54.11	.3573	.4207
United States.....	56.69	56.52	.3111	.3200
Boiler makers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.46	56.32	.2992	.3055
South Atlantic.....	54.28	54.09	.2976	.3163
North Central.....	55.58	55.42	.3198	.3121
South Central.....	58.42	58.34	.3146	.3076
Western.....	54.03	53.42	.3997	.4645
United States.....	56.00	55.73	.3162	.3290
Boiler riveters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.24	55.64	.2871	.2755
South Atlantic.....	54.00	54.00	.2639	.2533
North Central.....	57.11	57.95	.3087	.2647
South Central.....	58.50	57.18	.1509	.1679
United States.....	55.35	55.78	.2774	.2614
Brass finishers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	54.17	54.12	.2748	.2793
North Central.....	55.76	55.93	.2736	.2699
United States.....	54.73	54.73	.2744	.2762
Core makers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.51	55.64	.2706	.2616
South Atlantic.....	55.00	54.86	.2769	.2862
North Central.....	55.18	55.34	.2511	.2603
South Central.....	55.50	56.00	.2867	.2934
Western.....	53.53	53.21	.4131	.4239
United States.....	55.81	55.43	.2701	.2780
Core makers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	54.75	54.67	.1314	.1472
North Central.....	54.94	54.88	.1257	.1497
United States.....	54.93	54.88	.1269	.1496
Laborers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.90	56.19	.1623	.1681
South Atlantic.....	55.18	55.29	.1477	.1518
North Central.....	56.52	56.40	.1744	.1786
South Central.....	56.91	56.86	.1540	.1572
Western.....	54.39	55.04	.2412	.2508
United States.....	56.45	56.19	.1690	.1750
Machinists, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.61	55.86	.2829	.2948
South Atlantic.....	54.55	54.47	.2960	.3096
North Central.....	55.17	55.12	.2926	.2999
South Central.....	56.07	56.25	.3243	.3367
Western.....	54.46	53.94	.3759	.3940
United States.....	55.83	55.40	.2949	.3051
Molders, brass, male:				
North Atlantic.....	54.70	54.39	.3105	.3126
North Central.....	56.56	56.74	.2912	.2960
South Central.....	54.00	54.00	.3222	.3500
Western.....	54.00	54.00	.4305	.4653
United States.....	55.27	55.13	.3077	.3107
Molders, iron, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.20	55.76	.3180	.3290
South Atlantic.....	55.31	55.18	.3090	.3219
North Central.....	55.94	55.99	.3104	.3220
South Central.....	56.77	56.10	.3218	.3339
Western.....	54.21	54.54	.4227	.4277
United States.....	55.93	55.74	.3234	.3317
Pattern makers, metal, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.30	56.56	.3282	.3422
North Central.....	54.53	54.70	.3093	.3064
United States.....	54.72	54.95	.3113	.3113
Pattern makers, wood, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.89	55.62	.3458	.3542
South Atlantic.....	55.30	55.17	.3437	.3540
North Central.....	55.18	55.05	.3420	.3436
South Central.....	56.42	56.45	.3342	.3522
Western.....	54.71	54.83	.4534	.4590
United States.....	55.52	55.37	.3512	.3567

Protected by tariff up to 91 per cent on knives and variable on innumerable articles.
 Various trades in this industry fairly organized. Average percentage of labor cost in iron and steel products, 21.10.

FURNITURE.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Cabinetmakers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.36	53.06	\$0.3012	\$0.3041
South Atlantic.....	59.37	59.42	.1721	.1720
North Central.....	55.80	56.13	.2514	.2503
South Central.....	59.75	59.74	.1904	.1927
United States.....	55.50	55.65	.2577	.2577
Carvers, hand, male:				
North Atlantic.....	48.64	49.17	.3691	.3630
North Central.....	55.97	56.01	.2850	.2956
United States.....	52.73	53.30	.3221	.3222
Machine woodworkers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.32	56.27	.2576	.2636
South Atlantic.....	59.37	59.38	.1706	.1741
North Central.....	57.97	58.04	.2106	.2155
South Central.....	59.84	59.82	.1778	.1745
United States.....	58.03	58.03	.2101	.2156
Sawyers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	54.26	54.20	.2772	.2890
South Atlantic.....	59.57	59.62	.1897	.1855
North Central.....	57.84	57.72	.2174	.2236
South Central.....	59.91	59.90	.1898	.1907
United States.....	57.36	57.28	.2255	.2313
Upholsterers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	48.89	49.01	.3909	.3981
North Central.....	55.77	55.48	.2675	.2748
United States.....	53.48	53.38	.3104	.3148
Varnishers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.93	55.53	.2378	.2441
South Atlantic.....	59.58	59.62	.1922	.1528
North Central.....	57.31	57.24	.1997	.2044
South Central.....	59.82	59.73	.1554	.1632
United States.....	57.25	57.11	.2072	.2080

Protected by tariff of 35 per cent. (Par. 211.)
 Work people poorly organized.
 Average percentage of labor in general manufacturing goods, 19.9.

GLASS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Batch makers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	59.30	59.12	\$0.1810	\$0.1832
South Atlantic.....	57.78	57.40	.1969	.1994
North Central.....	61.11	61.16	.1984	.2076
United States.....	59.89	59.74	.1891	.1939
Blowers, flint glass, male:				
North Atlantic.....	49.60	49.65	.6413	.6570
South Atlantic.....	55.42	55.50	.5738	.5698
North Central.....	49.98	49.90	.6722	.6806
United States.....	50.21	50.24	.6510	.6616
Blowers, green glass, male:				
North Atlantic.....	47.91	47.77	.7616	.7963
South Atlantic.....	50.00	50.00	.7994	.8009
North Central.....	49.64	49.49	.7846	.7704
United States.....	48.65	48.42	.7718	.7894
Blowers, window glass, male:				
North Atlantic.....	41.91	41.95	.8892	.9443
North Central.....	40.00	40.00	.8571	.9213
United States.....	41.20	41.21	.8772	.9355
Cutters, window glass, male:				
North Atlantic.....	44.41	44.45	.7044	.7489
North Central.....	55.14	55.54	.6831	.7490
United States.....	49.02	49.07	.6953	.7490
Flatteners, window glass, male:				
North Atlantic.....	57.16	57.55	.7519	.8471
North Central.....	56.35	56.00	.6788	.7738
United States.....	56.81	56.87	.7208	.8151
Gaffers, flint glass, male:				
North Atlantic.....	51.17	51.28	.5376	.5306
North Central.....	49.50	49.50	.8014	.7989
United States.....	51.04	51.10	.5583	.5580

GLASS—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Gatherers, flint glass, male:				
North Atlantic.....	50.41	50.48	\$0.3082	\$0.3090
South Atlantic.....	58.00	58.00	.2956	.3031
North Central.....	49.50	49.50	.3248	.3361
United States.....	50.62	50.51	.3115	.3231
Gatherers, window glass, male:				
North Atlantic.....	41.91	41.94	.6429	.6867
South Atlantic.....	40.00	40.00	.6079	.6829
United States.....	41.19	41.20	.6298	.6852
Laborers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	59.07	59.07	.1511	.1527
South Atlantic.....	58.75	58.88	.1391	.1380
North Central.....	59.65	59.66	.1530	.1726
United States.....	59.39	59.41	.1518	.1641
Leersmen, male:				
North Atlantic.....	57.18	57.44	.1718	.1784
South Atlantic.....	59.54	59.54	.1702	.1702
North Central.....	57.41	56.36	.1829	.1994
United States.....	57.37	57.21	.1761	.1846
Packers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.01	56.40	.1997	.2022
South Atlantic.....	51.62	52.16	.2073	.2096
North Central.....	59.47	59.46	.1886	.1921
United States.....	57.49	57.53	.1947	.1981
Pressers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	52.51	52.44	.4074	.5002
South Atlantic.....	53.23	53.27	.7866	.8817
North Central.....	49.99	50.33	.6357	.6388
United States.....	51.70	51.73	.5084	.5751
Press gatherers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	52.51	52.44	.3109	.3833
South Atlantic.....	53.00	53.00	.6404	.7230
North Central.....	50.05	50.00	.4826	.4723
United States.....	51.71	51.65	.3815	.4257
Teasers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	76.49	76.42	.2022	.2035
South Atlantic.....	80.31	80.80	.1782	.1783
North Central.....	83.58	83.63	.1751	.1840
United States.....	79.43	79.68	.1903	.1936

Protected by tariff of from 40 per cent to 382 per cent (par. 97 to 102).
 Work people in trade highly organized.
 Average percentage of labor in glass, 37.1.

HATS, FUR.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Blockers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.85	53.88	\$0.3534	\$0.3647
Colorers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.43	54.67	.1960	.1971
Coners, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.79	53.92	.2881	.2891
Curlers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.48	53.46	.5031	.4348
Feeders, female:				
North Atlantic.....	54.12	54.16	.1145	.1266
Finishers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.91	53.45	.3317	.3310
Flangers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.95	54.14	.3304	.3244
Fur blowers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.18	54.09	.1644	.1759
Hardeners, male:				
North Atlantic.....	54.00	54.11	.2925	.2959
Pouncers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	54.31	53.72	.2542	.2451
Sizers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.94	53.58	.3004	.3135
Stiffeners, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.79	53.91	.3991	.3665
Trimmers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	54.33	53.65	.1460	.1507
Weighers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	53.29	53.32	.1260	.1386

Protected by a tariff of from 35 to 62 per cent. (Par. 442.)
 Work people in trade fairly organized.
 Average percentage of labor in miscellaneous, 19.9.

HOSIERY AND KNIT GOODS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Boarders, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.60	58.08	\$0.2002	\$0.2220
South Atlantic.....	63.80	63.70	.1148	.1444
North Central.....	58.12	57.75	.1403	.1415
United States.....	59.66	59.12	.1682	.1855
Finishers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.05	58.97	.1377	.1458
South Atlantic.....	64.16	64.20	.0865	.1052
North Central.....	58.20	57.18	.1108	.1165
United States.....	58.51	58.87	.1271	.1353
Knitters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	63.28	60.39	.2031	.2030
South Atlantic.....	64.33	64.41	.1103	.1241
North Central.....	57.48	57.23	.2741	.3023
United States.....	61.65	60.33	.2112	.2144
Knitters, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.35	58.07	.1348	.1381
South Atlantic.....	59.38	59.25	.1001	.1059
North Central.....	56.33	56.12	.1073	.1164
United States.....	57.74	57.46	.1226	.1270
Loopers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.62	58.42	.1455	.1471
South Atlantic.....	63.98	63.68	.0885	.1017
North Central.....	58.48	57.89	.1219	.1252
United States.....	59.88	59.40	.1275	.1332
Menders, female:				
North Atlantic.....	59.16	58.87	.1272	.1310
South Atlantic.....	62.64	62.18	.0756	.0847
North Central.....	57.50	56.98	.1187	.1194
United States.....	59.45	59.06	.1151	.1199
Pressers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	59.26	59.35	.1697	.1757
South Atlantic.....	65.30	65.54	.0877	.1158
North Central.....	56.32	56.59	.1628	.1853
United States.....	60.19	60.33	.1470	.1629
Pressers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.63	58.75	.1032	.1014
South Atlantic.....	56.00	55.00	.1203	.1216
North Central.....	58.35	58.30	.1051	.1088
United States.....	58.35	58.30	.1051	.1088
Ribbers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	59.78	59.62	.1495	.1704
South Atlantic.....	59.09	58.96	.1226	.1224
North Central.....	59.62	59.41	.1430	.1549
United States.....	59.62	59.41	.1430	.1549

Protected by a tariff of from 30 to 64 per cent. (Pp. 325 to 327.)
 Work people poorly organized.
 Average per cent of labor in textiles, 19.5.

IRON AND STEEL, BAR.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Catchers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	64.04	63.89	\$0.3338	\$0.3484
South Atlantic.....	60.92	60.92	.2530	.2732
North Central.....	67.36	67.36	.5489	.5320
South Central.....	72.00	72.00	.2647	.3055
United States.....	65.44	65.29	.3978	.4094
Heaters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	64.70	64.63	.4948	.5656
South Atlantic.....	61.85	62.00	.4793	.5504
North Central.....	67.52	67.52	.6553	.6368
South Central.....	72.00	72.00	.4846	.4913
United States.....	66.49	66.50	.5719	.5926
Heaters' helpers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	67.64	67.50	.2456	.2587
South Atlantic.....	60.92	61.00	.2218	.2740
North Central.....	66.99	66.99	.3340	.3224
South Central.....	72.00	72.00	.1821	.1933
United States.....	67.10	67.10	.2707	.2844

IRON AND STEEL, BAR—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1905.	1907.	1905.	1907.
Hot straighteners, male:				
North Atlantic.....	63.41	63.97	\$0.2066	\$0.2124
South Atlantic.....	61.16	61.06	.1535	.1701
North Central.....	69.66	69.75	.2600	.2543
South Central.....	72.00	72.00	.1366	.1418
United States.....	65.67	65.76	.2078	.2125
Rollers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	63.76	63.66	.7042	.7734
South Atlantic.....	61.33	61.33	.7002	.7739
North Central.....	70.25	70.30	1.0850	1.0397
South Central.....	72.00	72.00	.9401	1.0059
United States.....	66.69	66.61	.8674	.8931
Roughers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	65.36	65.33	.3854	.4040
South Atlantic.....	61.14	61.14	.3410	.3785
North Central.....	61.01	61.37	.5182	.5761
South Central.....	72.00	72.00	.3324	.3519
United States.....	63.43	63.54	.4407	.4804

IRON AND STEEL, BESSEMER CONVERTING.

Blowers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.33	61.26	\$0.5440	\$0.5329
South Atlantic.....	74.00	74.00	.4229	.4412
North Central.....	66.55	66.55	.6174	.6382
South Central.....	75.00	75.00	.3898	.4125
United States.....	65.69	66.00	.5302	.5360
Bottom makers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	69.00	69.39	.3142	.2982
South Atlantic.....	72.00	72.00	.2193	.2320
North Central.....	67.00	67.00	.3430	.3428
South Central.....	65.14	64.29	.1790	.1689
United States.....	68.38	68.45	.2879	.2812
Ladle liners, male:				
North Atlantic.....	64.74	65.40	.3807	.3710
South Atlantic.....	73.50	73.50	.3166	.3459
North Central.....	66.55	66.55	.4443	.4424
South Central.....	75.00	75.00	.2240	.2527
United States.....	67.86	68.09	.3702	.3736
Melters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	66.48	67.29	.4084	.3831
South Atlantic.....	72.00	72.00	.3846	.4212
North Central.....	50.55	50.55	.5765	.5440
South Central.....	66.00	66.00	.4229	.4695
United States.....	61.09	61.73	.4705	.4501
Steel pourers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.41	53.20	.5259	.5135
South Atlantic.....	74.00	74.00	.4592	.5071
North Central.....	51.53	51.53	.7088	.6690
South Central.....	66.00	66.00	.4229	.4636
United States.....	57.19	55.42	.5712	.5590
Vessel men, male:				
North Atlantic.....	65.00	57.00	.5512	.5734
South Atlantic.....	72.00	72.00	.4123	.4484
North Central.....	55.09	55.09	.7634	.7349
South Central.....	78.00	78.00	.3049	.3316
United States.....	63.97	60.55	.5777	.5863

Protected by a tariff of from 13 to 14 per cent. (Par. 124.)
 Work people in trade fairly organized among independent producers;
 poorly organized where the trust controls.
 NOTE.—Frightfully long hours these people work.
 Average per cent of labor in iron and steel products, 22.10.

IRON AND STEEL, BLAST FURNACE.

Cinder snappers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	84.00	84.00	\$0.1478	\$0.1567
South Atlantic.....	84.00	84.00	.1375	.1404
North Central.....	84.00	84.00	.1743	.1794
South Central.....	84.00	84.00	.1287	.1264
United States.....	84.00	84.00	.1499	.1569
Hot-blast men, male:				
North Atlantic.....	84.00	84.00	.1813	.1907
South Atlantic.....	84.00	84.00	.1536	.1561
North Central.....	84.00	84.00	.1759	.1897
South Central.....	84.00	84.00	.1560	.1530
United States.....	84.00	84.00	.1738	.1822

IRON AND STEEL, BLAST FURNACE—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Keepers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	84.00	84.00	\$0.2023	\$0.2137
South Atlantic.....	84.00	84.00	.1836	.1865
North Central.....	84.00	84.00	.2133	.2228
South Central.....	84.00	84.00	.1662	.1656
United States.....	84.00	84.00	.1981	.2070
Keepers' helpers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	84.00	84.00	.1637	.1718
South Atlantic.....	84.00	84.00	.1396	.1428
North Central.....	84.00	84.00	.1749	.1841
South Central.....	84.00	84.00	.1287	.1331
United States.....	84.00	84.00	.1573	.1644
Top fillers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	81.95	81.98	.1640	.1763
South Atlantic.....	84.00	84.00	.1330	.1537
North Central.....	79.46	79.46	.1995	.2095
South Central.....	84.00	84.00	.1583	.1591
United States.....	82.04	82.11	.1655	.1765

Tariff of from 19 to 41 per cent. (Par. 129.)
 Average per cent of labor gross of product, 22.1.

LUMBER.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Cant setters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.00	60.00	\$0.1950	\$0.1950
North Central.....	60.83	60.83	.2089	.2179
South Central.....	60.00	60.00	.1875	.1875
Western.....	60.00	60.00	.2050	.2175
United States.....	60.63	60.63	.2053	.2129
Carriage men, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.00	60.00	.2686	.2759
South Atlantic.....	61.98	60.76	.1589	.1638
North Central.....	60.25	60.26	.2330	.2432
South Central.....	60.82	60.42	.1967	.2152
Western.....	60.00	60.00	.2417	.2578
United States.....	60.55	60.31	.2183	.2300
Choppers and sawyers, in woods, male:				
South Atlantic.....	62.21	62.27	.1433	.1449
North Central.....	60.34	60.48	.1831	.1906
South Central.....	60.37	60.39	.1787	.1844
Western.....	61.56	61.50	.2940	.3138
United States.....	60.64	60.73	.1934	.2013
Edgemen, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.00	60.00	.2765	.2773
South Atlantic.....	62.00	61.06	.1765	.1821
North Central.....	60.22	60.21	.2576	.2641
South Central.....	60.57	60.30	.2428	.2523
Western.....	60.00	60.00	.3268	.3420
United States.....	60.44	60.28	.2554	.2624
Filers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.00	60.00	.3500	.4421
South Atlantic.....	62.50	60.69	.4440	.4725
North Central.....	60.00	60.00	.4816	.4884
South Central.....	60.09	60.52	.5387	.5708
Western.....	60.00	60.00	.5113	.5402
United States.....	60.43	60.78	.4814	.5057
Laborers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.00	60.00	.1688	.1799
South Atlantic.....	60.71	59.96	.1332	.1367
North Central.....	60.32	60.16	.1744	.1804
South Central.....	61.00	60.74	.1507	.1604
Western.....	60.00	60.00	.2103	.2245
United States.....	60.44	60.22	.1729	.1805
Sawyers, band, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.00	60.00	.5136	.4870
South Atlantic.....	62.45	61.36	.5191	.5304
North Central.....	60.29	60.30	.5063	.5230
South Central.....	61.14	60.60	.5997	.5970
Western.....	60.00	60.00	.4975	.5069
United States.....	60.54	60.37	.5170	.5303

LUMBER—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Sawyers, circular, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.00	60.00	\$0.3500	\$0.3500
South Atlantic.....	61.67	60.83	.3673	.3700
North Central.....	60.00	60.00	.3667	.3411
South Central.....	60.00	60.00	.5119	.5378
Western.....	60.00	60.00	.5456	.5699
United States.....	60.24	60.12	.4477	.4439
Sawyers, gang, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.00	60.00	.2308	.2375
South Atlantic.....	59.33	56.00	.1667	.1833
North Central.....	60.38	60.38	.3072	.3210
South Central.....	60.00	60.00	.2815	.2877
Western.....	60.00	60.00	.3083	.3250
United States.....	60.13	59.81	.2766	.2886
Trimmers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.00	60.00	.2067	.2133
South Atlantic.....	62.74	62.19	.1494	.1496
North Central.....	60.27	60.31	.2274	.2285
South Central.....	60.43	60.43	.1799	.1836
Western.....	60.00	60.00	.2487	.2595
United States.....	60.46	60.46	.2150	.2160

Protected by a tariff of from 2.78 to 15.84 per cent. (Par. 197.)
Work people fairly organized in the West.

PAPER AND WOOD PULP.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Back tenders, male:				
North Atlantic.....	64.14	55.14	\$0.1766	\$0.2249
North Central.....	68.33	68.33	.1580	.1664
United States.....	65.02	57.57	.1727	.2142
Beaters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	61.23	53.34	.1783	.2054
North Central.....	68.79	68.74	.1628	.1665
United States.....	62.82	56.19	.1750	.1982
Bleachers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.25	53.47	.2036	.2113
North Central.....	62.57	62.57	.1640	.1668
United States.....	55.60	55.81	.1936	.1999
Calenderers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	54.56	56.20	.1980	.2047
North Central.....	64.88	64.88	.1752	.1777
United States.....	57.00	57.97	.1926	.1992
Calenderers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	55.00	55.00	.1382	.1505
Cutters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	52.24	58.01	.2123	.1722
North Central.....	59.14	59.12	.1758	.1796
United States.....	54.38	58.37	.2010	.1746
Cutters, female:				
North Atlantic.....	54.94	60.18	.1088	.1101
North Central.....	59.95	59.97	.0956	.1046
United States.....	56.13	60.13	.1056	.1086
Enamellers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	48.55	48.37	.2169	.2333
North Central.....	60.00	60.00	.1796	.1879
United States.....	51.64	50.18	.2062	.2263
Finishers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	60.05	56.96	.1776	.1959
North Central.....	59.93	61.40	.1791	.1835
United States.....	60.02	58.07	.1780	.1928
Finishers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	57.70	56.70	.1313	.1374
North Central.....	59.97	60.52	.1013	.1082
United States.....	58.97	58.60	.1144	.1229
Laborers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	59.31	58.65	.1573	.1606
North Central.....	60.62	60.59	.1499	.1550
United States.....	59.63	59.11	.1555	.1593

PAPER AND WOOD PULP—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Machine tenders, male:				
North Atlantic.....	61.11	53.99	\$0.2771	\$0.3349
North Central.....	68.35	68.35	.2696	.2716
United States.....	62.41	56.27	.2757	.3249
Press tenders, male:				
North Atlantic.....	66.73	58.90	.1572	.1842
North Central.....	61.44	61.44	.1343	.1453
United States.....	65.79	59.33	.1531	.1777
Pulp grinders, male:				
North Atlantic.....	68.11	52.64	.1592	.1975
North Central.....	71.93	71.92	.1342	.1492
United States.....	68.51	54.07	.1566	.1939
Rag sorters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	57.85	59.86	.1675	.1628
Rag sorters, female:				
North Atlantic.....	52.10	52.85	.1043	.1150
North Central.....	59.56	59.64	.0979	.1168
United States.....	53.77	54.63	.1029	.1155
Wood cookers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	61.39	56.28	.2056	.2421
North Central.....	71.75	71.75	.1833	.1885
United States.....	62.22	57.72	.2019	.2371
Wood preparers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	62.32	56.76	.1637	.1990
North Central.....	59.90	59.89	.1505	.1618
United States.....	61.81	57.24	.1609	.1933

Protected by a tariff of wood pulp free to 10 per cent. (Par. 402.)
Paper from 5.58 to 49 per cent. (Pars. 403 to 409.)
Work people fairly organized.
Average percentage of labor miscellaneous, 19.9.

POTTERY.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Dippers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	46.50	46.50	\$0.5206	\$0.5654
North Central.....	44.43	44.54	.5382	.5268
United States.....	45.06	45.12	.5329	.5382
Jigger men, male:				
North Atlantic.....	51.39	51.28	.4354	.4356
North Central.....	53.00	53.00	.4772	.4496
United States.....	52.41	52.37	.4620	.4445
Kiln firemen, male:				
North Atlantic.....	62.44	62.44	.3684	.3684
North Central.....	82.15	82.15	.2500	.2500
United States.....	74.09	74.09	.2984	.2984
Kiln men, male:				
North Atlantic.....	46.43	46.70	.3800	.3707
North Central.....	45.73	45.71	.4038	.4362
United States.....	46.04	46.13	.3933	.4084
Mold makers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.15	53.15	.3868	.3833
North Central.....	52.40	52.40	.3452	.3461
United States.....	52.70	52.70	.3616	.3607
Pressers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	52.72	52.68	.4354	.4445
North Central.....	53.00	53.00	.3737	.3619
United States.....	52.81	52.77	.4140	.4207
Sagger makers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	50.81	51.07	.5046	.4822
North Central.....	47.44	47.44	.5223	.5420
United States.....	49.13	49.19	.5134	.5131
Setters out, male:				
North Atlantic.....	46.22	46.22	.4867	.4915
North Central.....	45.68	45.68	.5120	.5477
United States.....	45.93	45.93	.5006	.5224

Protected by a tariff of from 20 to 60 per cent. (Pars. 90 to 92.)
Work people highly organized. Note the reasonable working hours.
Average percentage of labor in clay products, 37.1.

PRINTING AND BINDING, BOOK AND JOB.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Bookbinders, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.34	52.82	\$0.3440	\$0.3514
South Atlantic.....	54.00	53.08	.3081	.3269
North Central.....	53.84	53.63	.3150	.3195
South Central.....	53.52	53.17	.3128	.3213
Western.....	49.56	49.64	.3946	.4165
United States.....	53.36	53.02	.3280	.3363
Compositors, male:				
North Atlantic.....	50.53	50.16	.3614	.3712
South Atlantic.....	51.82	50.85	.3271	.3336
North Central.....	51.29	51.19	.3421	.3433
South Central.....	52.60	52.91	.3337	.3409
Western.....	43.07	48.91	.4335	.4671
United States.....	51.01	50.75	.3537	.3620
Compositors, female:				
North Atlantic.....	51.87	51.59	.2887	.3077
North Central.....	52.96	52.29	.2758	.2671
United States.....	52.24	51.74	.2843	.2989
Electrotypers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	51.54	51.63	.4216	.4239
North Central.....	52.95	51.45	.3505	.3617
Western.....	49.83	49.04	.4800	.5022
United States.....	51.99	51.26	.3960	.4050
Linotype operators, male:				
North Atlantic.....	49.49	49.42	.4545	.4581
South Atlantic.....	50.34	50.03	.4213	.4263
North Central.....	49.63	49.61	.4608	.4743
South Central.....	48.80	49.16	.4731	.4572
Western.....	47.91	47.50	.5690	.5743
United States.....	49.46	49.38	.4625	.4675
Linotype operators, female:				
North Atlantic.....	52.11	52.42	.3062	.3085
North Central.....	53.11	53.00	.2037	.2716
Western.....	46.00	45.75	.5321	.4808
United States.....	51.74	51.78	.2812	.3118
Press feeders, male:				
North Atlantic.....	52.38	52.49	.2086	.2264
South Atlantic.....	53.83	52.75	.1609	.1622
North Central.....	53.90	53.49	.1896	.1949
South Central.....	53.23	52.86	.1649	.1712
Western.....	49.06	49.05	.2366	.2498
United States.....	52.91	52.62	.1949	.2053
Press feeders, female:				
North Atlantic.....	53.95	53.96	.1265	.1244
South Atlantic.....	54.00	53.70	.1136	.1208
North Central.....	53.90	53.43	.1450	.1407
South Central.....	53.75	53.69	.0980	.1168
United States.....	53.93	53.74	.1279	.1282
Pressmen, male:				
North Atlantic.....	52.81	52.62	.3550	.3691
South Atlantic.....	53.85	52.95	.3024	.3143
North Central.....	53.94	53.52	.3384	.3517
South Central.....	53.55	52.94	.3136	.3358
Western.....	49.00	48.94	.4357	.4553
United States.....	53.10	52.75	.3475	.3619
Proof readers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	50.15	49.81	.4101	.4197
South Atlantic.....	53.67	51.88	.3258	.3402
North Central.....	52.91	51.33	.3815	.4022
South Central.....	53.50	53.50	.3598	.3481
Western.....	48.86	48.86	.4096	.4275
United States.....	51.03	50.41	.3958	.4071
Proof readers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	52.44	51.72	.2928	.3195
South Atlantic.....	54.00	54.00	.1636	.1713
North Central.....	52.40	52.03	.2736	.2800
South Central.....	53.17	51.14	.2388	.2789
Western.....	50.40	49.50	.3099	.3930
United States.....	52.47	51.98	.2709	.2945
Sewers and stitchers, book, female:				
North Atlantic.....	53.34	52.98	.1269	.1306
South Atlantic.....	53.79	52.82	.0994	.1073
North Central.....	53.81	53.63	.1180	.1219
South Central.....	53.07	53.05	.1069	.1067
Western.....	49.79	49.58	.1525	.1663
United States.....	53.08	52.83	.1206	.1249

PRINTING, NEWSPAPER.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Compositors, male:				
North Atlantic.....	46.97	47.08	\$0.5006	\$0.5140
South Atlantic.....	47.21	44.88	.4711	.5069
North Central.....	47.19	47.11	.5148	.5281
South Central.....	48.46	48.52	.5037	.5060
Western.....	46.48	46.66	.6124	.6363
United States.....	47.17	46.92	.5135	.5296
Linotype operators, male:				
North Atlantic.....	46.56	46.46	.5557	.5641
South Atlantic.....	44.60	44.64	.5560	.5745
North Central.....	47.32	47.22	.5336	.5455
South Central.....	47.79	47.74	.6391	.6451
Western.....	46.35	46.73	.6237	.6653
United States.....	46.67	46.64	.5646	.5791
Pressmen, male:				
North Atlantic.....	46.66	46.47	.4645	.4871
South Atlantic.....	48.11	48.44	.3717	.3721
North Central.....	49.68	48.52	.4024	.4195
South Central.....	52.73	52.41	.4312	.4233
Western.....	48.75	47.56	.4754	.5344
United States.....	48.34	47.73	.4337	.4558
Stereotypers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	45.89	45.64	.5285	.5367
South Atlantic.....	46.80	46.56	.4067	.4466
North Central.....	48.93	48.73	.4296	.4380
South Central.....	51.42	51.36	.3973	.4200
Western.....	50.03	48.74	.5027	.5467
United States.....	47.68	47.39	.4752	.4905

Protected by a tariff of from 16 per cent to 49 per cent (par. 408). Work people highly organized. Note the reasonable hours. Laborers well organized, as a rule. Average percentage of labor in printing products, 21.6.

SHIPBUILDING.

Blacksmiths, male:				
North Atlantic.....	54.92	55.13	\$0.3093	\$0.3066
South Atlantic.....	57.52	57.77	.2738	.2753
North Central.....	58.72	58.58	.2956	.3095
Western.....	53.87	53.83	.3833	.3995
United States.....	56.01	56.29	.3086	.3063
Boiler makers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	54.16	54.09	.2876	.2957
South Atlantic.....	58.36	58.67	.2589	.2622
North Central.....	59.46	59.11	.3048	.3125
Western.....	54.00	54.00	.4274	.4702
United States.....	56.29	56.41	.2892	.2965
Calkers, iron, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.74	55.49	.2732	.2810
South Atlantic.....	54.28	54.23	.2332	.2305
North Central.....	57.53	57.66	.2995	.3532
Western.....	54.00	54.00	.3554	.4257
United States.....	55.70	55.52	.2849	.2990
Calkers, wood, male:				
North Atlantic.....	52.76	51.26	.3551	.3700
South Atlantic.....	54.15	54.32	.3005	.2997
North Central.....	54.00	54.00	.3100	.3300
Western.....	49.00	49.00	.5958	.7000
United States.....	52.94	51.85	.3506	.3656
Carpenters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	53.88	52.64	.3146	.3340
South Atlantic.....	57.25	57.13	.2746	.2815
North Central.....	58.55	58.41	.3000	.3087
Western.....	52.81	53.23	.4329	.4509
United States.....	54.99	54.21	.3146	.3296
Drillers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.92	55.73	.2368	.2536
South Atlantic.....	56.29	56.02	.1791	.1775
North Central.....	56.94	56.85	.2082	.2359
Western.....	54.00	54.00	.2823	.3016
United States.....	55.93	55.79	.2297	.2403
Fitters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.19	55.07	.2608	.2700
South Atlantic.....	58.39	58.05	.2437	.2526
North Central.....	56.98	57.73	.2736	.2960
Western.....	54.00	54.00	.4036	.4123
United States.....	56.74	56.65	.2602	.2814

SHIPBUILDING—continued.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Joiners, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.53	55.15	\$0.2988	\$0.3063
South Atlantic.....	57.01	57.02	.2759	.2765
North Central.....	59.00	58.30	.2995	.3172
Western.....	53.72	53.66	.4305	.4458
United States.....	55.92	55.87	.3181	.3148
Laborers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.54	55.58	.1677	.1756
South Atlantic.....	56.81	56.68	.1356	.1418
North Central.....	58.02	59.00	.1605	.1755
Western.....	53.90	53.60	.2204	.2309
United States.....	56.56	57.02	.1622	.1677
Machinists, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.16	55.05	.2707	.2787
South Atlantic.....	58.36	57.88	.2683	.2794
North Central.....	59.32	59.04	.2869	.3032
Western.....	54.00	54.00	.3769	.3928
United States.....	56.41	56.28	.2915	.2958
Molders, iron, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.07	55.28	.2870	.2907
South Atlantic.....	57.38	57.43	.2876	.2971
North Central.....	55.37	55.14	.3266	.3466
Western.....	54.00	54.00	.4358	.4397
United States.....	56.07	56.14	.3218	.3225
Painters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	54.85	54.72	.2687	.2814
South Atlantic.....	55.95	56.36	.2425	.2471
North Central.....	59.18	57.30	.2410	.2246
Western.....	54.00	54.00	.3025	.3279
United States.....	55.34	55.51	.2598	.2664
Pattern makers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.92	55.79	.3226	.3235
South Atlantic.....	57.69	58.11	.3162	.3346
North Central.....	59.16	59.00	.3394	.3487
Western.....	54.00	54.00	.4747	.5073
United States.....	56.56	56.80	.3440	.3454
Riggers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.57	55.19	.2064	.2163
South Atlantic.....	56.15	55.86	.2366	.2361
North Central.....	56.69	56.10	.2183	.2281
Western.....	50.57	52.29	.4892	.4039
United States.....	55.00	54.92	.2499	.2458
Riveters, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.19	54.85	.3345	.3375
South Atlantic.....	58.56	58.15	.2280	.2294
North Central.....	57.10	56.94	.2722	.3498
Western.....	54.00	54.00	.3097	.3689
United States.....	56.58	56.28	.2784	.3072

Work people well organized in the West.

SILK GOODS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Beamers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.97	56.89	\$0.1887	\$0.1938
Doublers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	57.69	57.17	.1055	.1163
Dyers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	55.64	55.66	.1954	.1902
Loom fixers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.15	58.03	.2656	.2768
Pickers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.18	57.76	.1185	.1274
Quillers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	57.74	57.75	.0918	.0984
Spinners, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.02	56.74	.1017	.1035
Spinners, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.91	58.44	.1035	.1136
Twisters-in, male:				
North Atlantic.....	57.91	57.92	.2391	.2504
Warpers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.27	56.37	.2403	.2505
Warpers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.12	57.70	.1563	.1663
Weavers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	57.66	57.68	.2086	.2177
Weavers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.33	58.02	.1543	.1700
Weavers, ribbon, male:				
North Atlantic.....	56.14	56.16	.2543	.2813

Protected by a tariff of from 46 per cent to 130 per cent. (Par. 392 to 395.)
 Work people poorly organized.
 Average percentage of labor in textile products, 19.5.

WOOLEN AND WORSTED GOODS.

Occupation and geographical division.	Average hours per week.		Average wages per hour.	
	1906.	1907.	1906.	1907.
Burlers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.31	57.89	\$0.1092	\$0.1153
Carders, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.73	58.49	.1213	.1290
Card strippers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.08	57.95	.1324	.1355
Combers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	59.20	58.57	.1219	.1239
Combers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	56.62	56.21	.0948	.0968
Dyers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	59.43	58.91	.1408	.1500
Loom fixers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.38	57.99	.2546	.2674
Spinners, frame, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.32	57.70	.0951	.1159
Spinners, frame, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.68	58.00	.1065	.1185
Spinners, mule, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.57	58.45	.2027	.2066
Weavers, male:				
North Atlantic.....	58.73	58.51	.2025	.2116
Weavers, female:				
North Atlantic.....	58.18	58.07	.1697	.1841

Protected by a tariff on—
 Wool, from 35 to 149 per cent. (Pars. 365 to 372.)
 Yarns, from 55 to 141 per cent. (Par. 374.)
 Knit fabrics, from 55 to 141 per cent. (Par. 374.)
 Blankets, from 71 to 143 per cent. (Par. 375.)
 Work people poorly organized.
 Average percentage of labor in textile products, 19.5.

EXHIBIT 11.

A comparison between the platforms of the two great political parties from 1856 to 1908 on the tariff, monopoly, reciprocity, and income tax:

Republican platforms.	Democratic platforms.
1856.	1856.
Tariff, silent.	Tariff, silent.
Monopoly, silent.	Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.	Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.	Income tax, silent.
1860.	1860.

TARIFF.
 12. That while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the workmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence.

Tariff, silent.

Monopoly, silent.
 Reciprocity, silent.
 Income tax, silent.
 1864.

Monopoly, silent.
 Reciprocity, silent.
 Income tax, silent.
 1864.

Tariff, silent.
 Monopoly, silent.
 Reciprocity, silent.
 Income tax, silent.
 1868.

Tariff, silent.
 Monopoly, silent.
 Reciprocity, silent.
 Income tax, silent.
 1868.

Tariff, silent.
 Monopoly, silent.
 Reciprocity, silent.
 Income tax, silent.
 1872.

Tariff, silent.
 Monopoly, silent.
 Reciprocity, silent.
 Income tax, silent.
 1872.

TARIFF.
 7. The annual revenue, after paying current expenditures, pensions, and the interest on the public debt, should furnish a moderate balance for the reduction of the principal, and that revenue, except so much as may be derived from a tax on tobacco and liquors, should be raised by duties upon importations, the details of which should be so adjusted as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor, and promote the industries, prosperity, and growth of the whole country.

TARIFF.
 6. We demand a system of Federal taxation which shall not unnecessarily interfere with the industry of the people, and which shall provide the means necessary to pay the expenses of the Government, economically administered, the pensions, the interest on the public debt, and a moderate reduction annually of the principal thereof; and recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their congressional districts, and to the decision of the Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation.

11. Among the questions which press for attention is that which concerns the relations of capital and labor, and the Republican party recognizes the duty of so shaping legislation as to secure

full protection and the amplest field for capital, and for labor, the creator of capital, the largest opportunities and a just share of the mutual profits of these two great servants of civilization.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.
1876.

TARIFF.

8. The revenue necessary for current expenditures and the obligations of the public debt must be largely derived from duties upon importations, which, so far as possible, should be adjusted to promote the interests of American labor and advance the prosperity of the whole country.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.
1880.

TARIFF.

5. We reaffirm the belief avowed in 1876, that the duties levied for the purpose of revenue should so discriminate as to favor American labor.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1884.

TARIFF.

The largest diversity of industry is most productive of general prosperity, and of the comfort and independence of the people.

We therefore demand that the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made, not "for revenue only," but that in raising the requisite revenues for the Government such duties shall be so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor, as well as capital, may have its just reward, and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

Against the so-called "economic system of the Democratic party," which would degrade our labor to the foreign standard, we enter our earnest protest.

The Democratic party has failed completely to relieve the people of the burden of unnecessary taxation by a wise reduction of the surplus.

The Republican party pledges itself to correct the inequalities of the tariff and to reduce the surplus, not by the vicious and indiscriminate process of horizontal reduction, but by such methods as will relieve the taxpayer without injuring the laborer or the great productive interests of the country.

We recognize the importance of sheep husbandry in the United States, the serious depression which it is now experiencing, and the danger threatening its future prosperity; and we therefore respect the demands of the representatives of this important agricultural interest for a readjustment of duties upon foreign wool, in order that such industry shall have full and adequate protection.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.
1876.

TARIFF.

Reform is necessary in the sum and modes of federal taxation, to the end that capital may be set free from distrust and labor lightly burdened.

We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly 4,000 articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense. It yields a dwindling, not a yearly rising revenue. It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few. It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor. It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas. It has cut down the sales of American manufactures at home and abroad, and depleted the returns of American agriculture—an industry followed by half our people. It costs the people five times more than it produces to the Treasury, obstructs the processes of production, and wastes the fruits of labor. It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue.

Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.
1880.

TARIFF.

13. The Democratic party is the friend of labor and the laboring man, and pledges itself to protect him alike against the cormorant and the commune.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1884.

TARIFF.

Commenting on the Republican party, the platform says: "It professes a desire to elevate labor; it has subjected American workmen to the competition of convict and imported contract labor."

"It offers a pledge to correct the irregularities of our tariff; it created and has continued them. Its own tariff commission confessed the needs of more than 20 per cent reduction; its Congress gave a reduction of less than 4 per cent. It professes the protection of American manufactures; it has subjected them to an increasing flood of manufactured goods and a hopeless competition with manufacturing nations, not one of which taxes raw materials. It professes to protect all American industries; it has impoverished many to subsidize a few. It professes the protection of American labor; it has depleted the returns of American agriculture and industry, followed by half of our people."

"The Democracy pledges itself to purify the administration from cor-

ruption, to restore economy, to revive respect for law, and to reduce taxation to the lowest limit consistent with due regard to the preservation of the faith of the nation to its creditors and pensioners. Knowing full well, however, that legislation affecting the operations of the people should be cautious and conservative in method, not in advance of public opinion, but responsive to its demands, the Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But, in making reduction in taxes, it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government, taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of reform must be subject in the execution to this plain dictate of justice; all taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government. The necessary reduction and taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country. Sufficient revenue to pay all the expenses of the Federal Government, economically administered, including pensions, interest and principal of the public debt, can be got under our present system of taxation from the custom-house taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on articles of luxury and bearing lightest on articles of necessity. We therefore denounce the abuses of the existing tariff, and, subject to the preceding limitations, we demand that federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes and shall not exceed the needs of the Government, economically administered.

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.
1888.

TARIFF REFORM.

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, most promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations. In the interests of American labor, which should in no event be neglected, the revision of our tax laws contemplated by the Democratic party should promote the advantage of such labor by cheapening the cost of necessities of life in the home of every workingman and at the same time securing to him steady and remunerative employment. Upon this question of tariff reform, so closely concerning every phase of our national life, and upon every question involved in the problem of good government, the Democratic party submits its principles and professions to the intelligent suffrages of the American people.

TAXATION.

The Republican party, controlling the Senate and resisting in both Houses of Congress a reformation of unjust and unequal tax laws which have outlasted the necessities of war and are now undermining the abundance of a long peace, denies to the people

Monopoly, silent.
Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.
1888.

PROTECTION TO AMERICAN INDUSTRIES.

We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against its destruction as proposed by the President and his party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests except those of the usurer and the sheriff. We denounce the Mills bill as destructive to the general business, the labor, and the farming interests of the country, and we heartily indorse the consistent and patriotic action of the Republican Representatives in Congress in opposing its passage.

DUTIES ON WOOL.

We condemn the proposition of the Democratic party to place wool on the free list, and we insist that the duties thereon shall be adjusted and maintained so as to furnish full and adequate protection to that industry throughout the United States.

MONOPOLY.

We declare our opposition to all combinations of capital, organized in trusts or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens; and we recommend to Congress and the state legislatures, in their respective jurisdictions, such legislation as will prevent the execution of all

schemes to oppress the people by undue charges on their supplies, or by unjust rates for the transportation of their products to market. We approve the legislation by Congress to prevent alike unjust burdens and unfair discriminations between the States,

equality before the law and the fairness and the justice which are their right. Thus the cry of American labor for a better share in the rewards of industry is stifled with false pretenses, enterprise is fettered and bound down to home markets, capital is discouraged with doubt, and unequal, unjust laws can neither be properly amended nor repealed. The Democratic party will continue, with all the power confided to it, the struggle to reform these laws in accordance with the pledges of its last platform, indorsed at the ballot box by the suffrages of the people.

Of all the industrious freemen of our land the immense majority, including every tiller of the soil, gain no advantage from excessive tax laws, but the price of nearly everything they buy is increased by the favoritism of an unequal system of tax legislation. All unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation. It is repugnant to the creed of Democracy that by such taxation the cost of the necessaries of life should be unjustifiably increased to all our people. Judged by Democratic principles, the interests of the people are betrayed when, by unnecessary taxation, trusts and combinations are permitted to exist, which, while unduly enriching the few that combine, rob the body of our citizens by depriving them of the benefits of natural competition.

Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1892.

THE PRINCIPLE OF PROTECTION.

We reaffirm the American doctrine of protection. We call attention to its growth abroad. We maintain that the prosperous condition of our country is largely due to the wise revenue legislation of the last Republican Congress. We believe that all articles which can not be produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty, and that on all imports coming into competition with the products of American labor there should be levied duties equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.

We assert that the prices of manufactured articles of general consumption have been reduced under the operations of the tariff act of 1890.

We denounce the efforts of the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives to destroy our tariff laws piecemeal, as manifested by their attacks upon wool, lead, and lead ores, the chief products of a number of States, and we ask the people for their judgment thereon.

Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1892.

TARIFF LEGISLATION.

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.

We denounce the McKinley tariff law enacted by the Fifty-first Congress as the culminating atrocity of class legislation; we indorse the efforts made by the Democrats of the present Congress to modify its most oppressive features in the direction of free raw materials and cheaper manufactured goods that enter into general consumption, and we promise its repeal as one of the beneficent results that will follow the action of the people in intrusting power to the Democratic party. Since the McKinley tariff went into operation there have been ten reductions of the wages of the laboring men to one increase. We deny that there has been any increase of prosperity to the country since that tariff went into operation, and we point to the dullness and distress, to the wage reductions and strikes in the iron trade, as the best possible evidence that no such prosperity has resulted from the McKinley Act.

We call the attention of thoughtful Americans to the fact that, after thirty years of restrictive taxes against the importation of foreign wealth in exchange for our agricultural surplus, the homes and farms of the country have become burdened with a real-estate mortgage debt of over \$2,500,000,000, exclusive of all other forms of indebtedness; that in one of the chief agricultural States of the West there appears a real-estate mortgage debt averaging \$165 per capita of the total population, and that similar conditions and tendencies are shown to exist in the other agricultural exporting States. We denounce a policy which fosters no industry so much as it does that of the sheriff.

TRIUMPH OF RECIPROCITY.

We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic party to this practical business measure, and claim that, executed by a Republican administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

Monopoly, silent.

Income tax, silent.
1896.

TARIFF.

We renew and emphasize our allegiance to the policy of protection as the bulwark of American industrial independence and the foundation of American development and prosperity. This true American policy taxes foreign products and encourages home industry; it puts the burden of revenue on foreign goods; it secures the American market for the American producer; it upholds the American standard of wages for the American workingman; it puts the factory by the side of the farm, and makes the American farmer less dependent on foreign demand and price; it diffuses general thrift, and founds the strength of all on the strength of each. In its reasonable application it is just, fair, and impartial; equally opposed to foreign control and domestic monopoly, to sectional discrimination and individual favoritism.

We denounce the present Democratic tariff as sectional, injurious to the public credit, and destructive to business enterprise. We demand such an equitable tariff on foreign imports which have come into competition with American products as will not only furnish adequate revenue for the necessary expenses of the Government, but will protect American labor from degradation to the wage level of other lands. We are not pledged to any particular schedules. The question of rates is a practical question to be governed by the conditions of time and of production; the ruling and uncompromising principle is the protection and development of American labor and industry. The country demands a right settlement, and then it wants rest.

RECIPROCITY.

We believe the repeal of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican administration was a national calamity, and we demand their renewal and extension on such terms as will equalize our trade with other nations, remove the restrictions which now obstruct the sale of American products in the ports of other countries, and secure en-

RECIPROCITY.

SEC. 4. Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges, by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products, with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a custom-house barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world, that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products, and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessities and comforts of life among our own people.

MONOPOLY, TRUSTS, AND COMBINATIONS.

SEC. 5. We recognize in the trusts and combinations, which are designed to enable capital to secure more than its just share of the joint product of capital and labor, a natural consequence of the prohibitive taxes which prevent the free competition which is the life of honest trade; but we believe their worst evils can be abated by law, and we demand the rigid enforcement of the laws made to prevent and control them, together with such further legislation in restraint of their abuses as experience may show to be necessary.

Income tax, silent.
1896.

TARIFF RESOLUTION.

We hold that tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country, and not discriminate between class or section, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the Government, honestly and economically administered. We denounce as disturbing to business the Republican threat to restore the McKinley law, which has twice been condemned by the people in national elections, and which, enacted under the false plea of protection to home industry, proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade, and deprived the producers of the great American staples of access to their natural markets.

Until the money question is settled we are opposed to any agitation for further changes in our tariff laws, except such as are necessary to meet the deficit in revenue caused by the adverse decision of the Supreme Court on the income tax. But for this decision by the Supreme Court there would be no deficit in the revenue under the law passed by a Democratic Congress in strict pursuance of the uniform decisions of that court for nearly one hundred years, that court having in that decision sustained constitutional objections to its enactment which had previously been overruled by the ablest judges who have ever sat on that bench. We declare that it is the duty of Congress to use all the constitutional power which remains after that decision, or which may come from its reversal by the court as it may hereafter be constituted, so that the burdens of taxation may be equally and impartially laid, to the end that wealth may bear its due proportion of the expense of the Government.

Reciprocity, silent.

larged markets for the products of our farms, forests, and factories.

Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished. Protection for what we produce; free admission for the necessities of life which we do not produce; reciprocity agreements of mutual interests which gain open markets for us in return for our open market to others. Protection builds up domestic industry and trade, and secures our own market for ourselves; reciprocity builds up foreign trade, and finds an outlet for our surplus.

Monopoly, silent.

Income tax, silent.
1900.

TARIFF POLICY REAFFIRMED.

We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor. In that policy our industries have been established, diversified, and maintained. By protecting the home market, competition has been stimulated and production cheapened. Opportunity to the inventive genius of our people has been secured and wages in every department of labor maintained at high rates—higher now than ever before, and always distinguishing our working people in their better conditions of life from those of any competing country. Enjoying the blessings of the American common school, secure in the right of self-government, and protected in the occupancy of their own markets, their constantly increasing knowledge and skill have enabled them to finally enter the markets of the world.

TRUSTS.

We recognize the necessity and propriety of the honest cooperation of capital to meet new business conditions, and especially to extend our rapidly increasing foreign trade; but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production, or to control prices, and favor such legislation as will effectively restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition, and secure the rights of producers, laborers, and all who are engaged in industry and commerce.

MONOPOLY, TRUSTS, AND POOLS.

The absorption of wealth by the few, the consolidation of our leading railroad systems, and the formation of trusts and pools require a stricter control by the Federal Government of those arteries of commerce. We demand the enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and such restriction and guarantees in the control of railroads as will protect the people from robbery and oppression.

Income tax, silent.
1900.

TARIFF RESOLUTION.

We hold that tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the branches of the National Government, to enact any legislation designed to prevent or even curtail the absorbing power of trusts and illegal combinations, or to enforce the antitrust laws already on the statute books, proves the insincerity of the high-sounding phrases of the Republican platform.

CORPORATE INTERFERENCE IN GOVERNMENT.

Corporations should be protected in all their rights and their legitimate interests should be respected, but any attempt by corporations to interfere with the public affairs of the people, or to control the sovereignty which creates them should be forbidden under such penalties as will make such attempts impossible.

THE DINGLEY TARIFF LAW.

We condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure, skillfully devised to give the few favors which they do not deserve and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear.

TRUSTS.

Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. They destroy competition, control the price of all material and of the finished product, thus robbing both producer and consumer. They lessen the employment of labor and arbitrarily fix the terms and conditions thereof, and deprive individual energy and a small capital of their opportunity for betterment. They are the most efficient means yet devised for appropriating the fruits of industry to the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and, unless their insatiable greed is checked, all wealth will be aggregated in a few hands and the Republic destroyed.

The dishonest patting with the trust evil by the Republican party in state and national platforms is conclusive proof of the truth of the charge that trusts are the legitimate product of Republican policies; that they are fostered by Republican laws; and that they are protected by the Republican administration for campaign subscriptions and political support.

We pledge the Democratic party to an unceasing warfare in nation, State, and city against private monopoly in every form. Existing laws against trusts must be enforced and more stringent ones must be enacted, providing for publicity as to the affairs of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, requiring all corpora-

RECIPROCITY FAVORED.

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

Income tax, silent.
1904.

THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

Protection which guards and develops our industries is a cardinal policy of the Republican party. The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

We insist upon the maintenance of the principles of protection, and therefore rates of duty should be readjusted only when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands their alteration; but this work can not safely be committed to any other hands than those of the Republican party. To intrust it to the Democratic party is to invite disaster. Whether, as in 1892, the Democratic party declares the protective tariff unconstitutional, or whether it demands tariff reform or tariff revision, its real object is always the destruction of the protective system.

However specious the name, the purpose is ever the same. A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity.

To a Republican Congress and a Republican President this great question can be safely intrusted. When the only free-trade country among the great nations agitates a return to protection, the chief protective country should not falter in maintaining it.

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

COMBINATIONS OF LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Combinations of capital and of labor are the results of the economic movement of the age, but neither must be permitted to infringe upon the rights and interests of the people. Such combinations when lawfully formed for lawful purposes are alike entitled to the protection of the laws, but both are subject to the laws, and neither can be permitted to break them.

tions to show, before doing business outside the State of their origin, that they have no water in their stock and that they have not attempted, and are not attempting, to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any article of merchandise; and the whole constitutional power of Congress over interstate commerce, the mails, and all modes of interstate communication shall be exercised by the enactment of comprehensive laws upon the subject of trusts.

THE FREE LIST AS A REMEDY.

Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free list to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection.

TRUSTS CONDEMNED.

We reaffirm our opposition, declared in the Republican platform of 1888, to all combinations of capital, organized in trusts or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens. We heartily indorse the action already taken upon this subject, and ask for such further legislation as may be required to remedy any defects in existing laws and to render their enforcement more complete and effective.

Reciprocity, silent.
Income tax, silent.

1904.

TARIFF LEGISLATION.

The Democratic party has been, and will continue to be, the consistent opponent of that class of tariff legislation by which certain interests have been permitted, through congressional favor, to draw a heavy tribute from the American people. This monstrous prevention of those equal opportunities which our political institutions were established to secure has caused what may once have been infant industries to become the greatest combinations of capital that the world has ever known. These especial favorites of the Government have, through trust methods, been converted into monopolies, thus bringing to an end domestic competition, which was the only alleged check upon the extravagant profits made possible by the protective system. These industrial combinations, by the financial assistance they can give, now control the policy of the Republican party.

We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few, and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the Government economically administered, and so levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class, or section, to the end that the burdens of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible.

We favor a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses and for the common weal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions, and its discriminations, keeping in view the ultimate ends of "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities," and the constitutional purpose of raising a revenue by taxation, to wit, the support of the Federal Government in all its integrity and virility, but in simplicity.

TRUSTS AND UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS.

We recognize that the gigantic trusts and combinations designed to enable capital to secure more than its just share of the joint products of capital and labor, and which have been fostered and promoted under Republican rule, are a menace to beneficial competition and an obstacle to permanent business prosperity. A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

Individual equality of opportunity and free competition are essential to a healthy and permanent commercial prosperity, and any trust, combination, or monopoly tending to destroy these by controlling production, restricting

competition, or fixing prices should be prohibited and punished by law. We especially denounce rebates and discrimination by transportation companies as the most potent agency in promoting and strengthening these unlawful conspiracies against trade.

CAPITAL AND LABOR.

We favor enactment and administration of laws giving labor and capital impartially their just rights. Capital and labor ought not to be enemies. Each is necessary to the other. Each has its rights, but the rights of labor are certainly no less "vested," no less "sacred," and no less "unalienable" than the rights of capital.

RECIPROCIDITY.

We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada and with peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining, or commerce.

Income tax, silent.

Reciprocity, silent.

Income tax, silent.

1908.

1908.

TARIFF REVISION PROMISED.

The Republican party declares unequivocally for a revision of the tariff by a special session of the Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next President, and commends the steps already taken to this end in the work assigned to the appropriate committees of Congress, which are now investigating the operation and effect of these schedules. In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries. We favor the establishment of a maximum and minimum rate to be administered by the President under limitations fixed by the law, the maximum to be available to meet the discrimination by foreign countries against American goods entering our markets, and the minimum representing the normal measure of protection at home, the aim and the purpose of Republican policy being not only to preserve without excessive duties the security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-workers of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system.

We welcome the belated promise of tariff reform, now offered by the Republican party, as a tardy recognition of the righteousness of the Democratic position on this question; but the people can not safely intrust the execution of this important work to a party which is so deeply obligated to the highly protected interests as is the Republican party. We call attention to the significant fact that the promised relief is postponed until after the coming election—an election to succeed in which the Republican party must have that same support from the beneficiaries of the high protective tariff as it has always heretofore received from them; and to the further fact that during years of uninterrupted power no action whatever has been taken by the Republican Congress as to correct the admittedly existing tariff inequities.

We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list; material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessities of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home; and gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

Existing duties have given the manufacturers of paper a shelter behind which they have organized combinations to raise the price of pulp and of paper, thus imposing a tax upon the spread of knowledge. We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber, and logs, and that those articles be placed upon the free list.

TRUSTS.

The Republican party passed the Sherman antitrust law over Democratic opposition, and enforced it after Democratic dereliction. It has been a wholesome instrument for good in the hands of a wise and fearless administration; but experience has shown that its effectiveness can be strengthened and its real objects better obtained by such amendment as will give the Federal Government greater supervision and control over and greater publicity in the management of that class of corporations engaged in interstate commerce having power and opportunity to effect monopolies.

A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. We therefore favor the vigorous enforcement of the criminal law against guilty trust magnates and officials, and demand the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States. Among the additional remedies we specify three: First, a law preventing a duplication of directors among competing corporations; second, a license system which will, without abridging the right of each State to create corporations, or its right to regulate as it will foreign corporations doing business within its limits, make it necessary for a manufacturing or trading corporation engaged in interstate commerce to take out a federal license before it shall be permitted to control as much as 25 per cent of the product in which it deals, the license to

Income tax, silent.

Reciprocity, silent.

protect the public from watered stock and to prohibit the control by such corporation of more than 50 per cent of the total amount of any product consumed in the United States; and, third, a law compelling such licensed corporations to sell to all purchasers in all parts of the country on the same terms, after making the allowance for the cost of transportation.

INCOME TAX.

We favor an income tax as part of our revenue system, and we urge the submission of a constitutional amendment specifically authorizing Congress to levy and collect a tax upon individual and corporate incomes, to the end that wealth may bear its proportionate share of the burdens of the Federal Government.

Reciprocity, silent.

EXHIBIT 12.

[Tables prepared by Byron W. Holt, October 15, 1906, 42 Broadway, New York.]

TABLE I.—Showing differences in discounts between export and home prices.

Articles—Description.	Export discount	Home discount	Per cent difference.
	from list.	from list.	
	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	
Auger bits, Snells or Mathieson	70 and 10	60	48
Auger bits, Jennings pattern	70, 10, and 10	60	60
Auger bits, Kings or Star	60, 10, and 5	60	17
Auger bits, Bates	80 and 10	75	38
Auger bits, handled	33½	25	13
Auger bits, car, Jennings pattern	60, 10, and 10	60	23
Alarms, electric	55 and 10	55	11
Axle pulleys	60 and 10	60	11
Ash cans, galvanized	25, 10, and 2	25	17
Bread or meat slicers	50	40	20
Box trucks	50	40	20
Barber's shears	75 and 5	70	26
Bellhanger's gimlets	60, 10, and 5	60	17
Boring machine augers	80 and 10	70 and 10	50
Boring machine ship augers	50 and 10	40	33½
Butts, door	50	40	25
Bolts, window	55, 20, 5 and 5	60	23
Bells, hand, nickel-plated	60 and 5	60	6
Bells, jingle	60 and 10	60	11
Bits, expansive, Clark Brown	70 and 10	50 and 10	66
Bits, expansive, Clark's genuine	60 and 10	50 and 10	25
Bits, expansive, cutters and screws	70 and 10	50 and 10	66
Bootjacks	55, 5 and 10	55 and 5	11
Bench hooks	70, 10, 5 and 10	70, 10 and 5	11
Blacksmith's butterises	75, 10, 5 and 10	75, 10 and 5	11
Bridle rings	70, 10, 5 and 10	70, 10 and 5	11
Belt hooks	80, 10 and 10	80 and 10	11
Blind hinges	75, 10 and 10	75 and 10	11
Brass pulleys	60 and 10	60	11
Bird-cage hooks	50	40	20
Bell pulls	55 and 10	55	11
Bells, door	70, 7½ and 10	70 and 7½	11
Bell cranks	70, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Barn and cabin door catches	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Box corners	80 and 10	80	11
Bench screws	10	Net.	11
Cattle ties	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Cornice hooks	90, 25 and 10	90 and 25	11
Chandelier hooks	70, 5 and 10	70 and 5	11
Chain bolts	70 and 10	70	11
Cake turners	50	40	20
Compasses and callipers	75, 10 and 7½	75 and 5	13
Chisels, box	60	50	20
Carpet stretchers, No. 5	75	60 and 10	44
Casters, stove leg	50	40	20
Casters, rubber tire	40	30	17
Casters, boss	80	70 and 10	35
Coat holders	50	40	25
Coat and hat hooks, crescent	80 and 5	70	53
Carriage washers, perfection	20, 10 and 2	20	17
Chains, hitching	25, 10 and 2	25	17
Carts, hand	50 and 5	40	27
Coal tongs	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Coal shovels	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Cow bells	70, 10, 5 and 10	70, 10 and 5	11
Can openers	10	Net.	11
Clamps	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11
Cotton, box, and hay hooks	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Curtain pins	50 and 5 and 10	50 and 5	11
Chest handles	60, 10 and 10	60 and 10	11
Corner braces	80, 10 and 10	80 and 10	11
Clothes line pulleys	70 and 10	70	11
Door bolts	60 and 10	60	11
Door springs	75 and 10	75	11
Door checks	75 and 5 and 10	75 and 5	11
Door holders; pulls and knobs	60, 10, 10 and 10	60, 10 and 10	11

TABLE I.—Showing differences in discounts between export and home prices—Continued.

Table with 4 columns: Articles—Description, Export discount from list, Home discount from list, Per cent difference. Lists various tools and hardware items with their respective discount percentages.

TABLE I.—Showing differences in discounts between export and home prices—Continued.

Table with 4 columns: Articles—Description, Export discount from list, Home discount from list, Per cent difference. Lists various tools and hardware items with their respective discount percentages.

TABLE II.—Showing difference between export and home prices of certain specified articles.

Articles and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Difference.
			Per cent.
Boring machines, upright.....each.....	\$2.25	\$2.50	11
Boring machines, angular.....do.....	2.40	2.75	14
Crowbars, 10 to 40 lbs.....per 100 pounds.....	2.35	3.25	38
Track wrenches, single.....do.....	5.00	5.75	15
Lining bars.....do.....	2.60	3.25	25
Tamping bars.....do.....	3.15	3.50	11
Nail sets, No. 15.....per gross.....	3.50	4.00	14
Saw sets, No. 1.....per doz.....	3.00	3.50	16
Saw sets, Taintor.....do.....	5.00	6.75	35
Box scrapers, No. 21.....do.....	2.25	2.50	10
Revolving punches, No. 26.....do.....	3.25	3.50	8
Saddler's punches, Nos. 1 to 6.....do.....	.65	.75	10
Box hooks, 10-inch.....do.....	2.25	2.50	11
Carpet stretchers, No. 66.....do.....	1.75	1.90	9
Tack claws, No. 68.....per gross.....	5.50	6.00	10
Gimlets, No. 18.....do.....	4.25	4.60	8
Gimlets, German pattern.....do.....	4.85	5.75	19
Can openers, No. 98.....do.....	9.00	10.00	11
Sardine scissors.....per doz.....	2.50	3.00	20
Cold chisels, 1/2 inch.....per lb.....	.17	.19	12
Spoke shaves, No. 0.....per doz.....	1.12	1.25	12
Plows, disc No. 1.....each.....	32.50	40.00	25
Harrows, 25-tooth.....do.....	18.25	22.00	25
Harrows, wood-frame, 18-tooth.....do.....	7.50	9.00	20
Cultivators, wheel, No. 61.....do.....	4.00	5.00	25
Plows, shovel, No. 20.....do.....	2.15	2.50	16
Hoes, berry and grape.....do.....	7.00	8.00	15
Hoes, potato, No. 1.....do.....	4.75	5.50	16
Wheelbarrows, wood, bolted.....per doz.....	14.50	16.00	11
Wheelbarrows, mortar.....do.....	18.00	20.00	11
Wheelbarrows, stone.....do.....	17.50	19.00	11
Wheelbarrows, garden, wood-wheel.....each.....	2.50	3.00	20
Road scrapers, No. 1.....do.....	4.00	5.00	25
Shoes, horse.....per 100 pounds.....	3.38	3.90	15
Shoes, mule.....do.....	3.38	3.90	15
Calks, toe.....do.....	3.00	3.90	30
Threshers, grain, horse or steam power, 32-in.....each.....	300.00	400.00	33 1/2
Straw stackers, 18-ft.....do.....	25.00	30.00	20
Grain weigher and bagger.....do.....	45.00	60.00	33 1/2
Rubber belting, 6-in.....per ft.....	.39	.30	33 1/2
Clover hullers, 32-in.....each.....	338.00	450.00	33 1/2
Horsepowers, 10-horse.....do.....	143.00	190.00	33 1/2
Sawmills, 24-ft. carriage.....do.....	244.00	325.00	33 1/2
Pumps, jet.....do.....	8.00	4.00	33 1/2
Engines, traction, 8-horsepower.....do.....	917.00	1,225.00	33 1/2
Engines, Farm, 8-horsepower.....do.....	563.00	750.00	33 1/2
Clothes wringers, 10 by 13.....per doz.....	18.70	22.50	20
Scales, wagon and hay, 3 tons.....each.....	67.50	75.00	11
Scales, depot, 4 tons.....do.....	162.00	180.00	11
Scales, platform, with wheels, 800 lbs.....do.....	17.10	19.00	11
Scales, grocer's, brass scoop, 244 lbs.....do.....	8.10	9.00	11
Incubators, No. 1.....do.....	15.00	20.00	33 1/2
Brooders, 200 chicks.....do.....	9.20	11.50	25
Potato planters, plain.....do.....	45.00	50.00	11
Potato diggers.....do.....	90.00	100.00	11
Forges, machinists, portable.....do.....	14.50	16.80	20
Shovels, D handle, square point, No. 2.....per doz.....	8.25	11.00	33 1/2

TABLE II.—Showing difference between export and home prices of certain specified articles—Continued.

Articles and description.	Export price.	Home price.	Difference.
			Per cent.
Spades, D handle, No. 2.....per doz.....	\$9.00	\$12.00	33 1/2
Watches, 23 Jewel Vanguard, nickel case.....each.....	22.47	26.23	16
Watches, 21 Jewel Vanguard, nickel case.....do.....	19.07	24.11	26
Watches, 21 Jewel Crescent st., nickel case.....do.....	15.43	19.88	28
Watches, 17 Jewel Premier, nickel case.....do.....	14.12	16.50	16
Watches, 23 Jewel Riverside Maximus case.....do.....	31.77	43.15	35
Watches, 19 Jewel Riverside, nickel case.....do.....	14.69	18.19	23
Watches, 21 Jewel Father Time, nickel case.....do.....	14.42	19.89	38
Beds, brass, 1 1/2 inch pillars.....do.....	22.67	27.50	21
Beds, brass, cribs, 1-inch pillars.....do.....	20.00	22.50	11
Beds, enameled, 1-inch pillars.....do.....	8.00	9.00	12
Bed springs, woven wire.....do.....	2.70	3.04	13
Bull rings, steel, 2 1/2-in.....per doz.....	.67	.75	12
Bull rings, copper, 2 1/2-in.....per gross.....	10.85	13.45	24
Cattle leaders, No. 2.....do.....	6.00	7.20	20
Corn hooks, serrated blade.....do.....	23.70	25.20	7
Knives, kitchen.....do.....	12.00	16.00	33 1/2
Auger bits, Snells, 1/2-in.....per doz.....	1.62	2.40	48
Auger bits, Jennings, 1/2-in.....do.....	1.21	2.00	60
Auger bits, Kings, 1/2-in.....do.....	1.71	2.00	17
Auger bits, Star, 1/2-in.....do.....	1.87	1.60	17
Auger bits, Mathieson, 1/2-in.....do.....	3.08	3.60	48
Pulleys, axle, 2 1/2-in.....do.....	.72	.89	11
Pulleys, hothouse, 2 1/2-in.....do.....	.81	.99	11
Bits, expansive, Clark Brown.....do.....	4.86	8.10	66
Bits, expansive, cutters, 1/2 to 1/2-in.....do.....	.81	1.35	66
Locks, rim, 5-in.....do.....	3.60	4.01	11
Locks, mortise, No. 4607.....do.....	3.24	3.60	11
Locks, padlocks, assorted, No. 5.....per gross.....	3.89	4.32	11
Springs, coil, steel, 1/2-in.....per doz.....	.48	.54	11
Springs, coil, brass, 2-in.....do.....	.40	.45	11
Keys, door, No. 105.....per gross.....	.60	.90	11
Keys, padlock, No. 20.....do.....	1.77	1.97	11
Wagon stake irons, 2-in.....per doz.....	.77	.86	11
Staples, in kegs, 1-in.....per keg.....	4.80	5.30	11
Shears, barbers, 8-in. Japanned.....per doz.....	3.80	4.80	26
Shears, tailors, 13-in.....per pair.....	3.60	4.32	20
Shears, tinner's snippis, 13-in.....do.....	.90	1.00	11
Shears, pruning, 9-in.....per doz.....	13.50	16.20	20
Soap, toilet, Violet.....per gross.....	32.00	40.80	25
Soap, toilet, Jockey Club.....do.....	23.87	28.05	25
Soap, toilet, Lettuce.....do.....	19.50	22.44	15
Soap, toilet, Vioris, large.....do.....	16.62	19.12	15
Soap, toilet, Sweet Lavender.....do.....	14.04	19.12	35
Soap, toilet, Shaving stick, large.....do.....	13.00	16.74	20
Soap, toilet, Honey.....do.....	11.11	12.75	15
Soap, toilet, Cashmere Bouquet.....do.....	20.48	30.24	48
Soap, toilet, white Castile.....do.....	9.94	12.11	25
Soap, toilets Glycerine.....do.....	8.34	12.75	52
Flavoring extract, vanilla 1/2 pints.....per doz.....	7.58	8.43	11
Flavoring extract, lemon pints.....do.....	9.65	10.88	12
Florida water.....per case.....	2.75	5.00	81
Perumery Edition de Luxe, 2 oz.....per doz.....	15.60	17.85	15
Perfumery, 2 oz.....do.....	11.70	13.38	15
Talcum powder, violet, large.....do.....	1.39	1.60	16
Vaseline No. 2.....do.....	.58	.70	20

EXHIBIT 13.

Dingley prohibitive duties.

[See H. R. Doc. 1504, 60th Cong., 2d sess., for reduction in these revenues.]

Payne-Aldrich bill.	Article.	Duty.	Ad valorem.	Revenue, 1907.	Evans's Imports and Duties, 1894-1907.
Par.			Per cent.		Table No.
423	Barley.....	30 cents per bushel.....	53.64	\$9,544	148
	Buttons:				
	Bone.....	1/2 cent per line plus 15 per cent.....	66.45	681	181
	Horn and vegetable Ivory.....	1/2 cent per line plus 15 per cent.....	71.88	49,270	182
	Nickel bar.....	1/2 cent per line plus 15 per cent.....	73.79	601	185
	Pearl shell.....	1/2 cents per line plus 15 per cent.....	57.40	94,219	189
	Shoe buttons.....	1 cent per gross.....	44.92	84	190
1	Acid, salicylic.....	10 cents per pound.....	38.30	918	234
	Acids, n. s. p. f.....	25 per cent.....	25.00	12,435	242
59	Potash, chlorate of.....	2 1/2 cents per pound.....	34.61	514	459
58	Potash, chromate and bichromate.....	3 cents per pound.....	41.14	283	460
68	Soda-bicarbonate, etc.....	1/2 cent per pound.....	23.87	1,020	484
73	Soda ash.....	1/2 cent per pound.....	34.63	25,295	500
81	Vanillin.....	80 cents per ounce.....	320.00	80	537
287	Chicory root.....	1 cent per pound.....	64.25	26,778	549
91	Clock cases, with or without movements, composed of china, porcelain, bisque, etc.....	60 per cent.....	60.00	156	580
290	Dandelion root and other articles used as substitutes for coffee, n. s. p. f.....	2 1/2 cents per pound.....	37.00	8,305	614
425	Corks three-fourths inch or less in diameter.....	25 cents per pound.....	42.08	22,896	642
323	Plusbes, velvets, and other pile fabrics of cotton, etc., dyed, colored, etc.....	12 cents per yard plus 25 per cent.....	58.42	257,088	1174
323	Corduroys of cloth, dyed, colored, etc.....	12 cents per yard plus 25 per cent.....	58.10	1,704	1178
344	Collars and cuffs of cotton.....	45 cents per dozen plus 15 per cent.....	58.68	650	1220
	Corsets, n. s. p. f.....	50 per cent.....	50.00	37,244	1221
344	Collars and cuffs, part linen.....	40 cents per dozen plus 20 per cent.....	49.60	25,787	1637
353	Manufactures of flax, n. s. p. f.....	45 per cent.....	45.00	362,528	1700
273	Oranges.....	1 cent per pound.....	59.69	207,828	1792
	Lemons.....				
	Oilcloth.....				

Dingley prohibitive duties—Continued.

Payne-Aldrich bill.	Article.	Duty.	Ad valorem.	Revenue, 1907.	Evans's Imports and Duties, 1894-1907.
Par. 97	Glass:		Per cent.		Table No.
	Cylinder, crowned, common window glass, unpolished—				
	Above 16 by 24 inches, not exceeding 24 by 30 inches	2½ cents per pound	74.32	\$82,569	1921
	Above 24 by 30 inches, not exceeding 24 by 36 inches	2½ cents per pound	78.69	26,970	1922
98, 99, 100, 101	Plate, cast, polished, silvered, etc.—				
	Not exceeding 16 by 24 inches	11 cents per square foot	43.80	78	1973
441	Above 16 by 24 inches and not above 24 by 30 inches	13 cents per square foot	39.44	469	1974
254	Haircloth, crinoline cloth	10 cents per square yard	65.68	228	2029
151	Hay	\$4 per ton	50.18	251,280	2037
	Table, carving, cooks, kitchen, etc., knives, forks, and steels, with handles, n. s. p. f.	1½ cents each plus 15 per cent.	69.43	17,554	2307
150	Tubes and tubing for cycles	35 per cent.	35.00	9,324	2472
450, 451	Gloves, ladies' and children's:				
	Schmaschen, glace finish, not over 14 inches in length, unlined	\$1.75 per dozen	41.63	182,722	2527
	Lamb or sheep, glace finish, not over 14 inches in length, unlined	\$2.50 per dozen	49.48	548,283	2742
	Of sheep origin, with exterior grain surface, not over 17 inches in length, unlined	\$2.50 per dozen	41.64	9,040	2560
	Goat, kid, or other leather than sheep, glace finish, not over 14 inches in length, unlined	\$3 per dozen	43.34	126,570	2573
	Goat, etc., with exterior surface removed, not over 14 inches in length, unlined	\$3 per dozen	41.41	5,684	2501
303	Malt extract in casks (fluid)	20 cents per gallon	33.37	265	2652
418	Manufactures of palm leaf, n. e. p. f.	30 per cent.	30.00	3,698	2881
457	Masks of paper or pulp	35 per cent.	35.00	282	2911
464	Slate pencils, all other	3 cents per 100	59.77	6,471	2956
302, 304	Bay rum or bay water	\$1.50 per proof gallon	331.81	2,021	2961
236	Rice, cleaned	2 cents per pound	62.66	539,081	3022
215	Saccharine	\$1.50 per pound plus 10 per cent.	216.71	847	3084
397	Silk goods, ornamented with beads or spangles	60 per cent.	60.00	3,293	3155
395	All other manufactures of silk, n. s. p. f.	50 per cent.	50.00	637,337	3162
	Spar, manufactures of	50 per cent.	50.00	699	3171
455	Straw and grass manufactures, n. s. p. f.	36 per cent.	36.00	200,320	3226
213	Sugar, refined	1.95 cents per pound	72.57	84,220	3295
198	Sticks for umbrellas, parasols, and sunshades	40 per cent.	40.00	2,977	3351
250	Cabbage	3 cents per head	44.58	174	3355
	Spirits				
356, 357, 365	Wool, Class I:				
362	Washed	22 cents per pound	61.32	369	3498
362	Scoured	33 cents per pound	37.50	2,679	3499
362, 365	Wool, Class II:				
365	Scoured	36 cents per pound		(b)	3511
362, 366	Wool, Class III:				
366	Scoured	12 and 21 cents per pound		(b)	3530
373	Yarns, valued not more than 30 cents per pound	27½ cents per pound plus 40 per cent.	143.02	31	3562
375	Blankets—				
	Valued more than 30 cents and not more than 40 cents per pound	22 cents per pound plus 30 per cent.	107.60	340	3565
375	Valued more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound	33 cents per pound plus 35 per cent.	106.12	232	3577
375	Over 3 yards long, valued not more than 40 cents per pound	33 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	165.42	67	3571
375	Valued more than 40 cents, not more than 70 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	120.98	4,438	3572
	Valued more than 70 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.	101.55	8,591	3573
382	Carpets—				
	Brussels	44 cents per square yard plus 40 per cent.	75.81	8,645	3577
384	Wool, Dutch and 2-ply Ingrain	18 cents per square yard plus 40 per cent.	58.63	963	3584
375	Tapestry, Brussels	28 cents per square yard plus 40 per cent.	60.73	1	3581
	Flannels for underwear—				
	Valued over 30 cents, not over 40 cents per pound	22 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	143.67	34	3623
	Valued over 40 cents, not over 50 cents per pound	33 cents per pound plus 35 per cent.	101.26	130	3625
	Valued over 50 cents, not over 70 cents per pound	11 cents per square yard plus 50 per cent.	105.49	117	3626
	Valued over 70 cents per pound	11 cents per square yard plus 55 per cent.	86.39	5,217	3627
	Weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, valued more than 50 cents and not more than 70 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	125.80	5,481	3630
378	Knit fabrics—				
	Valued not over 40 cents per pound	33 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	141.00	1	3635
	Valued over 40 cents, less than 70 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	119.06	642	3636
	Valued above 70 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.	95.67	9,255	3673
378	Hats of wool, valued over 50 cents per pound	44 cents per pound plus 60 per cent.	86.61	13,771	3648
378	Shawls, knitted or woven	44 cents per pound plus 60 per cent.	92.70	57,813	3654

^a See others.

^b More imported.

EXHIBIT 14.

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, compared with the present tariff law, showing percentages of decrease.

[Prepared under direction of the Senate Committee on Finance, Sixty-first Congress, first session.]

SCHEDULE A.—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS.

Paragraph of Senate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty—		Percentage of reduction.	Total imports, by value, 1907.
		Present law.	Senate bill.		
1	Acids:				
	Boracic	5 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	60.00	\$28,425.00
	Chromic	3 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	33.33	303.00
	Gallic	10 cents per pound	8 cents per pound	20.00	7,086.00
	Lactic, containing not over 40 per cent of actual lactic acid	3 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	33.33
	Salicylic	10 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	50.00	2,397.00
	Tannic, or tannin	50 cents per pound	35 cents per pound	30.00	2,797.00
	Tartaric	7 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	28.57	3,876.00

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.

SCHEDULE A—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS—continued.

Para- graph of Sen- ate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty—		Percent- age of reduction.	Total imports by value, 1907.
		Present law.	Senate bill.		
2	Alcoholic compounds.....	60 cents per pound and 45 per cent.	60 cents per pound and 25 per cent.	20.09	\$1,365.30
4	Alumina, hydrate of, containing not more than 64 per cent of alumina.....	$\frac{5}{16}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{16}$ cent per pound a.....	33.33	1,296.00
	Alum. alum cake, etc.: Containing less than 15 per cent of alumina and more than $\frac{1}{16}$ of 1 per cent of iron oxide.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	50.00	24,582.30
	Containing more than 15 per cent of alumina or less than $\frac{1}{16}$ of 1 per cent of iron oxide.....	do.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	25.00	
5	Ammonia, sulphate of.....	$\frac{3}{16}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{3}{16}$ cent per pound.....	33.33	1,770,222.00
6	Argols, crude: Containing not more than 40 per cent of bitartrate of potash.....	1 cent per pound.....	5 per cent.....	85.26	114.00
	Containing more than 40 per cent of bitartrate of potash.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	do.....	65.59	10,443.00
	Argols, partly refined: Containing not more than 90 per cent of bitartrate of potash.....	4 cents per pound.....	3 cents per pound.....	25.00	2,634.00
	Containing more than 90 per cent of bitartrate of potash.....	5 cents per pound.....	4 cents per pound.....	20.00	1.00
	Tartrate of soda, or potassa, or Rochelle salts.....	4 cents per pound.....	3 cents per pound.....	25.00	76.00
	Cream of tartar, and patent tartar.....	6 cents per pound.....	5 cents per pound.....	16.67	614.00
9	Blue vitriol.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound a.....	50.00	75,650.50
11	Borax.....	$\frac{5}{8}$ cents per pound.....	2 cents per pound.....	60.00	48,118.00
	Borates of lime or soda: Containing not more than 36 per cent of anhydrous boracic acid.....	3 cents per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound.....	58.33	346.00
	Containing more than 36 per cent of anhydrous boracic acid.....	4 cents per pound.....	do.....	68.75	2,325.00
14	Chloroform.....	20 cents per pound.....	10 cents per pound.....	50.00	1,575.00
17	Collodion, etc.: Collodion and all compounds of pyroxylin.....	50 cents per pound.....	40 cents per pound.....	20.00	2,195.00
	Rolled, or in sheets, unpolished and not made up into articles.....	60 cents per pound.....	45 cents per pound.....	25.00	205.00
588	Copperas, or sulphate of iron.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	Free of duty.....	100.00	89.00
20	Ethers: Sulphuric.....	40 cents per pound.....	8 cents per pound.....	80.00	372.00
	Nitrous, spirits of.....	25 cents per pound.....	20 cents per pound.....	20.00
	Fruit ethers, oils, or essences.....	\$2 per pound.....	\$1 per pound.....	50.00	1,439.00
	Other, n. s. p. f.....	\$1 per pound.....	50 cents per pound.....	50.00	1,012.00
21	Extracts of mangrove bark.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	37.50	42.46
22	Gelatin, fish glue, or isinglass, prepared fish bladders and fish sounds, valued not above 10 cents.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound.....	2 cents a.....	20.00
27	Iodoform.....	\$1 per pound.....	75 cents per pound.....	25.00	59.00
	Licorice, extracts of.....	4 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.....	20 per cent.....	49.77	77,984.00
3	Croton oil.....	20 cents per pound.....	25 per cent.....	22.88	1.10
	Cotton-seed oil.....	4 cents per gallon.....	3 cents per gallon a.....	25.00	9,342.00
33	Flaxseed or linseed oil.....	20 cents per gallon.....	15 cents per gallon.....	25.00	5,712.00
	Poppy-seed oil.....	do.....	do.....	25.00	3,243.00
37	Peppermint oil.....	50 cents per pound.....	25 cents per pound.....	50.00	18,839.00
45	Ocher and ochery earths, ground in oil or water.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound.....	1 cent per pound.....	33.33
	Sienna and sienna earths, ground in oil or water.....	do.....	do.....	33.33
	Umber and umber earths, ground in oil or water.....	do.....	do.....	33.33
48	Ultramarine, dry, in pulp, or mixed with water.....	34 cents per pound.....	3 cents per pound.....	20.00	66,753.00
	Wash blue containing ultramarine.....	do.....	do.....	20.00	23,623.00
49	Varnishes, spirit.....	\$1.32 per gallon and 35 per cent.....	35 per cent.....	66.38	5,154.00
52	Whiting, ground in oil (putty).....	1 cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	25.00	143.00
58	Potash: Bichromate and chromate of.....	3 cents per pound.....	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.....	25.00	685.00
59	Chlorate of.....	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.....	2 cents per pound.....	20.00
61	Nitrate of, or saltpeter, refined.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	Free of duty.....	100.00	15,833.12
64	Plasters, healing or curative, and court-plaster.....	35 per cent.....	25 per cent.....	28.57	9,468.50
68	Soda: Bicarbonate of, or supercarbonate of, or saleratus, etc.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	16.67	4,274.00
	Bichromate and chromate of.....	2 cents per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound.....	12.50	425.00
70	Crystal carbonate of, etc.....	$\frac{3}{16}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	16.67	2,023.00
	Chlorate of.....	2 cents per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound.....	25.00
71	Hydrate of, or caustic.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	33.33	39,336.00
	Nitrite of.....	2 cents per pound.....	2 cents per pound.....	20.00	37,623.00
	Hyposulphite of.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	25.00	1,093.00
	Sulphide of.....	do.....	do.....	25.00	20,988.00
72	Sal. or soda crystals.....	$\frac{1}{16}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	16.67	4,771.00
73	Soda ash.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	33.33	73,052.00
	Arseniate of.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound.....	1 cent per pound.....	20.00	9,306.00
74	Silicate of.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	$\frac{1}{4}$ cent per pound.....	25.00	11,461.00
75	Sulphate of— Glauber salts.....	\$1.25 per ton.....	\$1 per ton.....	20.00	4,974.00
	Salt cake, or niter cake.....	do.....	do.....	20.00	37,679.00
76	Moss, sea.....	10 per cent.....	Free of duty.....	100.00	17,567.00
	Prepared.....	20 per cent.....	10 per cent.....	50.00	12,029.00
77	Sponges, manufactures of, n. s. p. f.....	40 per cent.....	30 per cent.....	25.00	45.00
78	Strychnia, or strychnine, and salts of.....	30 cents per ounce.....	15 cents per ounce.....	50.00	338.00
79	Sulphur: Refined.....	\$8 per ton.....	\$6 per ton.....	25.00	18,080.00
	Sublimed.....	do.....	do.....	25.00	41,501.00
81	Vanillin.....	80 cents per ounce.....	25 cents per ounce.....	68.75	25.00

SCHEDULE B—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE.

82	Brick, fire, not more than 10 pounds each: Glazed, enameled, etc.....	45 per cent.....	35 per cent.....	22.22	\$20.00
	Weighing more than 10 pounds each, not glazed.....	35 per cent.....	30 per cent.....	14.28
	Weighing more than 10 pounds each, glazed.....	45 per cent.....	35 per cent.....	22.22
	Brick, other than fire: Glazed, enameled, etc.....	do.....	do.....	22.22	7,665.00
86	Plaster rock or gypsum: Crude.....	50 cents per ton.....	20 cents per ton.....	60.00	457,047.00
	Ground or calcined.....	\$2.25 per ton.....	\$1.75 per ton.....	22.22	21,807.00
88	Mica: Unmanufactured or rough trimmed only.....	6 cents per pound and 20 per cent.....	5 cents per pound and 20 per cent.....	7.58	1,116,320.25
	Cut or trimmed.....	12 cents per pound and 20 per cent.....	10 cents per pound and 20 per cent.....	7.47	73,364.00
90	Rockingham ware, decorated.....	60 per cent.....	40 per cent.....	33.33
94	Carbons for electric lighting.....	90 cents per 100.....	70 cents per 100 feet.....	22.22	157,311.00
	Filter tubs.....	45 per cent.....	35 per cent.....	22.22	1,755.00

a Amendment to be submitted by committee.

b Estimated.

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.
SCHEDULE B—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE—continued.

Para- graph of Sen- ate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty—		Percent- age of re- duction.	Total imports, by value, 1907.
		Present law.	Senate bill.		
97	Cylinder, crown, and common window glass, unpolished:				
	Above 24 by 30 and not exceeding 24 by 36 inches.....	2½ cents per pound	2½ cents per pound	4.00	\$84,273.37
	Above 24 by 36 and not exceeding 30 by 40 inches.....	3½ cents per pound	3½ cents per pound	5.70	26,346.45
	Above 30 by 40 and not exceeding 40 by 60 inches.....	4 cents per pound	3½ cents per pound	3.23	11,698.00
98	Cylinder and crown glass, polished, unsilvered:				
	Above 24 by 30 and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches.....	15 cents per square foot	12 cents per square foot	20.00
	Above 24 by 60 inches.....	20 cents per square foot	15 cents per square foot	25.00
99	Plate glass, fluted, rolled, etc.: Above 24 by 60 inches.....	35 cents per square foot	22½ cents per square foot	35.71	1,613.00
100	Plate glass, cast, polished, unsilvered: Above 24 by 60 inches.....	do	do	35.71	40,687.00
101	Plate glass, cast, polished, silvered, and looking-glass plates: Above 24 by 60 inches.....	38 cents per square foot	25 cents per square foot	34.21	1,944.00
	Cylinder and crown glass, polished, silvered, and looking-glass plates: Above 24 by 60 inches.....	do	do	34.21	1,173.00
102	Plate glass, cast, polished, silvered, when bent, etc., above 24 by 60 inches.....	38 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	25 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	31.26	45.00
	Plate glass, cast, polished, unsilvered, when bent, etc., above 24 by 60 inches.....	35 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	22½ cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	33.65	6,324.00
	Cylinder, crown, and common window glass, unpolished, when bent, etc.:				
	Above 24 by 30 and not exceeding 24 by 36 inches.....	2½ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	2½ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	4.04	1,731.00
	Above 24 by 36 and not exceeding 30 by 40 inches.....	3½ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	3½ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	3.38	1,668.00
	Above 30 by 40 and not exceeding 40 by 60 inches.....	3½ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	3½ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	3.05	15,173.00
	Above 40 by 60 inches.....	4½ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	4½ cents per pound and 5 per cent.	3.00
	Cylinder and crown glass, polished, silvered, when ground, bent, etc., above 24 by 60 inches.....	38 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	25 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	30.64	18.00
	Cylinder and crown glass, polished, unsilvered, when ground, bent, etc., above 24 by 30 and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches.....	15 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	12 cents per square foot and 5 per cent.	18.18	208.00
109	Marble:				
	Sawed or dressed, over 2 inches in thickness.....	\$1.10 per cubic foot	\$1 per cubic foot	9.09	360.00
	Slabs or paving tiles—				
	Not more than 1 inch in thickness—				
	Unrubbed.....	12 cents per superficial foot	8 cents per superficial foot	33.33	48,593.00
	Rubbed.....	15 cents per superficial foot	10 cents per superficial foot	33.33	16,686.00
	More than 1 inch and not more than 1½ inches thick—				
	Unrubbed.....	do	do	20.00	8,212.00
	Rubbed.....	18 cents per superficial foot	12 cents per superficial foot	33.33	724.00
	More than 1½ inches and not more than 2 inches thick—				
Unrubbed.....	do	12½ cents per superficial foot	30.55	202.00	
Rubbed.....	21 cents per superficial foot	14½ cents per superficial foot	30.91	
Onyx:					
In block, rough or squared.....	\$1.50 per cubic foot	65 cents per cubic foot	56.67	71,437.00	
Sawed or dressed, over 2 inches in thickness.....	\$1.10 per cubic foot	\$1 per cubic foot	9.09	
Mosaic cubes of marble, onyx, or stone, not exceeding 2 inches in size, loose.....	1 cent per pound and 20 per cent.	½ cent per pound and 20 per cent.	58.59	49,405.00	
Attached to paper or other material.....	20 cents per superficial foot and 35 per cent.	5 cents per superficial foot and 35 per cent.	7.08	

SCHEDULE C—METALS, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

115	Iron ore.....	40 cents per ton	25 cents per ton	37.50	\$1,212,607.00
576	Basic slag.....	\$1 per ton	Free of duty	100.00	8,197.00
116	Iron in pigs:				
	Ferromanganese.....	\$4 per ton	\$2.50 per ton	37.50	6,027,240.00
	Spiegeleisen.....	do	do	37.50	2,486,086.00
	All other (except ferrosilicon).....	do	do	37.50	5,862,930.00
Scrap iron and steel:					
	Iron, wrought and cast.....	do	do	37.50	193,973.22
Steel.....	do	do	37.50	100,996.00	
117	Bar iron:				
	Rolled or hammered, comprising—				
	Flats not less than 1 inch wide nor less than ¼ of 1 inch thick.....	⅜ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	50.00	5,647.00
Round iron not less than ⅞ of 1 inch in diameter.....	do	do	50.00	163,050.00	
Square iron.....	do	do	50.00	3,115.10	
118	Bars or shapes of rolled or hammered iron n. s. p. f., and round iron in coils or rods, less than ⅞ of 1 inch in diameter.....	⅜ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	25.00	7,195.92
	Slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than iron in bars and more advanced than pig, except castings.....	⅜ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	20.00	1,090.00
	Bars, blooms, billets, slabs, or loops in the manufacture of which charcoal is used as fuel.....	\$12 per ton	\$8 per ton	33.33	1,495,826.00
119	Beams, girders, joists, etc., and all other structural shapes of iron or steel.....	⅜ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	20.00	467,466.00
120	Boiler or other plate iron or steel (except crucible plate steel and saw plates), etc.:				
	Valued 1 cent per pound or less.....	do	⅜ cent per pound	40.00
	Valued above 1 cent and not above 2 cents per pound.....	⅜ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	33.33	7,667.00
	Valued above 2 cents and not above 4 cents per pound.....	1 cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	30.00	1,807.00
	Valued above 4 cents per pound.....	25 per cent	20 per cent.	20.00
	Cold rolled, smoothed only, valued above 2 cents and not above 4 cents per pound.....	1⅞ cents per pound	⅜ cent per pound	25.00	2,193.00
121	Anchors, or parts of.....	1½ cents per pound	1 cent per pound	33.33	2,808.50
	Forgings of iron or steel or combined iron or steel.....	35 per cent	30 per pound	14.28	190,105.49
122	Hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel n. o. p. f., etc.:				
	Not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge.....	⅜ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	40.00	3,479.00
	Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge.....	⅜ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	33.33	95.90
	Thinner than No. 20 wire gauge.....	⅜ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	25.00	3,769.00
	Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, flared, splayed, or punched, etc.:				
	Not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge.....	⅜ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	33.33	390.00
	Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge.....	⅜ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	28.57
	Bands or strips of steel, suitable for making band saws: ^b				
	Untempered.....	3 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	1⅞ cents per pound	63.06	3,602.00
	Tempered, or tempered and polished.....	6 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	3⅞ cents per pound	64.77	11,589.00

^a Estimated.

^b Not enumerated in Senate bill.

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.

SCHEDULE C—METALS, AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued.

Para-graph of Sen-ate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty—		Percent-age of re-duction.	Total im-ports, by value, 1907.
		Present law.	Senate bill.		
	Wire of iron or steel, coated with zinc, etc.:				
	Not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge	1 3/4 cents per pound	1 3/4 cents per pound	17.24	\$321.00
	Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	2 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	11.36	2,581.00
	Manufactures of—				
	Not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge	2 1/2 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	9.26	79.00
	Smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	2 1/2 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	8.47	9.00
	Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	3 1/2 cents per pound	3 1/2 cents per pound	7.25	6,966.00
	Wire rope and wire strand:				
	Made of iron and steel wire—				
	Not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge	2 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	22.22	738.00
	Smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	2 1/2 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	20.00	1,980.00
	Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	3 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	16.67	6,278.00
	All valued more than 4 cents per pound	40 per cent plus 1 cent per pound.	40 per cent plus 1/2 cent per pound.	6.10	21,726.00
	All valued more than 4 cents per pound, n. s. p. f.	45 per cent plus 1 cent per pound.	do.	13.64	24,981.56
	Made of iron or steel wire, coated with zinc, etc.—				
	Not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge	2 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	20.41	1,654.00
	Smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	2 1/2 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	18.52	1,077.00
	Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	3 1/2 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	15.62	5,078.00
	All valued more than 4 cents per pound	40 per cent plus 1 1/2 cents per pound.	40 per cent plus 1/2 cent per pound.	5.28	7,379.00
136	Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, etc., cold rolled, etc., galvanized or coated with zinc, etc., valued above 7 and not above 10 cents per pound.	2 1/2 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	4.54	674.00
	Sheets and plates, n. s. p. f., and saw plates of steel, etc., cold rolled, cold ham-mered, blued, brightened, tempered, etc.:				
	Valued above 2 1/2 and not above 3 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	36.84	112.36
	Valued above 3 and not above 4 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	31.81	3,072.43
	Valued above 4 and not above 7 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	30.43	58.00
	Valued above 7 and not above 10 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	23.33	2,359.00
	Valued above 10 and not above 13 cents per pound	3 1/2 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	20.59	676.00
	Valued above 13 and not above 16 cents per pound	3 1/2 cents per pound	3 1/2 cents per pound	18.42	745.00
	Steel circular saw plates:				
	Valued above 4 and not above 7 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	19.44	16,088.00
	Valued above 7 and not above 10 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	14.00	51,199.00
	Valued above 10 and not above 13 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	2 1/2 cents per pound	12.07	6,005.00
139	Anvils	1 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	13.33	43,629.00
141	Axles, or parts of, axle bars, etc.	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	25.00	36,825.00
142	Hammers and sledges, etc.	1 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	8.33	4,286.05
143	Bolts, etc.	do.	1 1/2 cents per pound	25.00	14,993.95
	Castings:				
145	Cast-iron pipe of every description	1/2 cent per pound	1/2 cent per pound	37.50	23,775.50
146	Cast-iron vessels, not above 2 cents per pound	1/2 cent per pound	1/2 cent per pound	37.50
	Chiseled, drilled, machined, or otherwise advanced	do.	1/2 cent per pound	12.50
147	Malleable-iron castings, n. s. p. f.	1/2 cent per pound	do.	22.22	45,085.86
148	Hollow ware, coated, glazed, or tinned	2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	25.00	743.00
	Chain or chains, made of iron or steel:				
149	Not less than 1/2 inch in diameter	1 1/2 cents per pound	1/2 cent per pound	22.22	629.00
	Less than 1/2 inch and not less than 3/8 inch in diameter	1 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	18.18	131.00
	Less than 3/8 inch and not less than 1/4 inch in diameter	1 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	6.67	25.00
150	Boiler tubes, pipes, flues, or stays, etc.:				
	Not less than 1/2 inch in diameter	2 cents per pound	1 cent per pound	50.00
	Less than 1/2 inch and not less than 1/4 inch in diameter	do.	1 1/2 cents per pound	12.50
	Cylindrical or tubular tanks, etc.	45 per cent per pound.	30 per cent	33.33
	Flexible metal tubing or hose, n. s. p. f.	35 per cent per pound.	do.	14.29
	Welded cylindrical furnaces, made from plate metal	24 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	20.00	4,274.00
	Tubes and tubing for cycles	35 per cent	30 per cent	14.29	26,640.00
	Tubes, finished, n. s. p. f.	do.	do.	14.29	63,830.00
153	Table, carving, cooks', etc., knives, forks, and steels, etc.:				
	With handles of mother-of-pearl, shell, or ivory (silver, etc.)	16 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	14 cents each and 15 per cent.	9.30	4,740.00
	With handles of deerhorn	12 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	10 cents each and 15 per cent.	12.67	7,863.00
	With handles of hard rubber, solid bone, celluloid, or any pyroxylin material.	5 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	4 cents each and 15 per cent.	14.31	5,537.00
	With handles of any other material	1 1/2 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	1 cent each and 15 per cent.	26.14	25,283.94
	Butchers', hunting, plumbers', painters', etc., knives, etc.:				
	With handles of mother-of-pearl, shell, or ivory (silver, etc.)	16 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	14 cents each and 15 per cent.	8.91	69.00
	With handles of deerhorn	12 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	10 cents each and 15 per cent.	14.11	11.00
	With handles of hard rubber, solid bone, celluloid, or any pyroxylin material.	5 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	4 cents each and 15 per cent.	15.41	72.50
	With handles of any other material	1 1/2 cents per piece and 15 per cent.	1 cent each and 15 per cent.	25.25	822.85
154	Files, file blanks, rasps, and floats:				
	2 1/4 inches in length and under	30 cents per dozen	40 per cent	50.79	4,951.61
	Over 2 1/4 and not over 4 1/4 inches in length	50 cents per dozen	do.	52.32	26,484.00
	Over 4 1/4 and under 7 inches in length	75 cents per dozen	do.	54.27	36,919.32
	Nails, spikes, and tacks:				
158	Nails and spikes, cut, of iron and steel	1/2 cent per pound	1/2 cent per pound	33.33	1,792.00
159	Nails, horseshoe, hob, and all other wrought-iron or steel nails, n. s. p. f.	2 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	33.33	83.00
160	Nails, wire, made of wrought iron or steel—				
	Not less than 1 inch in length and not lighter than No. 16 wire gauge	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	50.00	3,288.00
161	Spikes of wrought iron or steel	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	25.00	738.30
	Nuts and washers, of wrought iron or steel	do.	do.	25.00	2,553.00
	Horse, mule, or ox shoes, of wrought iron or steel	do.	do.	25.00	34.00
162	Tacks, brads, or sprigs, cut—				
	Not exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand	1 1/2 cents per pound	1 cent per pound	50.00	140.00
	Exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand	1 1/2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	50.00	2.00
165	Rivets, of iron or steel	2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	37.50	5,430.00
166	Saws:				
	Circular saws	25 per cent	20 per cent	20.00	884.00
	Crosscut saws	5 cents per linear foot.	5 cents per linear foot.	16.67	2,384.00
	Hand, back, and other saws, n. s. p. f.	30 per cent	25 per cent	16.67	32,564.50
	Mill saws	10 cents per linear foot	8 cents per linear foot.	20.00
	Pit and drag saws	8 cents per linear foot.	6 cents per linear foot.	25.00	205.00
	Steel band saws, etc.	10 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	5 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	23.22	1,706.00
					62.00

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.

SCHEDULE C—METALS, AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued.

Para- graph of Sen- ate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty.		Percent- age of re- duction.	Total imports, by value, 1907.
		Present law.	Senate bill.		
167	Screws, wood:				
	Over 1/4 inch and not more than 1 inch in length	8 1/2 cents per pound ...	8 cents per pound	5.88
	Over 1 inch and not more than 2 inches in length	6 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	16.67	\$107.00
	More than 2 inches in length	4 cents per pound	3 1/2 cents per pound ...	12.50	86.00
169	Wheels, or parts of, etc.	1 1/2 cents per pound ...	1 1/2 cents per pound ...	16.67	153,550.00
	Ingots, etc., for railway wheels or tires, etc	1 1/2 cents per pound ...	1 cent per pound	20.00
170	Aluminum:				
	In crude form, etc	8 cents per pound	7 cents per pound	12.50	258,601.40
	Plates, sheets, etc	13 cents per pound	11 cents per pound	15.38	7,333.00
176	Silver leaf in packs of 500 leaves	75 cents per pack	50 cents per pack	33.33	804.00
178	Hooks and eyes, metallic, etc	5 1/4 cents per pound and 15 per cent.	4 cents per pound and 15 per cent.	17.55	\$4,702.00
181	Monazite sand and thorite	6 cents per pound	4 cents per pound	33.33
186	Agraffes, barettes, bars, etc., not jewelry	45 per cent.	40 per cent.	11.11
191	Zinc:				
	In blocks or pigs	1 1/2 cents per pound ...	1 cent per pound	33.33	95,069.00
	In sheets	2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound ...	37.50	5,286.00
194	Cash registers, linotype and all typesetting machines	45 per cent.	30 per cent.	33.33
195	Aluminum rope (made from aluminum wire)	45 per cent plus 1 cent per pound.	40 per cent plus 1/2 cent per pound.	11.98	1,913.00

SCHEDULE D—WOOD, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

196	Timber:				
	Round, used for spars, etc.	1 cent per cubic foot.	1/2 cent per cubic foot .	50.00	\$25,902.86
	Hewn, squared, or sided, etc.	do	do	50.00	49,811.78
197	Lumber:				
	Boards, planks, etc., whitewood, etc.—				
	Not planed or finished	\$1 per M feet	50 cents per M feet ...	50.00	211,967.74
	Planed or finished on two sides	\$2 per M feet	\$1.50 per M feet	25.00	12,302.00
	Planed on one side and tongued and grooved	do	do	25.00
	Planed on two sides and tongued and grooved	\$2.50 per M feet	\$2 per M feet	20.00
	Sawed lumber n. o. p. f.—				
	Not planed or finished	\$2 per M feet	\$1 per M feet	50.00	14,623,256.00
	Planed or finished on one side	\$2.50 per M feet	\$1.50 per M feet	40.00	239,649.28
	Planed or finished on two sides	\$3 per M feet	\$2 per M feet	33.33	48,348.91
	Planed or finished on three sides	\$3.50 per M feet	\$2.50 per M feet	28.57	34.00
	Planed or finished on four sides	\$4 per M feet	\$3 per M feet	25.00	1,224.00
	Planed on one side and tongued and grooved	\$3 per M feet	\$2 per M feet	33.33	83,415.75
	Planed on two sides and tongued and grooved	\$3.50 per M feet	\$2.50 per M feet	28.57	15,482.78
200	Paving posts, railroad ties, etc	20 per cent.	10 per cent.	50.00	570,323.41
201	Clapboards:				
	Pine	\$1.50 per thousand	\$1 per thousand	33.33	7,391.20
	Spruce	do	do	33.33	149,609.30
558	Fence posts	10 per cent.	Free	100.00	16,620.34
203	Laths	25 cents per thousand.	20 cents per thousand.	20.00	1,736,525.17

SCHEDULE E—SUGAR, MOLASSES, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

213	Sugar, Dutch standard in color, above No. 16, etc	1.95 cents per pound.	1.90 cents per pound.	2.56	\$116,060.70
215	Saccharine	1.50 per pound and 10 per cent.	75 cents per pound.	52.32	391.00

SCHEDULE G—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

232	Corn meal	20 cents per bu. of 48 lbs	40 cents per 100 pounds	4.00	\$87.50
258	Pease, green, in bulk, etc	40 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	37.50	2,910.03
262	Seeds: Celery	30 per cent.	10 cents per pound.	51.07	92.95
	Canary	do	Free of duty	100.00	96,145.00
266	Fish: Anchovies, etc., in other packages	40 per cent.	30 per cent.	25.00	105,452.50
286	Tallow	1/2 cent per pound	1/2 cent per pound	33.33	29,733.00
	Wool grease, etc., crude and not refined	1/2 cent per pound	1/2 cent per pound	50.00
292	Starch, all other than potato	1 1/2 cents per pound	1 cent per pound	33.33	51,973.00
293	Dextrine, etc	2 cents per pound	1 1/2 cents per pound	25.00	142,320.00

SCHEDULE H—SPIRITS, WINES, AND OTHER BEVERAGES.

300	Ginger wine or ginger cordial:				
	In casks or packages other than bottles or jugs—				
	Containing 14 per cent or less of absolute alcohol	40 cents per gallon	\$2.60 per proof gallon	35.00	(a)
	Do. (reciprocity)	35 cents per gallon	do	25.71	\$13,303.00
	In bottles or jugs, containing each more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart.	\$1.60 per dozen	do	2.38	6,983.00

SCHEDULE J—FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

334	Yarns, of jute, single, finer than 5 lea or number	35 per cent.	30 per cent.	14.28	\$68,354.50
335	Cables and cordage composed of istle or tampico fiber, etc	1 cent per pound	1/2 cent per pound	25.00	8,577.50
336	Threads, twines, etc.:				
	Made from yarn not finer than—				
	5 lea or number	13 cents per pound	10 cents per pound ...	23.08	8,159.00
	10 lea or number	16 1/2 cents per pound	13 1/2 cents per pound ..	17.91	1,017.00
	[Senate rate on these threads is 3 cents per pound less than present rate for each corresponding lea or number.]				
337	Yarns of flax, hemp, or ramie, etc., single in the gray, not finer than 8 lea or number.	7 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	14.28	14,395.00
338	Gill netting, etc.:				
	Made of thread, twines, etc., not finer than—				
	5 lea or number	13 cents per pound and 25 per cent.	10 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	22.44	3,205.75

(a) None.

Estimate of reductions in duties of H. R. 1438 as reported from the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, etc.—Continued.

SCHEDULE J—FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE, AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued.

Para- graph of Sen- ate bill.	Article.	Rates of duty—		Percent- age of re- duction.	Total imports by value, 1907.
		Present law.	Senate bill.		
338	Gill netting, etc.—Continued. Made of thread, twine, etc.—Continued. 6 lea or number.....	13½ cents per pound and 25 per cent.	10½ cents per pound and 20 per cent.	21.01	\$4.00
	[Senate rate on this gill netting is 3 cents per pound and 5 per cent less than the present rate for each corresponding lea or number of the thread from which made.]				
340	Carpets, etc., of flax, etc.: Value not exceeding 15 cents per square yard.....	5 cents per square yard and 35 per cent.	4 cents per square yard and 30 per cent.	17.42	359.00
	Valued over 15 cents per square yard.....	10 cents per square yard and 35 per cent.	8 cents per square yard and 30 per cent.	16.43	71,361.00
341	Hose, hydraulic, etc.....	20 cents per pound...	15 cents per pound...	25.00	1,758.00
343	Oilcloths, etc., 12 feet and over in width.....	20 cents per square yard and 20 per cent.	12 cents per square yard and 15 per cent.	34.65	89,396.00

SCHEDULE L—SILKS AND SILK GOODS.

392	Silk partly manufactured from cocoons, etc.....	40 cents per pound...	35 cents per pound...	12.50	\$295.05
395	Plushes on which ordinary duty does not amount to 50 per cent.....	50 per cent.....	\$1.85 per pound a.....	.90	11,481.00
	Other, on which ordinary duty does not amount to 50 per cent.....	do.....	\$2.50 per pound a.....	40.64	453.06
	Fabrics weighing not over ¼ ounce per square yard.....	\$4.50 per pound.....	\$4 per pound.....	11.11	459,925.00
396	Handkerchiefs:				
	Not hemmed or hemmed only—				
	Weighing ½ ounce to 1½ ounces per square yard—				
	Boiled off.....	\$3 per pound.....	50 per cent.....	15.25	8,520.00
	Dyed or printed in the piece.....	\$3.25 per pound.....	do.....	18.41	4,282.00
	Weighing 1½ ounces to 8 ounces—				
	Dyed in the piece, etc., containing over 45 per cent in weight of silk...	\$3 per pound.....	do.....	32.83	3,151.00
	Dyed in the thread, etc., containing 30 per cent to 45 per cent in weight of silk.	\$1.30 per pound.....	do.....	10.71	9.00
	Hemstitched, etc.—				
	Weighing ½ ounce to 1½ ounces per square yard, boiled off.....	\$3 per pound and 10 per cent.	60 per cent.....	5.50	20,304.00
	Weighing 1½ ounces to 8 ounces per square yard, dyed in the piece, etc., containing over 45 per cent in weight of silk.....	do.....	do.....	23.28	4,133.00

SCHEDULE M—PULP, PAPERS, AND BOOKS.

405	Printing paper, book paper, etc.:				
	Valued 2 to 2½ cents per pound.....	¾ cent per pound....	¾ cent per pound....	25.00	\$3,634.00
	Valued above 3 and not above 4 cents per pound.....	¾ cent per pound....	¾ cent per pound b....	16.67
408	Lithographic prints, etc.:				
	On paper, etc.—				
	Exceeding 1/16 to 1/8 inch in thickness—				
	Exceeding 35 to 400 square inches.....	8 cents per pound....	7 cents per pound....	12.50	423,019.00
	Exceeding 400 square inches.....	35 per cent.....	do.....	52.17	9,764.62

SCHEDULE N—SUNDRIES.

431	Gunpowder, etc.:				
	Valued 20 cents or less per pound.....	4 cents per pound....	2 cents per pound....	50.00	\$291.00
	Valued over 20 cents per pound.....	6 cents per pound....	4 cents per pound....	33.33	213,303.00
432	Matches:				
	In boxes.....	8 cents per gross.....	6 cents per gross.....	25.00	197,816.00
	Otherwise.....	1 cent per thousand...	¼ cent per thousand...	25.00	10,183.00
433	Blasting caps.....	\$2.36 per thousand...	\$2 per thousand.....	15.25	15,982.00
	Cartridges.....	35 per cent.....	30 per cent.....	14.28	101,482.57
	Mining and blasting fuse.....	do.....	do.....	14.28	14,083.00
441	Haireloth, known as crinoline.....	10 cents per square yard.	8 cents per square yard.	20.00	347.00
442	Hats, bonnets, etc., of fur, etc.:				
	Valued not over \$5 per dozen.....	\$2 per dozen and 20 per cent.	\$1.25 per dozen and 15 per cent.	34.92	4,907.25
	Valued \$5 to \$10 per dozen.....	\$3 per dozen and 20 per cent.	\$2.25 per dozen and 15 per cent.	25.00	77,155.41
	Valued \$10 to \$20 per dozen.....	\$5 per dozen and 20 per cent.	\$4 per dozen and 15 per cent.	21.76	69,032.24
	Valued over \$20 per dozen.....	\$7 per dozen and 20 per cent.	\$5.50 per dozen and 15 per cent.	22.92	82,402.44
448	Leather band or belting.....	20 per cent.....	5 per cent.....	75.00	61,739.11
	Upper, dressed.....	do.....	15 per cent.....	25.00	2,167,945.75
	All other.....	do.....	do.....	25.00	1,231,369.25
	Calfskins, tanned, etc.....	do.....	do.....	25.00	216,854.00
	Skins dressed and finished other than chamois.....	do.....	do.....	25.00	806,589.75
	Skins for morocco—				
	Finished.....	do.....	do.....	25.00	41,697.58
	Tanned.....	10 per cent.....	5 per cent.....	50.00	3,112,821.75
	Patent leather, etc.—				
	Weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen skins.....	30 cents per pound and 20 per cent.	27 cents per pound and 15 per cent.	18.31	216,113.00
	Weighing 10 pounds to 25 pounds per dozen skins.....	30 cents per pound and 10 per cent.	27 cents per pound and 8 per cent.	13.07	92,185.00
	Pianoforte leather.....	35 per cent.....	20 per cent.....	42.86
	Boots and shoes.....	25 per cent.....	15 per cent.....	40.00	164,509.30
	Shoe laces.....	50 cents per gross and 20 per cent.	50 cents per gross and 10 per cent.	25.20	343.00
453	Harnesses, etc.....	45 per cent.....	35 per cent.....	22.22	160,632.83
462	Paintings, etc.....	20 per cent.....	15 per cent.....	25.00	2,544,262.08
463	Statuary.....	do.....	do.....	25.00	9,138.00
468	Agricultural implements, etc.....	do.....	do.....	25.00	23,643.70

a Estimated.

b Amendment to be submitted by committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I will state that it was my purpose to address myself to this amendment—

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Clay	Guggenheim	Page
Bacon	Crane	Heyburn	Paynter
Beveridge	Crawford	Hughes	Perkins
Borah	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Brandegee	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Root
Briggs	Curtis	Jones	Smoot
Bristow	Davis	Kean	Stone
Brown	Dick	La Follette	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Lodge	Taliaferro
Burkett	Dolliver	McCumber	Tillman
Burnham	du Pont	McEnery	Warner
Burrows	Fletcher	Martin	Warren
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Wetmore
Carter	Foster	Newlands	
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Overman	
Clapp	Gore	Owen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. FOSTER. I will state that it will be impossible for me at this hour to conclude my remarks to-day, and if it does not put the chairman of the committee to any special or great inconvenience—

Mr. ALDRICH. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I will request that he take up some other item of the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, that is quite agreeable to me. Mr. FOSTER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, there are several verbal changes, and two or three changes in rates which the Committee on Finance have decided should be made in the silk schedule. The phraseology in several paragraphs is defective, and I think perhaps that I might offer this modification, and have it read. I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to some of the changes which have been made in the velvet provisions. The only changes made are reductions and changes in phraseology. I offer this now as a substitute for the proposition as originally introduced, and I ask that it may be read. I shall not ask to have it acted on to-night. I ask the Senator from Iowa to examine it before morning, so that he can see the changes which have taken place.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope that, after it has been read, it may be printed, so that we may examine it.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is already in print, and I send a copy of it to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island submits an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 135, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

SCHEDULE L.—SILK AND SILK GOODS.

392. Silk partially manufactured from cocoons or from waste silk, and not further advanced or manufactured than carded or combed silk, 35 cents per pound.

393. Spun silk or schappe silk yarn, valued at not exceeding \$1 per pound, whether in singles, or advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more yarns together, 35 cents per pound; if valued at exceeding \$1 per pound, in skeins, warps, or cops, if in singles or not advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more yarns together, on all numbers up to and including No. 205, 45 cents per pound, and in addition thereto ten one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; exceeding No. 205, 45 cents per pound, and in addition thereto fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; if advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more yarns together, on all numbers up to and including No. 205, 50 cents per pound, and in addition thereto ten one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; exceeding No. 205, 50 cents per pound, and in addition thereto fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; if valued at exceeding \$1 per pound, in skeins, warps, or beams, if in singles or not advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more yarns together, on all numbers up to and including No. 205, 55 cents per pound, and in addition thereto ten one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; exceeding No. 205, 55 cents per pound, and in addition thereto fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; if advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more yarns together, on all numbers up to and including No. 205, 60 cents per pound, and in addition thereto ten one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; exceeding No. 205, 60 cents per pound, and in addition thereto fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; if valued at exceeding \$1 per pound, colored, bleached, or dyed, in skeins or warps, if in singles or not advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more yarns together, on all numbers up to and including No. 205, 55 cents per pound, and in addition thereto ten one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; exceeding No. 205, 55 cents per pound, and in addition thereto fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; if advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more yarns together, on all numbers up to and including No. 205, 60 cents per pound, and in addition thereto ten one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; exceeding No. 205, 60 cents per pound, and in addition thereto fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; if valued at exceeding \$1 per pound, colored, bleached, or dyed, in skeins, bobbins, cops, spools, or beams, if in singles or not advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more yarns together, on all numbers up to and including No. 205, 65 cents per pound, and in addition thereto ten one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; exceeding No. 205, 65 cents per pound, and in addition thereto fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; if advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more yarns together, on all numbers up to and including No. 205, 70 cents per pound, and in addition thereto ten one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound; on all numbers exceeding No. 205, 70 cents per pound, and in addition thereto fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per number per pound. In assessing duty on all spun silk or schappe silk yarn, the number indicating the size of the yarn shall be taken according to the metric or French system, and shall, in all cases, refer to the size of the singles: *Provided*, That in no case shall the duty be assessed on a less number of yards than is marked on the skeins, bobbins, cops, spools, or beams. But in no case shall any of the goods enumerated in this paragraph pay less rate of duty than 37½ per cent ad valorem.

394. Thrown silk in the gum, if singles, 50 cents per pound; if tram, 75 cents per pound; if organzine, \$1 per pound; and if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture, in addition to the rates herein provided, 50 cents per pound. Sewing silk, twist, floss, and silk threads or yarns of any description made from raw silk, not specially provided for in this section, if in the gum, \$1 per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture, \$1.50 per pound, *Provided*, That in no case shall duty be assessed on a less number of yards than is marked on the skeins, bobbins, cops, spools, or beams.

395. Velvets, chenilles, and other pile fabrics, not specially provided for in this section, cut or uncut, composed wholly or in chief value of silk, weighing not less than 5½ ounces per square yard, \$1.50 per pound; weighing less than 5½ ounces per square yard, but not less than 4 ounces, and having more than 130 picks per inch, or if all the filling is not cotton, \$2.75 per pound; if having 130 picks per inch or less, and if all the filling is cotton, \$2 per pound; all the foregoing weighing less than 4 ounces to the square yard, \$4 per pound. Plushes, cut or uncut, composed wholly or in chief value of silk, weighing not less than 9½ ounces per square yard, \$1 per pound; weighing less than 9½ ounces per square yard, \$2.40 per pound. Measurements to ascertain widths of goods for determining weight per square yard of the foregoing articles shall not include the selvages, but the duty shall be levied upon the total weight of goods, including the selvages. The distinction between "plushes" and "velvets" shall be determined by the length of the pile; those having pile exceeding one-seventh of an inch in length, to be taken as "plushes;" those having pile one-seventh of 1 inch or less in length, shall be taken as "velvets." The distance from the end of the pile to the bottom of the first binding pick shall be considered as the length of the pile. Velvet or plush ribbons, or other pile fabrics not over 12 inches and not less than three-fourths of 1 inch in width, cut or uncut, of which silk is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, containing no silk except that in the pile and selvages; if black, \$1.60 per pound; if other than black, \$1.75 per pound; if containing silk other than that in the pile and selvages; if black, \$2 per pound; if other than black, \$2.25 per pound; for each one-fourth of 1 inch or fraction thereof, less than three-fourths of 1 inch in width, there shall be paid in addition to the above rates, 40 cents per pound. Woven fabrics in the piece, composed wholly or in chief value of silk, not specially provided for in this section, weighing not more than one-third of 1 ounce per square yard, \$4 per pound; weighing more than one-third of 1 ounce, but not more than two-thirds of 1 ounce per square yard; if in the gum, \$3 per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, \$3.25 per pound; if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, \$3.50 per pound; if weighing more than two-thirds of 1 ounce but not more than 1 ounce per square yard; if in the gum, \$2.65 per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, \$3 per pound; if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, \$3.25 per pound; if weighing more than 1 ounce but not more than 1½ ounces per square yard; if in the gum, \$2.50 per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, \$2.85 cents per pound; if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, \$3.10 per pound; if weighing more than 1½ ounces, but not more than 2 ounces, and if containing not more than 20 per cent in weight of silk, if in the gum, 70 cents per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, 85 cents per pound; if containing more than 20 per cent, but not more than 30 per cent in weight of silk; if in the gum, 85 cents per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, \$1.10 per pound; if containing more than 30 per cent, but not more than 40 per cent in weight of silk; if in the gum, \$1.05 per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, \$1.25 per pound; if containing more than 40 per cent, but not more than 50 per cent in weight of silk; if in the gum, \$1.25 per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, \$1.50 per pound; if containing more than 50 per cent in weight of silk or if wholly of silk; if in the gum, \$2.50 per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, \$3 per pound; if weighing more than 2 ounces, but not more than 8 ounces per square yard, and if containing not more than 20 per cent in weight of silk; if in the gum, 57½ cents per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, 70 cents per pound; if containing more than 20 per cent, but not more than 30 per cent in weight of silk; if in the gum, 75 cents per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, 90 cents per pound; if containing more than 30 per cent, but not more than 40 per cent in weight of silk; if in the gum, 90 cents per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, \$1.10 per pound; if containing more than 40 per cent, but not more than 50 per

cent in weight of silk: if in the gum, \$1.10 per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, \$1.30 per pound; if containing more than 50 per cent in weight of silk, or if wholly of silk: if in the gum, \$2.25 per pound; if ungummed, wholly or in part, or if further advanced by any process of manufacture, or otherwise, or if dyed or printed in the piece, \$2.75 per pound. Woven fabrics in the piece, composed wholly or of chief value of silk, if dyed in the thread or yarn, and the weight is not increased in dyeing beyond the original weight of raw silk, if containing less than 30 per cent in silk, \$1.25 per pound; if containing more than 30 per cent but not more than 45 per cent in weight of silk, \$1.60 per pound; if containing more than 45 per cent in weight of silk, \$3 per pound; if weight is increased in dyeing beyond the original weight of raw silk; if weighing more than one-third of 1 ounce, but not more than 1 ounce, per square yard; if black (except selvedges), \$2.25 per pound; if other than black, \$3 per pound; if weighing more than 1 ounce, but not more than 1½ ounces per square yard; if black (except selvedges), \$2 per pound; if other than black, \$2.75 per pound; if weighing more than 1½ but not more than 2½ ounces per square yard; if black (except selvedges), \$1.80 per pound; if other than black, \$2.50 per pound; if weighing more than 2½ but not more than 4 ounces per square yard; if black (except selvedges), \$1.65 per pound; if other than black, \$2.25 per pound; if weighing more than 4 but not more than 8 ounces per square yard, and if containing not more than 30 per cent in weight of silk; if black (except selvedges), 75 cents per pound; if other than black, 90 cents per pound; if containing more than 30 per cent but not more than 45 per cent in weight of silk; if black (except selvedges), \$1.10 per pound; if other than black, \$1.30 per pound; if containing more than 45 per cent in weight of silk but not more than 60 per cent; if black (except selvedges), \$1.40 per pound; if other than black, \$1.60 per pound; if containing more than 60 per cent in weight of silk, or if composed wholly of silk, and if having not more than 220 single threads to the inch in the warp; if black (except selvedges), \$1.50 per pound; if other than black, \$2 per pound; if having more than 220 but not more than 300 single threads to the inch in the warp; if black (except selvedges), \$1.65 per pound; if other than black, \$2.25 per pound; if having more than 300 but not more than 380 single threads to the inch in the warp; if black (except selvedges), \$1.80 per pound; if other than black, \$2.50 per pound; if having more than 380 but not more than 460 single threads to the inch in the warp; if black (except selvedges), \$2 per pound; if other than black, \$2.75 per pound; if having more than 460 single threads to the inch in the warp; if black (except selvedges), \$2.25 per pound; if other than black, \$3 per pound; if printed in the warp and weighing not more than 1½ ounces per square yard, \$3.50 per pound; weighing more than 1½ but not more than 2 ounces per square yard, \$3.25 per pound; weighing more than 2 ounces per square yard, \$2.75 per pound. But in no case shall any goods made on Jacquard looms or any goods containing more than one color in the filling, or any of the goods enumerated in this paragraph, including such as have india rubber as a component material, pay a less rate of duty than 45 per cent ad valorem.

396. Handkerchiefs or mufflers composed wholly or in chief value of silk, finished or unfinished, if cut, not hemmed or hemmed only, shall pay 50 per cent ad valorem; if such handkerchiefs or mufflers are hemstitched or imitation hemstitched, or reversed, or have drawn threads, or are embroidered in any manner, whether with an initial letter, monogram, or otherwise, by hand or machinery, or are tamboured, appliquéed, or having tucking or insertion, 60 per cent ad valorem.

397. Ribbons, bandings, including hatbands, beltings, bindings, all of the foregoing not exceeding 12 inches in width, and if with fast edges, bone casings, braces, cords, and tassels, garters, gorings, suspenders, tubings, and webs and webbing, composed wholly or in chief value of silk, and whether composed in any part of india rubber or otherwise, if not embroidered in any manner, by hand or machinery, 50 per cent ad valorem.

398. Laces, edgings, insertings, galloons, flouncings, neck ruffings, ruchings, braids, fringes, trimmings, ornaments, nets or nettings, velis or vellings, and articles made wholly or in part of any of the foregoing, or of chiffons, embroideries and articles embroidered by hand or machinery, or tamboured or appliquéed, clothing ready made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including knit goods, made up or manufactured in whole or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer; all of the foregoing composed of silk, or of silk and metal, or of which silk is the component material of chief value, whether in part of india rubber or otherwise and braid composed in part of india rubber, not specially provided for in this section, and silk goods ornamented with beads or spangles, 60 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That articles composed wholly or in chief value of any of the materials or goods dutiable under this paragraph shall pay not less than the rate of duty imposed upon such materials or goods by this section: *Provided further*, That tamboured or appliquéed articles or fabrics shall pay no less rate of duty than that imposed upon the material if not so tamboured or appliquéed.

399. All manufactures of silk, or of which silk is the component material of chief value, including such as have india rubber as a component material, not specially provided for in this section, 50 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That all manufactures of silk enumerated under any paragraph of this schedule, if composed in any part of wool, shall be classified and assessed for duty as manufactures of wool.

400. In ascertaining the weight of silk under the provisions of this schedule, either in the threads, yarns, or fabrics, the weight shall be taken in the condition in which found in the goods, without deductions therefrom for any dye, coloring matter, or other foreign substance or material. In ascertaining the number of single-warp threads to the inch under the provisions of this schedule, the number of all warp single or two or more ply threads shall be determined by the singles.

401. Yarns, threads, filaments of artificial or imitation silk, or of artificial or imitation horsehair, by whatever name known, and by whatever process made, if in the form of singles, 45 cents per pound; if in the form of tram, 50 cents per pound; if in the form of organzine, 60 cents per pound: *Provided*, That in no case shall any yarns, threads, or filaments of artificial or imitation silk or imitation horsehair, or any yarns, threads, or filaments made from waste of such materials, pay a less rate of duty than 30 per cent ad valorem; braids, laces, embroideries, galloons, neck ruffings, ruchings, fringes, trimmings, beltings, cords, tassels, ribbons, or other articles or fabrics composed wholly or in chief value of yarns, threads, filaments, or fibers of artificial or imitation silk or of artificial or imitation horsehair, by whatever name known, and by whatever process made, 45 cents per pound, and in addition thereto, 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall not call this up for action now, but when I do I shall explain the changes which have taken place. As I have stated, they are mostly changes in phraseology. The only changes in rates are reductions upon some of the velvet items.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance whether there will be printed a comparison between the schedule as now framed and the proposed law that will take the place of the tariff now in force?

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator mean the provisions that are already in the bill as reported from the Committee on Finance?

Mr. CUMMINS. I mean the same comparison which has already been instituted between the bill as reported and the Dingley rates which we have. In so far as there has been a change of duties, will the Committee on Finance present a similar comparison? This is a complicated schedule, and it is a little difficult to those who have not given a great deal of study to the matter to make that comparison.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will be easier to have a comparison made and printed between the paragraphs as originally reported from the Committee on Finance and the proposition which is now made.

I think perhaps that had better be ordered. We will have that printed, so that Senators can see the changes which have been made from our original report. It will be impossible to have any sort of a comparison that would be intelligible between this plan of assessing duties and the original law, for the reason that they are based upon an entirely different plan. These duties are entirely specific.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that.

Mr. ALDRICH. And the others are compound.

Mr. CUMMINS. The committee did institute that comparison?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes. I can state in general terms what the differences are, and I shall do so when the matter is up for consideration.

Mr. CUMMINS. So far as the changes now made are concerned, the committee will compare them with the original report, so they can be seen at a glance?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; I will have this printed as an amendment. I ask that it may be printed as an amendment to the bill, with the changes printed in italics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator, I desire to ask that certain amendments which I propose to offer may lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have several suggested changes, largely of a verbal character, which I think might be disposed of now. I think there will be no objection to any of them. I send the amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] requests that the amendments which he submitted may be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BACON. Yes, sir; in order that I may offer them at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be made.

Mr. ALDRICH. I wish to move an amendment on page 8, line 16. I ask first that the vote by which the paragraph was agreed to may be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the paragraph was agreed to will be reconsidered. The Chair hears none. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 16, after the word "gelatin," it is proposed to strike out the comma and the word "edible."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. In paragraph 40 I withdraw the committee amendment, or I will ask that it be disagreed to. The paragraph has been passed over in this case. I think it has never been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, line 23, paragraph 40, the Committee on Finance reported an amendment to strike out the words "one dollar and fifty," and to insert "seventy-five."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What is the proposition, Mr. President?

Mr. SCOTT. I understand the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the amendment heretofore proposed by the committee may be disagreed to. It amounts to the same thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment can not be withdrawn. The Chair will put the question to the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the Senate disagree to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCOTT. Am I to understand that that restores the duty to \$1.50?

Mr. ALDRICH. It does.

I ask that paragraph 49 be amended so as to read as proposed in the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which paragraph 49 was agreed to will be reconsidered. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island will now be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, after line 3, it is proposed to insert as a substitute for the House text and the Senate committee amendment the following:

49. Varnishes, including so-called gold size or Japan, and spirit varnishes or enamel paints made with varnishes containing 5 per cent or more of methyl alcohol, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. On the same page, in line 24, paragraph 54, I move to strike out the words "including oxide of iron pigment and oxide of iron polishing powder."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paragraph will be reconsidered. The Senator from Rhode Island now offers an amendment to it, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, line 24, strike out the words "including oxide of iron pigment and oxide of iron polishing powder."

Mr. BURKETT. Where will those articles come in if those words are stricken out?

Mr. ALDRICH. They will come in in the iron paragraph or under the chemical paragraph, where they ought to be anyhow. They ought not to be here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. In paragraph 93, page 23, after line 11, I move to insert the words I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the vote whereby the paragraph was agreed to will be reconsidered. The Senator from Rhode Island offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, at the end of paragraph 93 as amended, it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the following:

Electrodes, brushes, plates, and disks, all the foregoing composed wholly or in chief value of carbon, 30 per cent ad valorem.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. In paragraph 97, on page 26, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has an amendment to offer.

Mr. McCUMBER. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk as a substitute for paragraph 97.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 26, in lieu of paragraph 97, as printed in the bill, it is proposed to insert:

57. Unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches, valued at not more than 1½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; valued at more than 1½ cents per pound, 1¾ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 384 square inches, valued at not more than 1¾ cents per pound, 1¾ cents per pound; valued at more than 1¾ cents per pound, 1¾ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, valued at not more than 2¼ cents per pound, 1¾ cents per pound; valued at more than 2¼ cents per pound, 2¼ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 864 square inches, valued at not more than 2¼ cents per pound, 2¼ cents per pound; valued at more than 2¼ cents per pound, 2¼ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 1,200 square inches, valued at not more than 2½ cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; valued at more than 2½ cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 2,400 square inches, valued at not more than 2½ cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound; valued at more than 2½ cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound; above that, valued at not more than 3 cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound; valued at more than 3 cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound; Provided, That unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window 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 glass.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this is a very complicated and lengthy amendment, and I should be glad to have it explained, so as to be informed whether it is an increase or a decrease.

Mr. ALDRICH. It decreases the duty upon common window glass.

Mr. NELSON. What is the effect on the other kinds of glass? There are a large number of classifications not contained in the original amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] will explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact that the amendment as sent to the desk includes paragraph 98. Does the Senator desire to have that considered as part of his amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; only paragraph 97 at present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] as a substitute for paragraph 97.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am utterly opposed to this amendment if it reduces the duty; and from the mere reading at the desk no one can tell what effect it will have upon paragraph 97 as it is now in the bill. I think it is only fair that it should go over and be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER. I can say, Mr. President, that it reduces the duty on all classes of glass from the rates of the Dingley law as well as the rates of the pending bill as it came from the House.

Mr. NELSON. On all these brackets?

Mr. McCUMBER. On all these brackets, as will be seen when it is printed. It provides for very slight reductions in the higher grades.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. It will be remembered that I raised the question with reference to the duties on glass in this paragraph.

I have examined the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. The general tendency of the amendment is to reduce the duties upon the low-priced glass, with very slight reductions upon the higher-priced glass. While I would have been better satisfied if the reductions had been made without introducing the element of value into the subject at all, yet, upon the whole, I believe that this is a fair reduction of the rates on glass of this kind and will fairly meet the demand that exists for reduction in common window glass.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator in charge of the amendment to explain, if he will, the ratio of reduction.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can give it. For instance, on glass not exceeding 150 square inches the Dingley rate is 1½ cents; the rate as fixed by the bill as it came from the House is 1¾ cents; and the amendment makes the rate 1¾ cents on glass valued at not over 1¾ cents per pound and 1¾ cents when it is of a higher value, the higher value, as has been shown, being glass used for pictures mainly, and the other is used in window frames, and each of the brackets is divided into those two classes.

We will take the next class, glass over 150 square inches and not exceeding 384 square inches, the Dingley rate on which was 1¾ cents per pound, and the rate of the House bill was the same. The rate as fixed by this amendment is 1¾ cents when valued at not over 1¾ cents per pound, and 1¾ cents if valued at over 1¾ cents per pound. You may take each of the brackets as they follow on, and in no instance is the rate greater than the rate fixed by the House bill, and on the cheaper glass the rate is lower than the rate fixed by the House bill.

Mr. NELSON. As I understand, Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator, the paragraph has been divided into two brackets in each case?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. And in each of the first brackets the rate has been made lower?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. And the higher brackets have not gone over the Dingley rates?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is correct. In the second bracket and in the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh the rates are lower than the Dingley rates, even on the higher grades of glass.

Mr. DICK. If I understand the Senator correctly, he states that all the rates have been reduced both as compared with the Dingley law and as compared with the bill as it came from the House. Am I right about that?

Mr. McCUMBER. Every bracket has been reduced on a portion of the glass that would come in under that bracket; that is, on that which would be denominated "common window glass" the rates have all been reduced; and when we get up to the larger sizes, they have been reduced both as to the higher and

the lower brackets. In other words, an investigation showed that the rates could be reduced without injury to the higher class on both values; but upon the lower class of glass we thought that the rates could not be reduced except as to window glass. The amendment may seem to be rather complicated, but I can go through it and explain each subdivision if the Senator so desires.

Mr. DICK. No; I do not care so much about that as to know where the deepest cut was made.

Mr. McCUMBER. The deepest cut was made in the larger sizes.

Mr. DICK. But in the effort to equalize, no sizes have been increased?

Mr. McCUMBER. No sizes have been increased.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I do not intend that this amendment shall be adopted if I can help it. West Virginia has been pretty patient. This is one of her chief industries; and I know of my own personal knowledge that those engaged in the manufacture of window glass in my State have not only not made any money, but that they have been making window glass at a loss. Why we should be picked out and discriminated against in this bill by a member of the committee, I can not understand. I shall insist that the amendment go over until we have an opportunity to examine it, or I shall try to talk upon it until 7 o'clock.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the amendment provides a much better adjustment of the rates upon various classes of glass than the provision originally presented. It is true that it does reduce the duties upon common window glass, but I think the reduction has been pretty fairly done and that the rates are preserved sufficiently to be protective. I do not think that any interest will seriously suffer if this paragraph shall be adopted.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in no case is the duty less than 100 per cent. Take glass valued a not over 1½ cents. On such glass the duty is 1½ cents per pound. That is a pretty fair duty. I appreciate the fact that common window glass is sold exceedingly low. There is no great demand for glass of 150 square inches; it is not used in building homes to any extent. The small-size glass is used in factories, mills, and places of that kind. The glass provided for in the next bracket below that is used in factories and mills as well as in the building of dwelling houses, but in no instance do we find the duty much less than 100 per cent on that class.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from West Virginia, in order to facilitate the transaction of business, that he allow this to be agreed to, and if to-morrow morning he finds that he is injured, I will be very glad to have the paragraph reopened.

Mr. SCOTT. I have no objection to that, and I do not want to be an obstructionist; but I do want to say the fact that the Senator from North Dakota informed the Senate that it is 100 per cent does not make any difference to me. If it takes 200 per cent to protect the glass industry of my State and other States, I am in favor of putting it on. That is no argument at all. I know that the window-glass industry is in a languishing condition, and I do know those engaged in it have lost money. Why should this industry be selected for a reduction?

I am willing to let this matter go over until to-morrow, with the understanding that I shall have the opportunity to call it up.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the amendment may be agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BACON. What is the amendment?

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

Several SENATORS. No.

Mr. BACON. If it is too long to be read—

Mr. ALDRICH. It is in regard to window glass.

Mr. ROOT. Before this matter goes over, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to a fact which was well understood when this was up in the Senate before. It was generally agreed that the importations of window glass which appear in our statistical tables were entirely of glass not used for glazing windows, but used for photographic plates and in picture frames and for similar purposes, and that there was no importation whatever of common window glass. So it seemed to be the general understanding that the committee would undertake to find a way of discriminating between these two different products and would arrange the duties so that the smaller duties would be upon the cheaper glass of more common use. As the duty now stands, it permits the introduction of high-grade glass, coming under the head of window glass, and is absolutely prohibitive upon the real window glass.

This amendment discriminates between the duties, so that the duty upon the high-grade glass, of which there is already a

large importation, will be left practically as it is, and the duty upon the low-grade glass, which is now practically prohibited, shall be reduced, so that it will practically have the same relation to the production and importation of that kind of glass that the other duty has to the high grade of glass.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if I understood correctly the Senator who introduced this amendment, he said that the amendment would reduce all sizes, kinds, and characters of window glass. There have been several weeks of discussion here on the tariff bill, and I am glad in one sense that the committee is willing at last to agree with the gentlemen who have been trying to revise downward, and it happens to be on window glass, a product of an industry in my State that is languishing now, as I stated before, and can scarcely keep its head above water. I do not think that is fair. Of course there must be a victim. There has to be a reduction downward. Now, I suppose they have struck the place where the victim is to be offered up as a sacrifice.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator says the trade in window glass is languishing. I want to ask the Senator if it is languishing by reason of the importation of window glass or its overproduction. If I understand correctly, there are no importations whatever of this lower class of glass. I do understand there is an overproduction at the present time.

Mr. SCOTT. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing always to accommodate the chairman of the Finance Committee, a gentleman who has been overworked, and who I know has done the very best he could for us all. But I want it distinctly understood that it goes over, so far as I am concerned, with the privilege, when I see the amendment in print, to ask, if I object to it, that it be reconsidered, and that there will be no objection.

Mr. ALDRICH. That was my statement.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question then is—

Mr. DICK. The chairman of the committee can speak for himself with reference to that single objection. But somebody else can make it. The Senator from West Virginia reserves no right except that which the chairman of the committee, in making this concession, is willing to surrender. I see no advantage to the committee in having it at once agreed to, if the privilege is to be open to have it reconsidered when once the amendment is printed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that it may go over, in order that it may be disposed of. I am anxious to get ahead with the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent that the schedule, or the paragraph—

Mr. ALDRICH. The paragraph.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. May go over until to-morrow. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALDRICH. On page 71, paragraph 208, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 71, paragraph 208, line 19, after the word "cane," insert the words "or reeds;" and in line 22, strike out "twenty-five," and insert "twenty."

Mr. OVERMAN. The words "or reeds" are in the paragraph now. What is the change?

Mr. LODGE and others. No.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is in line 19, after the word "cane" to insert "or reeds."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In lines 23 and 24, strike out "forty-five" and insert "forty."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Are there other amendments to this paragraph?

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I wish to ask if paragraph 207 has not been passed over?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On the first reading it was. Without objection, paragraph 208 as amended is agreed to. No objection is heard.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to ask the chairman a question. If I recollect aright, I have a promise out from him. I refer to paragraph 199, in reference to brier root, where I am trying to get in my laurel root, of which to make pipes.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator has a right to go back to that whenever he feels like. However, I will ask that the amendment which I send up be considered.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 210, page 72, line 3, after the word "blinds," insert "baskets."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 5—

Mr. SCOTT. I will now offer my amendment to paragraph 199, by consent.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee will take it up later.

Mr. SCOTT. I always get that.

The SECRETARY. In line 5, strike out the words "natural or raw;" and in lines 5, 6, and 7, strike out the words "if stained, dyed, painted, printed, polished, grained, or creosoted, 40 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to strike out paragraph 212. I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Now, will the Senator allow me to offer an amendment to paragraph 199, on page 70?

Mr. ALDRICH. Not the amendment which he suggested, because the committee will take it up and consider it; but if he has another, I will be very glad to have him offer it.

In paragraph 260 I offer an amendment which makes some modifications both in rates and in language. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is interested in this amendment, and I ask him to give attention to it while it is being read.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of paragraph 260, as printed in the bill, it is proposed to insert:

260. Stocks, cuttings, or seedlings of Myrobalan plum, Mahaleb or Mazzard cherry, Manetti multiflora and briar rose, 3 years old or less, \$1 per thousand plants; stocks, cuttings, or seedlings of pear, apple, quince, and the St. Julien plum, and evergreen seedlings, 3 years old or less, \$2 per thousand plants; rose plants, budded, grafted, or grown on their own roots, 4 cents each; stocks, cuttings, and seedlings of all fruit and ornamental trees, deciduous and evergreen, shrubs and vines, and all trees, shrubs, plants, and vines commonly known as "nursery" or "greenhouse" stock, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not understand this paragraph. After we pass line 15 there are duties imposed upon general classes of plants, and I presume there is a good reason for the special duties upon those found in lines 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15. But it seems there are certain particular varieties of plum trees and cherry trees which are selected for this duty. As to pear, apple, and quince, they are general, and as to all other classes they seem to be general. But there is no duty on plum trees generally. There are, however, two or three kinds of plum trees selected, and upon them a duty is placed. I suppose it is quite a trivial matter. Still it is something out of the ordinary, to my mind. I have no doubt there is an explanation for it, and I should be very glad if the Senator would give it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The designations which the Senator alludes to are the present law and have been for some time. There are some few designations of important plum trees or trees of various kinds that are new, and it is thought best by the people interested—

Mr. BACON. I can not hear the Senator to save my life. I beg his pardon.

Mr. ALDRICH. The men who are interested in nurseries have asked the committee to make these changes, to designate certain trees and shrubs and plants which are not designated in the paragraph as it stands.

So far as the rates are concerned, I think they are without exception reductions. The Senator from Kansas can give us some information on the subject.

Mr. BACON. I do not know that I made myself entirely clear to the Senator. I am not objecting to the rate, although it may be high. I do not know. I have not examined it.

The only fact that struck me was that whereas as to other plants the imposition of a duty is general, when you come to plum trees the amendment picks out two or three particular classes of plum trees. If it said plum trees, just as it says pear and quince trees, I would not ask any questions. But my curiosity was excited to know what there was in this particular variety of plum trees which entitled them to a duty when the other plum trees did not have a duty imposed.

Mr. ALDRICH. They are 3-year old trees; rare trees; that is all.

Mr. BACON. If they are rare, that is the very reason why they should come in free, instead of being selected to pay a duty. Although of course I know that the committee has had no such desire, it looks very much to me as though some of these horticulturists or those interested in fruit trees must have a particular interest in a particular kind of plum tree. I can not imagine anything else. If there is any other good reason, I will be very willing to accept it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. This amendment was suggested by the American Association of Nurserymen. Its object is to change from the mixed specific and ad valorem duty of the Dingley law to a specific duty. I do not know why certain plum trees are named, unless the nurserymen desire protection against the importation of those varieties.

Mr. BACON. I should like to know from the Senator whether there is any reason why these plum trees should have a protective duty other than plum trees generally? Why not have all plum trees included, unless it be that there is some particular interest in that kind of a tree.

Mr. CURTIS. I regret not to be able to give the Senator the information he desires.

Mr. BACON. I do not think there is any doubt about the fact—of course I am not going to offer any amendment—that somebody has got a special job in this particular class of plum tree.

Mr. GALLINGER. It may be a political plum tree.

Mr. BACON. Possibly. They seem to be given out here with a good deal of freedom and very much partiality.

Mr. CURTIS. No, Mr. President, in all seriousness, so far as plum trees are concerned, I have not the data. I proposed the amendment at the request of the nurserymen's association. The data furnished me was turned over to the Senator from Pennsylvania. I notice that these plum trees were specifically named in the Dingley law.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the amendment may be agreed to.

Mr. BACON. Without—

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Georgia was only a farmer, he would not be obliged to ask all these questions.

Mr. BACON. It is because I am one and live on a farm that I am interested in this matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing—

Mr. BACON. But I confess that my curiosity has not been gratified, and I am still left to a surmise—a surmise which I think is very well founded—that somebody has a monopoly of this particular kind of plum trees.

Mr. ALDRICH. When the Senator from Pennsylvania returns to the city I will see that he informs the Senator from Georgia in regard to this matter.

Mr. BACON. In the meantime does the Senator propose that the amendment shall be adopted by the Senate?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask that the amendment be again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will, at the request of the Senator from Virginia, again report the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 260, on page 80, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

260. Stocks, cuttings, or seedlings of Myrobalan plum, Mahaleb or Mazzard cherry, Manetti multiflora, and briar rose, 3 years old or less, \$1 per thousand plants; stocks, cuttings, or seedlings of pear, apple, quince, and the St. Julien plum, and evergreen seedlings, 3 years old or less, \$2 per thousand plants; rose plants, budded, grafted, or grown on their own roots, 4 cents each; stocks, cuttings, and seedlings of all fruit and ornamental trees, deciduous and evergreen, shrubs and vines of all trees, shrubs, plants, and vines commonly known as "nursery" or "greenhouse" stock, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

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

Mr. NELSON. I find that duty on this variety of plum trees and cherry trees here described is increased from 50 cents, under the Dingley law, to \$1, an increase of 100 per cent. That bothers me more than the characteristic of the plum tree. I should like to hear an explanation why the duty is doubled in this case.

Mr. ALDRICH. As long as the agriculturist of the committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania, is absent, I will let this go over until to-morrow.

What is the plum the Senator refers to? The rate under the Dingley law is practically the same as it is here.

Mr. NELSON. No; under the first bracket it is 50 cents.

Mr. ALDRICH. Three years old or less, 50 cents per thousand plants and 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. NELSON. It is 50 cents a thousand and 15 per cent under the Dingley law.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not doubling the duty. The present duty is 50 cents and 15 per cent ad valorem, which may be more or less than a dollar.

Mr. NELSON. But you now have it \$1 and 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; a dollar without the 15 per cent. It is impossible to say at this moment whether it is an increase or a decrease. It certainly is not doubling the rate.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I can contribute an item of information, although I do not want to be asked any questions. I have had many communications from nurserymen on the subject of this paragraph. Some of them are gentlemen of very high character, people from whom I have been buying nursery stock for many years and whom I know very well.

Mr. BACON. Without asking the Senator a question—

Mr. ROOT. I hope the Senator will not—

Mr. BACON. I am not going to ask a question. I just want to observe the number of farmers there are in this body.

Mr. ROOT. I hope the Senator will respect my request. The effect of the communications was that it would contribute greatly to the convenience both of the nurserymen raising this stock in this country and the importer if the compound duty could be changed to a simple specific duty by count. Elwanger & Barry and other great nurserymen have been writing to me on that subject, and their letters contain statements based upon evidence that this specific duty would be the equivalent of the 15 per cent ad valorem. This duty has been placed at the equivalent of the old duty. On the basis of this testimony, which I think is as good evidence as it is possible to get, the duty which is reported in this amendment will be the exact equivalent of the compound duty as it exists in the Payne bill.

Mr. BURKETT. I will say to the Senator that if he will look at the imports, on the valuation there, the highest of which it seems last year was \$2.74, 15 per cent would be about 31 or 32 cents. Added to the 50 cents, it would make it 82 cents. The importations in 1906 were \$1.58 on the average.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator, with all his accomplishments, is not a mathematician. Fifteen per cent of \$2.74 is a good deal more than 30 cents.

Mr. BURKETT. It is somewhere between 30 and 40.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is 42 or 43 cents, and 50 cents and 41 or 42 cents would make 91 or 92 cents in place of a dollar. It shows that the statement of the Senator from New York is approximately correct—that these new rates are approximately the old ones.

Mr. BURKETT. That is the highest rate. The year before it was \$1.58. The valuation varies a good deal.

Mr. BACON. I understood the Senator from Rhode Island to say the matter was to go over for the purpose—

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that it may be agreed to and then go over.

Mr. BACON. I hope that before this important matter is disposed of we will know why it is that two classes of plum trees and one kind of cherry tree are picked out for this particular duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the amendment may be agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALDRICH. Several Senators desire an executive session. Therefore I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 7 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 16, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15, 1909.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Lawrence Bailliere, of Maryland, to be collector of customs for the district of Annapolis, in the State of Maryland. (Re-appointment.)

Orlando V. Hurt, of Oregon, to be collector of customs for the district of Yaquina, in the State of Oregon, in place of Charles B. Crosno, whose term of service expired by limitation January 26, 1909.

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Robert G. Valentine, of Holliston, Mass. (now Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs), to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, vice Francis E. Leupp, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. Lawrence L. Bruff, Ordnance Department, to be colonel from June 13, 1909, vice Col. Frank Heath, retired from active service on that date.

Maj. Charles B. Wheeler, Ordnance Department, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 13, 1909, vice Lieut. Col. Lawrence L. Bruff, promoted.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

CHAPLAIN.

Rev. Marinus Martin Londahl, of Minnesota, to be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant from June 2, 1909, vice Patrick P. Carey, Coast Artillery Corps, who was retired from active service on December 2, 1908.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Leonard H. Forbes to be postmaster at Burnside, Conn. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

HAWAII.

Arthur Waal to be postmaster at Lahaina, Hawaii, in place of Arthur Waal. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1909.

ILLINOIS.

Moses C. Smith to be postmaster at Newman, Ill., in place of Charles Q. Whallon. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1908.

IDAHO.

Orin H. Barber to be postmaster at American Falls, Idaho. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

John T. Witty to be postmaster at Shoshone, Idaho, in place of Henry A. Brown, resigned.

INDIANA.

Samuel E. Nicoles to be postmaster at Medaryville, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

MICHIGAN.

Gilbert H. Hudson to be postmaster at Bloomingdale, Mich. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

NEW JERSEY.

Ralph M. Collins to be postmaster at Barnegat, N. J. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

Morris Davis to be postmaster at Bridgeton, N. J., in place of Henry Graham. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1909.

NEW YORK.

Charles J. Quick to be postmaster at Lestershire, N. Y., in place of William H. Hill, resigned.

OKLAHOMA.

James B. Miller to be postmaster at Fort Gibson, Okla., in place of Hubbard Ross. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1908.

PENNSYLVANIA.

R. K. Godding to be postmaster at Kane, Pa., in place of Lucius Rogers, deceased.

C. Penrose Hipple to be postmaster at Marietta, Pa., in place of Daniel G. Engle. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1908.

Jerome B. Lahr to be postmaster at Millerstown, Pa. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Albert H. J. George to be postmaster at White Lake, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1907.

TENNESSEE.

William F. Littleton to be postmaster at Kingston, Tenn., in place of Gillis T. Johnston, removed.

Elisha Thomas McKinney to be postmaster at Harriman, Tenn., in place of Reuben Hurtt, removed.

Frank J. Nunn to be postmaster at Brownsville, Tenn., in place of Giles Rives, resigned.

Charles Shelley Wortham to be postmaster at Tullahoma, Tenn., in place of Abe L. Davidson, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15, 1909.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the navy:

Richard S. Galloway,
Clarence N. Hincamp,
Edgar A. Ewing,
Riley F. McConnell,
Joseph W. Jewell,
Ralph R. Stewart,
Robert L. Montgomery,
Charles E. Hovey,
Ralph C. Parker,
Ezra G. Allen,
Emanuel A. Lofquist,

Jere H. Brooks,
Henry C. Gearing, jr.,
Elmer W. Tod,
Thaddeus A. Thomson, jr.,
Virginius E. Clark,
George W. Simpson,
Reuben R. Smith,
Homer H. Norton,
Alfred H. Miles,
Reginald E. Gillmor,
Carl C. Krakow,
James Parker, jr.,
Charles F. Pousland,
John F. Cox,
Grattan C. Dichman,
Harry A. McClure,
Louis J. Gulliver,
Cortlandt C. Baughman,
Richard B. Coffman,
Jonas H. Ingram,
Emory F. Clement,
Robert F. Gross,
Patrick N. L. Bellinger,
William T. Mallison,
Philip O. Griffiths,
Newton H. White, jr.,
Burton A. Strait,
Herbert A. Jones,
Samuel A. Clement, and
Richard F. Bernard.

First Lieut. William E. Smith to be a captain in the Marine Corps.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the navy:

James H. Morrison,
Edward A. Manck,
Thomas O'Donnell,
Arthur Cottrell,
Kellum D. Grant, and
Ellwood W. Andrews.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 15, 1909.

G. L. Hamrick to be postmaster at Tuttle, in the State of Oklahoma.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, June 16, 1909.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES. I present a letter from the secretary of the transportation bureau of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, of Washington, together with a series of resolutions, relative to the valuation of railroad properties in the United States. I ask that the letter and accompanying resolutions be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TRANSPORTATION BUREAU OF THE
SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Seattle, Wash., June 11, 1909.

Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Herewith copy of set of resolutions passed by the transportation bureau of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce at their meeting June 10, 1909.

You will note we request you to give your support to a bill making necessary appropriation to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to have valuations made on all railroad properties in the United States.

The writer has had personal experience as to the testimony introduced by the railroads in such matters, having been one of the witnesses in both of the Spokane cases, and having heard the testimony (in the last hearing of the Spokane case in Portland, Oreg., in the spring of 1907) of the engineers of the Northern Pacific and Great Northern railways, wherein they placed the valuation on their lines between four and five hundred million dollars for each road. This testimony was so manifestly colored that perhaps it defeated the object. Nevertheless, it has been found practically impossible to get reliable data as to the original cost of the Northern Pacific or Great Northern railway, or the cost of reproducing same upon the present scale of prices.

The question of what is a just and reasonable rate can never be settled until some authoritative body has appraised railroad properties and it

becomes definitely known what revenue they should receive in order to recompense the stockholders on a reasonable basis.

Trusting that you will vote for and use every effort possible to have this bill passed, I remain,
Yours, truly,

W. A. MEARS, *Manager.*

Whereas the United States Supreme Court has held that in determining a reasonable rate for freight and passengers, the tribunal before which the case is tried must consider the cost of reproduction of the transportation line involved; and

Whereas on the hearing of various cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission the railroad companies have submitted evidence that seems not to be governed by actual statistics, but by the individual opinion of the person testifying; and

Whereas this testimony has been of such character as to warrant the belief that it is greatly exaggerated as to the amount, and is apparently put at as high a figure as possible, the method of producing such results appearing purely arbitrary; and

Whereas the information as to the cost of such roads lies wholly within the knowledge of the railroad companies, and it is manifestly impossible for an individual litigant to secure even an approximate estimate of the cost of rebuilding a railroad; and

Whereas no satisfactory knowledge upon this subject can be obtained until public authorities make a detailed valuation upon a uniform basis; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission now has authority to make such valuation, but has not the necessary money to have such valuations made: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the transportation bureau of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce:

First. That we urge upon the Congress of the United States to grant the necessary appropriation to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to have such valuations made as soon as possible.

Second. That we respectfully request and urge upon our Senators and Members of Congress to support such appropriation and aid in every legitimate way in securing prompt enactment of legislation to this end.

Mr. DICK presented a petition of 49 members of Typographical Union No. 117, of Springfield, Ohio, praying that the change proposed by the Senate Finance Committee relative to the duty on print paper and wood pulp be accepted and approved, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against any reduction in the duty from the Dingley rates on news print paper and wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying that a higher duty be placed on steel rails than proposed in the pending tariff bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2621) granting an increase of pension to Don Carlos Sinclair (with the accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2622) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Robinson (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOURNE:

A bill (S. 2623) to provide for the disposal of lands chiefly valuable for oil; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2624) granting a pension to Jane Jameson (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

THE LEATHER AND SHOE INDUSTRY.

On motion of Mr. DICK, it was

Ordered, That 5,000 copies of Senate Document No. 72, Sixty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Shall Hides Be Free?" be printed.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the first bill on the calendar will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. President—

Mr. PAYNTER. I desire to call attention to the fact that there is not a quorum of the Senate present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Apparently. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bacon	Clay	Frye	Oliver
Borah	Crane	Gallinger	Page
Brandegee	Crawford	Gamble	Paynter
Briggs	Cullom	Hale	Perkins
Bristow	Cummins	Hughes	Scott
Brown	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Simmons
Burkeley	Davis	Jones	Smoot
Burkett	Dick	Kean	Stone
Burnham	Dillingham	La Follette	Sutherland
Burrows	Dolliver	McCumber	Tillman
Burton	Elkins	McLaurin	Warner
Carter	Fletcher	Martin	
Chamberlain	Flint	Nelson	
Clark, Wyo.	Foster	Nixon	