

Mr. BACON. And without outside influence, the Senator ought to add.

Mr. HALE. But that in the end some reasonable bill will be gotten through and will be sent to the House of Representatives, I have no doubt. And to me, instead of its being agreeable, all of the things that are brought out by the statement cited by the Senator who has just taken his seat are very disagreeable. There is no reason why the newspapers, as they do, should assume that they are in possession of secret information of furtive conclaves that are being held, and that Senators are to be controlled not by their convictions, but by arrangements. There is no reason, as the Senator says, why we should be subjected to that.

I wish for one that hereafter the newspapers would let us alone and let the Senate decide upon these matters and get to a vote as early as possible, and not try to impress us or the country with the idea that there is something occult about this, some mysterious, some subtle influence that is controlling us. There is nothing of that kind. There are very marked instances of opposition and of disagreement of sentiment on certain phases of this bill. So far as I am concerned, my effort will be to bring every one of those to a square yea-and-nay vote, and when you on the other side are beaten, you have to submit and when we are beaten we will submit.

Mr. BACON. No, Mr. President; not always. When they on the other side are beaten they get over on this side.

Mr. HALE. I do not believe in that.

Mr. BACON. That is what you did last Friday.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 23311) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALE. It is now 5 o'clock. I had hoped we might finish the naval appropriation bill this afternoon, but Senators desire to speak on the pending amendment to the bill; and, it being 5 o'clock, I shall not ask the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] to go on to-night. I think the chairman of the committee agrees with me in that regard. To-morrow is to be devoted to eulogies.

Mr. PERKINS. I will call up the bill Monday morning immediately after the routine morning business.

Mr. HALE. The Senator who is in charge of the bill announces that Monday morning, after the routine morning business, he will call up the naval appropriation bill, and I hope we may conclude its consideration and be ready to devote a solid week to the actual consideration of the railroad rate bill and not to the consideration of the questions that are presented by the newspapers.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that a table, prepared by Mr. Pulsifer in regard to the navies of the world, may be printed in the RECORD in this tabular form. This big sheet contains the statistics. It is all given in narrative form in what the Senator from New Hampshire had printed this afternoon. But I should like to have it also in tabular form. I think it would be very useful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MR. PULSIFER'S WAR-SHIP RATING.

As regards the United States and Germany, reckoning only vessels completed, United States is ahead; reckoning those built and building, they are about equal; adding the ships provided for in pending naval appropriation bill, United States leads Germany.

Mr. Pulsifer has prepared tables giving interesting data, which will enable anyone to see wherein one naval power has the advantage of another in any important particular. The tables include ships provided for since the Navy Yearbook was published, and also the ships provided for in the pending naval appropriation bill:

Ships completed.

Country.	Number and displacement of all ships.		Number and displacement of battle ships and armored cruisers.		Number of large guns (11, 12, 13, and 14 inch).	Number and displacement of "Dread-noughts."	
	Num. ber.	Tons.	Num. ber.	Tons.		Num. ber.	Tons.
Great Britain.....	445	1,768,850	95	1,301,680	256	4	73,700
United States.....	146	685,706	^a 44	^a 592,691	136	4	72,000
Germany.....	^b 199	^b 628,200	^b 36	^b 434,834	100	^b 3	^b 55,500
France.....	431	602,920	38	414,263	55		
Japan.....	179	400,968	25	309,265	64	1	19,200
Russia.....	209	259,263	15	162,409	34		
Italy.....	112	216,038	19	195,695	28		

^a Including *Charleston*, *Milwaukee*, and *St. Louis* (29,100 tons). Officially the three ships are protected cruisers. They are actually armored cruisers and so treated by standard foreign publications.

^b Including one battle ship (18,500 tons) completed since Navy Yearbook was published.

Average age first-class battle ships and armored cruisers.

Country.	Years.	Months.	Days.
Great Britain.....	5	11	2
United States.....	3	9	20
Germany.....	5	0	0
France.....	4	6	16
Japan.....	6	10	26
Russia.....	5	8	17
Italy.....	4	4	0

Ships completed and provided for.

Country.	Number and displacement of all ships.		Number and displacement of battle ships and armored cruisers.		Number of large guns (11, 12, 13, and 14 inch).	Number and displacement of "Dread-noughts."	
	Num. ber.	Tons.	Num. ber.	Tons.		Num. ber.	Tons.
Great Britain.....	^a 498	^a 2,106,873	^a 108	^a 1,581,680	386	^a 17	^a 353,700
United States.....	^b 179	^b 839,945	^b 50	^b 742,341	204	^b 10	^b 221,650
Germany.....	233	820,692	46	654,334	208	13	275,000
France.....	508	766,906	46	552,188	79		
Japan.....	191	436,704	30	408,465	113	6	118,410
Russia.....	224	412,250	23	313,135	98	4	92,000
Italy.....	122	259,278	25	235,359	63	4	80,000

^a Including three battle ships, displacement 25,000 tons each; armament either twelve 12-inch or ten 13½-inch guns (given above at twelve 12-inch); and one armored cruiser, displacement 26,000 tons; armament eight 12-inch guns, which were not agreed upon when Navy Yearbook was published.

^b Including two battle ships, displacement 27,000 tons each; armament twelve 12-inch or ten 14-inch guns (given above at twelve 12-inch), provided in pending bill.

^c Including *Charleston*, *Milwaukee*, and *St. Louis* (29,100 tons). Officially the three ships are protected cruisers. They are actually armored cruisers and so treated by standard foreign publications.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, May 21, 1910, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 20, 1910.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Conden, D. D.
The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 25552, the sundry civil appropriation bill; Mr. MANN in the chair.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Diekema].

Mr. DIEKEMA. Mr. Chairman, with no uncertain sound, but with notes clear and strong, the Republican party from the days of Abraham Lincoln to those of William H. Taft has always and everywhere declared in favor of a protective tariff, so levied as to safeguard both American labor and capital against ruinous foreign competition.

The Democratic party, on the contrary, has vacillated between free trade and a tariff for revenue only, sometimes, as in 1892, declaring a protective tariff unconstitutional, a fraud, and robbery, and then again, as in 1872, saying—

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.

This platform of 1872, rather than that of 1903, seems to have governed the Democrats in Congress during the recent consideration of the Payne tariff bill, for they generally voted for protection on everything produced within their respective districts and for free trade on the products of other sections and districts.

MEASURE OF PROTECTION DECLARED.

In 1903 the Republican party declared for a revision of the tariff by special session of Congress, and at the same time declared what the measure of protection should be in this revision, namely, "the imposition of such duties as will equal the differ-

ence between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries."

A very large majority of the American people, I believe, were entirely satisfied with this declaration. They wanted protection, and they wanted the political party friendly to the doctrine to write the new law. The present controversy is not so much, as it formerly was, over the principles of protection involved in the tariff, but as to whether the measure of protection promised in the platform has been adopted and used by Congress in adjusting the new rates.

MEASURE DECLARED ADEQUATE.

I submit that the measure of protection promised was a wise, just, and an adequate one. Under the competitive industrial conditions prevailing before these days of concentration, and consequent monopoly, it made very little difference how high the tariff walls were built about articles which we could produce, for exorbitant and unusual profits earned would very soon attract other capital, and resultant competition would reduce and regulate prices so as to fairly compensate capital using American labor.

What though the dikes were high, if behind them there dwelt a happy and contented people, earning good wages and able to purchase at reasonable rates the necessities and comforts of life? The height of the walls only temporarily measured the producers' ability to charge. Then domestic competition stepped in, and this, together with the law of supply and demand, regulated the price. Industry after industry that could not have been founded in any other way was thus established. Without this protection we could not have become a manufacturing nation, for whenever a new industry was started the foreign manufacturer could well afford to temporarily dump his goods upon our markets at a price far below cost, in order to strangle the new enterprise, and then again arbitrarily raise his prices and enjoy his monopoly of our trade. Many a patriotic American has been thus caught and separated from his money.

CHANGED CONDITIONS.

During those days the measure of protection fixed by the Republican platform of 1908 was not necessary and probably would have been unwise. But conditions have changed. The map of the industrial world has been revolutionized. Copartnerships have given way to corporations, corporations to trusts, trusts to holding companies, and holding companies to international combinations representing unlimited amounts of concentrated capital. It is the duty of the statesman to realize this changed condition and the new duties which it imposes and to legislate with an up-to-date mind and heart.

If a domestic producer succeeds in monopolizing his product or succeeds in effecting a combination with substantially all of the other producers, then domestic competition has been eliminated and he need fear only foreign competition. He can then fix the prices of his products just as high as the traffic will stand, just as high as the total of the cost of production abroad plus the tariff, freight rates, cost of handling, and necessary profits will amount to. Therefore under modern business conditions the height of the tariff walls has become of vital importance to the consumer, for it measures the limit to which concentration and monopoly can raise the prices, and the wisdom of the measure of protection adopted in the Republican platform of 1908 becomes evident.

WAS PROMISE KEPT?

So much for the justice and wisdom of this new measure of tariff rates. Has it been faithfully and invariably used in the revision of 1909? This is the question which now agitates the minds of the American people.

No committee ever made a more conscientious and industrious effort to ascertain the difference of cost of production at home and abroad than did the Ways and Means Committee of the present House. Listen to the language of the leader of the minority, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK of Missouri, upon the subject. Said he, in his speech on the tariff bill:

I want to say a word about the Committee on Ways and Means. I say now that no 18 men, * * * Democrats and Republicans both, in the history of this country ever did harder, more tedious, more fatiguing, or more honest work than the 18 members of the Ways and Means Committee did in those hearings. Think of it! We began at half past 9 in the morning and worked until 1 o'clock, took an hour for lunch, then worked till 7 o'clock, taking an hour for dinner, as we call it in the city, and supper in the country, and worked until 11 and 12 o'clock at night; keyed up, on edge, tussling with intellectual men who had facts in their possession about the tariff which they were determined not to give up, while we were determined that they should stand and deliver.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

What sources of information did the committee have upon which they based the new rates?

First. The testimony of our producers. This testimony was valuable, and most of the witnesses were, I trust, honest, but

they were interested witnesses, and testified with a full realization of their deep personal interest in the outcome of the legislation.

Second. The testimony of the importers. Those probably also tried to be honest, but it is apparent to every one who has read their testimony, as most of us have, that they were witnesses looking at the facts through the colored glasses of their own personal interest.

Third. There were the reports of our consular agents abroad. Very valuable and of great help to the committee, but not the work of experts trained for and experienced in this particular line of work. This work was only an incident of their general duties.

Based upon this information and upon the help of government experts in the Treasury Department, as well as upon the personal information and research of the able men of the committee, the schedules were drafted, and I say without any hesitation that the work was done honestly, efficiently, and as accurately as the sources of information above mentioned warranted.

I believe, however, that a board composed of skilled men, with no personal interest to deflect or influence their judgments and with adequate means and sufficient time at their command, could furnish the President, and through him the Congress, with more accurate and reliable information. Certainly the people are entitled to the very best and most disinterested report of the facts, and therefore I favor the appropriation of \$250,000 recommended by the President, and indorsed by the Committee on Appropriations, to be used for this purpose.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE PAVED THE WAY.

Why not make the appropriation?

Did not the Ways and Means Committee, when it imposed upon the President the duty to administer the maximum and minimum clause of the Payne bill, provide that he could appoint men, or a tariff board, so called, to investigate into the facts and report to him as a basis for this action?

He had the consular reports; he had the experts in the Treasury Department at his command; he had access to the printed volumes of testimony taken during the tariff hearings; he had all the sources of information that the committee had when the Payne bill was framed. Why, then, provide for a board of experts to gather further testimony? So as to make sure that no injustice should be done to any nation. We want this board now, so as to make sure that no injustice shall be done to any citizen, and if injustice has been done, so that we may speedily undo the wrong.

OBJECTIONS URGED.

I am sorry to be obliged to disagree with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], whom I respect so highly, upon this question; but each is entitled to his own convictions, and through the clash of ideas the truth will probably emerge clearer and stronger.

What, then, are the principal objections urged against this tariff board?

First. That the 485 Members of both Houses are better able to judge of industrial conditions and the wants of the people than a tariff board.

Second. That the business world would be kept in constant fear and dread and in an unsettled condition.

Third. That the Constitution of the United States provides that all laws for the raising of revenues for the Government must originate in the House of Representatives.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Let us examine these three objections separately.

First. That Members of Congress are better able to judge of industrial conditions and the wants of the people than a tariff board.

This is perhaps true, as far as the principles of protection and free trade are concerned, but when the principles have once been settled, what those Members then want is reliable and accurate information, facts impartially gathered, incontrovertible facts with which they can confront the producers and consumers of their districts, in order that equal justice may be done to all, and that none may be specially privileged. Is it not idle to say that the 485 Members, many of whom change every two years, are better able to gather this technical information than a board of skilled men assisted by special investigators and clerks?

Second. That the business world would be kept in constant fear and dread and in an unsettled condition.

It is true that nothing halts business and interferes with the course of prosperity so much as the threatened revision of the tariff, but this threatened revision will be the constant subject of agitation and the fruitful source of discontent and business disturbance just as long as the people are not satisfied that they

have received a square deal. The sunlight of publicity alone can clear the atmosphere.

No industry honestly conducted need fear this, and none other is entitled to serious consideration where the interests of the people are involved. Excessive protection is as unwise and unjust as free trade. No President would urge a general revision, and no Congress would undertake one (except in cases of change of political parties) unless the facts secured by the tariff board clearly showed that general rates of duties imposed were too high or too low. Again, the information secured by such a board would probably enable Congress in the future to correct individual inequalities and cases of injustice without the upheaval and disturbance always attending a general revision.

Third. That revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives.

This is correct, but the framers of the Constitution did not contemplate that all wisdom would be concentrated in the Members of the House as soon as elected, and that it would not be necessary for them to search diligently for the best and most reliable sources of information obtainable when framing revenue bills. Good intentions and honesty of purpose can not take the place of information, but when coupled with accurate information, industry, and the exercise of strong will power, they work out a nation's highest interests. There is no Representative so inefficient as the willfully ignorant one. How, then, can it be said that we violate either the letter or the spirit of the Constitution when we provide for a new and more adequate source of information?

PAYNE LAW.

I do not mean to intimate that even if every schedule could be made faultlessly right all would be pleased. The voice of selfishness would still clamor long and loud and fill the air with noise, smoke, and confusion. No tariff will ever entirely satisfy everybody until some one can discover a way of protecting everything everyone produces and of admitting free everything everyone consumes. Every great act of legislation is the result of compromise. I believe, however, with President Taft that the Payne Act is nearer right than any of its predecessors, and is the best tariff act ever placed upon the statute books. "The best proof of the pudding is the eating thereof." We know a tree by its fruit, and not by its leaf and blossom. What, then, are the fruits of the Payne Act? Let me mention some of them.

FRUITS OF THE PAYNE LAW—REVENUE.

It has produced the required revenue. From the ever increasing monthly Treasury deficits under the Dingley Act during the recent past, we have entered upon an era of an ever increasing monthly surplus. A surplus of more than \$22,000,000, not taking into account the amount expended from the revenues on the Panama Canal, which under the settled policy of Congress must be taken care of by bonds, and not taking into account the corporation tax, which will amount to over \$25,000,000, has already been accumulated under the Payne Act. We need over a billion of dollars annually to pay for the running expenses of this great country, and the first object of a tariff law is to produce the necessary revenue. The Payne Act has demonstrated that it is a revenue producer.

REVIVAL OF INDUSTRY.

It has revived industry; tens of thousands of idle freight cars have been taken from the side tracks and put to work; hundreds of silent engines have been taken from the roundhouses and are now doing double duty; the mine and factory have felt a new impulse and are being operated overtime; increased wages, which will amount to tens of millions of dollars per annum, have been voluntarily allowed to labor; the army of the unemployed has disappeared, the hungry are fed, the naked clothed, and the homeless sheltered.

FOREIGN CONCESSIONS.

Through the operation of the maximum and minimum clause, which the minority prophesied would engulf us in a general tariff war and would increase the average rate of duties on imports 25 per cent, we have secured fair treatment and special concessions from other nations, so that we have allowed the minimum rates to every commercial nation, and new markets have been opened for our products, thus stimulating industry and furnishing additional employment to labor.

LARGE IMPORTATIONS.

For the first time since Washington signed the original tariff bill we are bringing in over 51 per cent of all imports without duty under the free list. This is, of course, the result of the new schedules which have so greatly enlarged the free list.

BALANCE OF TRADE.

As a result of increasing the rates on luxuries and decreasing the same on necessities the balance of trade in our favor has

been nearly cut in two; and while this is proof positive of a wise revision downward it is also a warning, for those heavy importations are displacing American labor, and this must not go to a point where our labor will lack employment and the balance of trade will be against us, thus forcing our gold to go abroad.

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

But in spite of all this we are met with the constant assertion that the Payne Act is responsible for the high cost of living. It has been well said that the act may be responsible for the cost of high living, but not for the high cost of living, for the increases have been upon luxuries and the decreases upon necessities, and this is as it should be. Let women who want to wear the Parisian modes pay for them. Let those who drink imported champagne and foreign wines pay for them. Let men who want to smoke a clear Havana pay for it. These people can afford it. It was wise to so readjust the rates as to make twenty times as much decrease as increase on necessities and to increase only for the purpose of equalizing the cost of labor at home and abroad.

There has been no denial of the statement recently made by Congressman BOUTELL, the able statesman from Illinois, that even a commission composed entirely of Democrats, after investigating the subject of high prices, would have to come to the unanimous conclusion that there is not in the Payne tariff law a single advance in rate above the Dingley rates that justifies an increase in the final retail price to the ultimate consumer of a single necessary article of food, of clothing, or of household use.

The high cost of living is a world condition. Strange as it may seem, the greatest advances since the passage of the Payne law have been upon articles on the free list or upon which the duties were decreased or upon which no advance was made over the Dingley rates.

SAMUEL GOMPERS TESTIFIES.

I welcome the battle on this issue. The testimony from our American consular service, from the agents of the Department of Commerce and Labor, as well as that of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, agrees with the statements of observing travelers abroad that the cost of living is no higher here than in Europe, and that wages in America are double the wages there. President Gompers, who certainly can not be accused of a desire to make the administration of President Taft popular, or of desiring to render aid and comfort to the Republican party, after having made a careful review of European labor conditions in his annual report and after having stated that meat is usually from 25 to 100 per cent higher there than in the United States, closes with the following words:

If the immigrant to this country is willing to continue living here at the same level he was obliged to accept in his native land, he can find it for the same money.

MINISTER LOUDON SPEAKS.

Jonkheer J. Loudon, minister from the Netherlands to the United States, in an address delivered in Philadelphia on January 22, 1909, among other things, said:

We in Holland are free traders. Whilst I think if I were an American I should believe in protection for this country, I must say in Holland I certainly believe in free trade. It has done us good. It has kept our wages from being immoderately high and our peculiar industries have been able to prosper all the same.

This expresses the real situation, low wages and free trade with the cost of living as high as ours. Poor laboring people. The door of opportunity is closed to them. There is no star of hope in their sky. Thank God that the American standard of living is the highest in the world.

THE AMERICAN STANDARD.

I feel safe in saying that the American laborer will never submit to live and rear his family under conditions similar to those existing in foreign countries. In America we live in better houses; we sleep in better beds; we eat more and better food; we wear warmer and better clothing; our children attend better schools; we enjoy more of the comforts of life than any other people in any country on the globe. This condition will continue as long as we protect our farming, business, and manufacturing interests and our laboring classes against foreign and pauper labor.

Our cause is so just, the logic and history of our position are so impregnable, the results of protection have been so beneficial, and the hope for the future of the people of this great Republic of the West, of this majestic temple of human liberty, is so wrapped up in its continued success, that we should hail with delight the most diligent search for the most accurate information, which can only tend to perpetuate our administra-

tion and bless the people. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. OLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago there appeared in the RECORD, on page 6378, a statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] as to a newspaper clipping which referred to the failure of the cadets at the Naval Academy of the class of 1908 to pass their examinations and receive commissions of ensign. I have a letter from the Assistant Secretary in my hand, which I would like to print in the RECORD, telling the exact facts as to the matter.

The letter is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Washington, May 19, 1910.

MY DEAR MR. OLCOTT: In accordance with your request, I have looked into the matter of the examination for final graduation of the midshipmen of the class of 1908. There are 192 members in the entire class, 88 of whom failed to pass in certain subjects. As compared with the classes of 1906 and 1907, I find that out of a total of 109 in the class of 1906, the number found deficient was 25, or 23 per cent; and in the class of 1907, out of a total of 200, the number found deficient was 46, or 23 per cent. In 1908 the percentage of failures was 45, which, as you will see, is considerably in excess of the percentage of failures in the classes of 1906 and 1907. All those in the classes of 1906 and 1907 who failed in examination were allowed to be reexamined, and very few lost their regular standing in the class at the completion of their four years' course at the academy. There were some, however, who lost a few numbers, but it was only in exceptional cases where the men made very low marks on their reexamination. The men found deficient in the class of 1908 will also be given a reexamination, and it is fair to presume that the regular standing of the members of the class will not be changed, unless, of course, as I stated above, some of the men receive very low marks.

Sincerely, yours,

BEEKMAN WINTHROP.

Hon. J. VAN VECHTEN OLCOTT,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HAVENS].

Mr. HAVENS. Mr. Chairman, in opening this debate last week the leader of the majority in this House [Mr. PAYNE] stated, with pardonable pride, that he had now been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means for more than twenty years; that he had served through three revisions of the tariff; and that he had been engaged in the study of tariff questions before some of the gentlemen who are now criticising his work were politically born. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], who addressed the House recently on this subject, stated that, in his opinion, the new tariff law was a good law, a better one than it succeeded, under existing conditions. This gentleman, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, with a service in Congress of many terms, speaks with an emphasis on this subject born of that experience. The value of such experience as theirs can not be overestimated, and it may be thought that one without any experience whatever in Congress—and not much more in politics—should hesitate before daring to differ with the views of distinguished gentlemen who have had such long terms of service here.

There is, however, one respect, slight though it may be, in which these gentlemen are at a disadvantage. Work in Congress, protracted through many terms, is not always the best experience in which to learn the demands of intelligent popular sentiment. It is better perhaps that I should speak of some other legislative body rather than of this one, and never was there a better illustration than the legislature of New York at the present time. There, in the closing days of the session, the little bosses in the legislature—they will all be out soon [applause on the Democratic side]—the small bosses are endeavoring again to defeat the will of the people of that State, to defeat the policies of the governor of that State, in whom the people of the State have placed their confidence. Ever since Governor Hughes became governor of that State these little bosses, with the little organizations which they control and which they think so powerful, but which become playthings when the voters get a fair chance to deal with them [applause], have endeavored to thwart the policies of the governor, believing—and they believe yet—that the voters of the State are not with the governor, or, if they are with him today, that their attitude is not lasting, and that as soon as the governor retires the people will forget and turn once more to them for leadership. It is another case of the blind leading the blind, and while those are most blind who will not see, the political blindness of those who can not see is dark enough. [Applause.] The halls of a legislative body would seem calculated to promote political blindness of both sorts.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it will not do altogether to rely upon the thought and word of him whose experience is longest in Congress simply because of that experience, and sometimes it may be worth while to listen to those who come most recently into this Chamber, and who for that reason may have

a better, a more trustworthy view point with regard not only to the wishes of the people, but also as regards their need.

As an instance—not a very important instance, it is true, but as an instance of this political blindness—I may cite the remark of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in the speech already referred to, by which he sought to explain and minimize the effect and importance of the recent congressional elections in Massachusetts and New York by calling attention to the fact that both of the successful candidates in those elections had already said that they would not run again in those districts. I suppose it is intended that you shall infer from this that each of the Members elected from those districts declines to run again because he fears defeat. Is it possible that the gentleman knows of no other reason which might prevent a Member of this House from seeking reelection, or does he think that you, the other Members of this House, can conceive of no other reason why a Member should decline a renomination? The whole force of his suggestion must rest upon one assumption or the other, either that no other reason appeals to him or that no other reason would appeal to you. I believe that neither assumption is well founded, and therefore that his suggestion is entirely without force, even here. Some men have never sought a political career; some men can not afford one. The Member from Massachusetts [Mr. FOSS] recently elected to this House can speak for himself; but if my attitude on the subject is of any importance, it must be said that I belong to both classes—I did not seek a political career, and I can not afford to follow one. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Furthermore, the problem which I, in a somewhat conspicuous but really in a very small way, helped to solve in the congressional district where I live will not present itself there again. There is no longer any political boss to defeat in that district, or, if I am mistaken about that, I am surely not mistaken in saying that he will not make the mistake of running for Congress again.

Therefore, if the gentleman will see no other significance in the election in which I had a part, let me suggest to him that it may mean this, at least, namely, that it is easy to defeat the most experienced politician when he is wrong. [Applause.]

But there is a further significance, a more important significance, to the result in the thirty-second New York district at the recent election. The intelligent, independent vote was with us there on the tariff issue [applause on the Democratic side], and among that vote was the vote largely of the men who work in the factories of Rochester. These voters were with us because they understand this revision of the tariff, and they know how these tariff taxes are levied so as to bear heaviest on those least able to bear them, and they know why this is done. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STANLEY. As I understand, the district of the gentleman [Mr. HAVENS] is in a way surrounded by the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and it may have been very necessary for the latter gentleman to have parried an expected blow the best way he could. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAVENS. The two districts adjoin.

The clothing manufacturers were with us on the tariff issue because they know why there was no revision of the woolen schedule, and they resent it. There are many significant things in that election that might interest the gentlemen of the majority here if they would look into them.

Running through the speech, already referred to, of the distinguished gentleman, my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, there was a tone of hostility to, or, if that is too strong a word, of disagreement with, the press. I did not discover that the gentleman limited it to the Democratic press. He spoke of the newspapers, the great press of the country. It seems, if I understood the gentleman correctly, that in his opinion the newspapers of the country sent very inexperienced men to report the hearings of his committee; that the editors of the newspapers who are now criticising his tariff bill were found by him to be ignorant of the details of tariff schedules, and that being so, if I understood correctly the position he has taken, they should not now, in his opinion, criticise the results.

How hard it is sometimes to realize that the intelligent press of the country does represent the country's sentiment! [Applause on the Democratic side.] When you find a man, or a party, quarreling with the press of the country, you may be pretty sure—there are, perhaps, exceptions, but pretty sure—that the press, so far as that man or that party is concerned, has struck the nail very nearly on the head. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is better, if you will permit me to say it, gentlemen of the majority—regular gentlemen of the majority I mean—it is

better that you should conceal your quarrels with the press. If you display your differences with the press too persistently, some one, somewhere, may get a notion that the press is right, and that, of course, at the present time you must avoid. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Then there is another thing worth mentioning in this debate to which we have listened. The debate seems to be quite as warm between the gentlemen of the Republican party themselves as it is anywhere else. The speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], already referred to, seemed to be almost wholly a debate with the Republican Senator from Indiana [applause on the Democratic side]; and the speech of my colleague from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, was devoted largely, was it not, to answering the Senators from Iowa? Just think of it, regular Republicans quarreling with Iowa! [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Is Iowa no longer Republican—regular Republican—or is Iowa regular and some one else irregular? Answer these questions as you will, the situation is a most interesting one to a Democrat, to any Democrat, but particularly so to a Democrat who has been here not quite a month. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt about this—that the tariff presents a difficult problem and that a revision of the so-called Dingley Act of 1897 was a serious task.

When that revision was undertaken the country had expressed itself as willing to adopt for the present at least that standard of tariff revision to which the gentlemen of the majority were pledged. That standard, as it seems to be understood now, was that the tariff taxes should equal and not exceed the difference in the labor cost at home and abroad.

Mr. HILL. The difference in the entire cost.

Mr. HAVENS. Just a moment, if the gentleman will allow me. I will come to that. Or, as the platform phrased it, if the gentleman likes it better, the difference of the cost of production at home and abroad. Now, neither one of us wishes to say anything about that other clause that followed—"together with a fair profit to American industries," as they phrased it.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENS. I will.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman can speak for himself, but he can not speak for me. The reason for the other clause being in is that in the importation of foreign goods the law requires that a fair estimate of profits shall be put in as a part of the foreign cost. It must either be omitted from the American cost or the foreign cost to get a fair comparison. If the gentleman will look at the administrative law he will see that that is a fact.

Mr. HAVENS. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] for calling my attention to a matter that I might have overlooked. I always thought that the clause "a fair profit to the American industry" had served its purpose, that it was put in for a purpose and that it had served that purpose, but the gentleman who rose did not at first call my attention to it, and I thought he ignored it, as I think everybody should, for, in my judgment, it is indefensible and it is a part of wisdom not to try to defend it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. I agree with the gentleman entirely on that matter, but I think it should be left out of the foreign cost, or put into the American cost.

Mr. HAVENS. Passing that for a moment because we seem to agree about it [laughter on the Democratic side], we have not forgotten—

Mr. CLINE. If the gentleman will allow me, I want to call attention to the fact that the late Indiana platform, adopted by the gentleman at the other end of the building, left that clause absolutely out of it.

Mr. HAVENS. I had overlooked that.

Mr. CULLOP. And if the gentleman will pardon me I would like to call attention to the fact that they also adopted a plank denouncing the Payne bill as a moral wrong. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAVENS. Mr. Chairman, if the testimony of these gentlemen is right, debate is certainly somewhat warm between gentlemen on the other side of the House. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The rule by which, concededly, the men who framed this tariff were to be guided was the difference in labor cost at home and abroad. That was their pledge; it seemed fairly simple; the country approved it, and they went to work, or, rather, they had been at work for some time; they had been gathering information, they had been studying the schedules which they were to revise. Their platform said so; it boasted of it.

And this necessarily leads us to the one fact that can not be too strongly emphasized in connection with this latest Republican revision. They promised haste. They promised "unequivocally" to revise the tariff at a special session of Congress,

immediately after the inauguration of the President. They had already divided up the work here among committees, and were, as their platform states, investigating the operation and effect of these schedules. Can they remember now what forced them to that tardy promise to revise the tariff? Was it not because even then they knew that the people demanded lower duties in the interest of the consumer and not in the interest of the trusts? It is pretty certain that no such "unequivocal" declaration would have been put in the Republican platform of 1908 unless the Republicans who made that platform thought that a revision of the tariff was demanded by the voters; and when the "unequivocal" declaration is for an immediate revision at a special session of Congress we may be sure that the men who made that platform thought that the demand from the voters was pressing.

What were you in such a hurry about, my regular Republican friends, and why were you promising to hurry so? Was not your haste and your "unequivocal" declaration of haste caused by the voice of the country demanding that tariff duties be reduced? It is true, as you say, that your candidate for President stated in his speeches, interpreting the platform, that some duties might need to be raised in that revision. I wish now that he had not said it, for I think you have taken advantage of it, but let that go for the present. The point is that you promised an immediate revision, because the people demanded an immediate reduction of duties. You say that your understanding of your pledge was that you should raise duties as well as lower them in the revision which you were to make. For the sake of the argument, let that stand. Let us take your understanding of your pledge and test your work by that.

Pledged to a revision of the tariff, "unequivocally" pledged to a revision of the tariff, pledged to some kind of a revision of the tariff, what defense have the gentlemen who framed this tariff for their action in leaving the wool schedule unrevised? They say they have kept their pledges. They have not kept that pledge, and they have no defense to offer. We listened intently to these two members of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee. We heard them tell what they did and why they did it, but they did not undertake to say why they did not do this that they were pledged to do, what they admit that they were pledged to do—revise this Schedule K, the schedule on wool and woolens.

And let me tell them, if I may, that the country knows—they know up there in those Northern States, where they endure the rigors of those northern winters, where they need woolen garments, where they suffer for the want of them, where pneumonia and tuberculosis rage—they know why this Schedule K was not revised, and they know that the excuse for not revising it is worse than the failure to revise it, for that excuse has shown the people of this country what many of them had long suspected, that the partnership between the trusts and the men who make Republican tariff laws has not yet been dissolved. In the President's speech delivered at Winona, Minn., last September, we find the President saying that the wool schedule is too high, that it ought to have been reduced, and that—

It probably represents considerably more than the difference between the cost of production abroad and at home.

Then he says:

The difficulty about the woolen schedule is that there were two contending factions early in the history of Republican tariffs, to wit, woolgrowers and the woolen manufacturers, and that finally, many years ago, they settled on a basis by which wool in the grease should have 11 cents a pound, and by which allowance should be made for the shrinkage of the washed wool in the differential upon woolen manufactures.

"They settled." What does he mean? Does he mean that the Committee on Ways and Means in its wisdom recommended and that this House, acting upon the report of that committee, in its deliberations passed an act out of its wisdom? Not at all. "They settled."

Then he says:

The percentage of duty was very heavy—quite beyond the difference in the cost of production, which was not then regarded as a necessary or proper limitation upon protective duties.

When it came to the question of reducing the duty at this hearing in this tariff bill on wool, Mr. PAYNE in the House and Mr. ALDRICH in the Senate, although both favored reduction in the schedule, found that in the Republican party the interests of the woolgrowers of the far West and the interests of the woolen manufacturers in the East and in other States, reflected through their Representatives in Congress, was sufficiently strong to defeat any attempt to change the woolen tariff, and that had it been attempted it would have beaten the bill reported from either committee.

There is the confession that the interested parties, other than the consumers, have controlled the Republican party represented in this Congress to betray the interests of the consumers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have already said that the country understands this situation. They know why you did not revise this schedule, and that is the reason why they are not going to support your party in the coming campaign and did not support it in my election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BATES. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENS. I do not. I must refuse to yield. I have only thirty minutes. Gentlemen on the other side have been debating these questions for twenty years, and now perhaps I may be pardoned if I do not yield when I have but thirty minutes.

If you think that the people of northern New York do not understand this question, gentlemen of the regular majority, you have a surprise in store for you. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is a simple problem. There are the two schedules, there is the Republican pledge, and there is the Republican confession. Men may still vote the Republican ticket, but no man whose pocket is not lined with unrighteous gain from it will vote for the Republican party because of this schedule, while no man who is free to act will approve of this transaction. And there is more of it. The duties under this wool schedule are out of all proportion to the standard which the dominant party promised to adopt in revising it—are out of all proportion to the difference in the labor cost, or the cost of production, at home and abroad. It is not a slight thing, it is not a technical violation of their pledge; it is one of the most important schedules in the bill; it touches some of the greatest industries of the country; it concerns the clothing of every man, woman, and child in the country, and on that schedule the infant industry which they still brazenly foster is able to control their action.

Look at the schedule for a moment. On all manufactures of every description, made even in part of wool, not specially provided for and valued at not more than 40 cents a pound, the duties averaged for the year ending June 30, 1909, 154.99 per cent. If the goods were of better quality, exceeding 40 cents a pound and not more than 70 cents a pound in value, the average duties for the year ending June 30, 1909, were 126.32 per cent, and the people in the district which I have the honor for a short time to represent understand this—make no mistake about it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is no need of many figures. These illustrate it. Here are your taxes, Republican taxes, not only far in excess of the total cost of production abroad, but at a rate 28 per cent heavier on the cheaper goods than on the more expensive.

The workmen of the country understand this. They know that these taxes discriminate against them. The clerks, the men of small salaries, the families living on fixed incomes—they understand it, and they all know that these taxes are levied in this schedule so as to bear most heavily upon them, and they understand that this reversed every essential of just taxation. I desire to submit a statement of the average duties on certain manufactures of wool, shown in percentage of the cost abroad, for the year ending June 30, 1909, not one of which was changed in this revision, but all of which were reenacted into the present law. It is not necessary to repeat them, but I may say that the duties to which I call attention run from 100 per cent to nearly 200 per cent.

Some items of the Dingley law for the year ending June 30, 1909, which carried an ad valorem rate of 100 per cent or more and which were not changed by the present law.

THE WOOL SCHEDULE.

	Per cent.
All other manufactures, wholly or in part of wool:	
Valued at not more than 40 cents per pound.....	154.99
Valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 70 cents.....	126.32
Plushes, between 40 cents and 70 cents per pound.....	125.04
Plushes valued at more than 70 cents per pound.....	100.51
Plushes, the average for.....	101.61
Knit fabrics, not wearing apparel:	
Valued at not more than 40 cents per pound.....	137.91
Valued between 40 cents and 70 cents per pound.....	127.38
Flannels for underwear:	
Valued between 40 cents and 50 cents per pound.....	107.60
Weighting over 4 ounces per square yard—	
Valued between 50 cents and 70 cents per pound.....	116.09
Valued above 70 cents per pound.....	107.86
Average for all flannels.....	104.41
Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, and Italian cloths:	
Wholly of cotton or other vegetable materials in the warp, the remainder wholly or in part wool—	
Valued at not more than 15 cents per square yard—	
Not above 70 cents per pound.....	107.24
Above 70 cents per pound.....	103.58
Consisting wholly or in part of wool—	
Valued less than 70 cents per pound.....	117.76
Valued above 70 cents per pound.....	106.26
Weighting over 4 ounces per square yard—	
Valued not more than 40 cents per pound.....	137.04
Valued between 40 cents and 70 cents per pound.....	119.10

	Per cent.
Cloths, woolen or worsted:	
Valued at not more than 40 cents per pound.....	139.27
Valued between 40 cents and 70 cents per pound.....	120.16
Blankets:	
Valued between 40 cents and 50 cents per pound.....	105.18
More than 3 yards in length—	
Valued at not more than 40 cents per pound.....	192.09
Valued between 40 cents and 70 cents per pound.....	119.32
Slubbing, ring and garnetted wastes.....	150.00
Wool and hair advanced:	
Valued at not more than 40 cents per pound.....	143.62
Valued between 40 cents and 70 cents per pound.....	139.91
Valued above 70 cents per pound.....	115.00
Class 3. Wool or carpet wool, valued at over 12 cents per pound, scoured.....	108.95
Class 1. Wool, washed, on the skin.....	143.59
Class 1. Wool, washed, not on the skin.....	170.93

Furthermore, we have in this woolen schedule not only positive proof of the scandalous failure of the men who framed this tariff to keep their pledge to the country, made before election, but we have a good illustration of the enormous duties left unrevived by this bill and of the way the higher duties are put on the cheaper goods in direct discrimination against the people of slender means. And, as we view it on this side of the House, these heavy duties, growing heavier as the grade of goods grows cheaper, are imposed in inverse ratio to the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. For it is our position that the difference in labor cost at home and abroad is proportionally less as the labor is less skilled and its products are coarser and cheaper.

We are therefore not afraid—on the contrary, we desire—to have the difference in labor cost at home and abroad determined. If determined fairly and honestly it will show, as we believe, that there is less difference than our opponents claim; it will bear out our contention that the highest paid labor is the cheapest in the end, and that American labor is paid high wages because of its wonderful efficiency. We do not need to quarrel about that now. The pending bill appropriates \$250,000 to be used under the direction of the President to ascertain the facts with regard to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. We may differ as to how this investigation can best be accomplished, but we all want it done, and we all want it done well. Somebody must do it, if it is to be done at all, and that person, board, or body will be human; will have some personal or political bias, or both. The work will never be done perfectly, but in my humble judgment we can trust the President to do this and to do it fairly, and for that reason I wish to vote for this appropriation. I do not expect that my judgment on this subject will carry much, if any, weight. There may be many on this side of the House who differ from my position upon it, but surely it is not a fundamental Democratic party matter and I am going to vote for the appropriation because it seems to me now to be right.

No investigation worthy of the name can be made into this difference in the labor cost without substantiating the position of the Democratic party on the tariff. We are right, our opponents are wrong on this question, and the more the facts are brought out, the more clearly this will appear. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let us have the facts, no matter where we get them, for the truth is mighty and will prevail.

Furthermore, may it not be better from a mere party standpoint that this investigation as to the basis for tariff rates should be made by our political opponents, if we are to consider the President's tariff board as a political body? If we made the investigation and the report, we should be put on the defensive in using its figures—we should be constantly calling upon our own witness to prove our case. Let us have the figures from hostile witnesses if they are such, and the figures will be that much more valuable to us and to our cause. Where does the majority leader [Mr. PAYNE] stand on this appropriation? I listened to him for two hours and he failed to tell me where he stood. Neither did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] enlighten us as to his position. It is rumored that both are opposed to this appropriation. If so, they failed to tell us why; if they are not opposed, they failed to tell us that. If they are afraid of the facts—and they seem to be—then I want them.

It is said, however, that if this work is undertaken now it will confuse the issue to be submitted to the people this fall and two years from now, that our opponents may say that this Payne-Aldrich bill is not final, that they are going to "revise" it again as soon as they get the facts which they are now gathering. Are we afraid of that? Is not the answer to it that they have had the absolute power for some fifteen years to get these facts and to revise this tariff fairly, and that no further promise from that source on that subject is to be trusted. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] to yield me more time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York fifteen minutes additional. [Applause.]

Mr. HAVENS. On the other hand, if we, in combination with those whom we have always opposed on this issue, defeat this appropriation now, will not the people say, and say what may be very embarrassing to us, that after all these years of talk we did not dare to have the facts brought out?

Think well of these matters, gentlemen, before you vote with your political enemies against this appropriation.

Then this Payne-Aldrich tariff bill puts an annoying tax upon business men who conduct their business in a corporate form, while men doing the same business exactly as individuals or in partnerships are not taxed upon their incomes, are not bothered to make reports or compelled to disclose their business affairs to their competitors.

I think you will find that that law is unconstitutional. If it is not, it ought to be, because it is class legislation in effect, if it is not so in the theory of the law; and class legislation, let me tell you, gentlemen, is a good thing to shun, even if the particular form of class legislation that is offered to you is to your liking or pleases your locality or your supporters. Once depart from the strict principle that all legislation must treat all alike—all alike not only in technical legal form, but in spirit and effect—and one never knows how soon he will be the victim of a similar injustice. It is not the tax upon these corporations, not the amount of the tax, it is the principle of it that is not approved, and the sober sense of the country will never long approve legislation of that sort, no matter how popular is the class that is favored or how unpopular is the one oppressed.

And for the very reason which actuates me in opposing this federal tax upon the incomes of corporations I am in favor of giving the Federal Government power to levy a just income tax. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The burden of such a tax falls where the burden of any tax should fall, upon those best able to bear it [applause on the Democratic side], and the burden is in proportion to the benefits received from the Government. [Applause.] There is no good reason why, if the State which I have the honor in part to represent here for a short time, by reason of its wealth, its resources, and its large business interests, receives a large share of the benefits of the Government, it should not pay a proportionate share of the taxes of the Government. The proposition seems to need no argument, and apparently it is favored, as it ought to be favored, by both political parties.

Turning our attention again to the tariff bill, which took effect in August last, the so-called Payne-Aldrich bill, the fact of the matter is that the intelligent sentiment of this country is against it. The people are against it; not because it is all bad. They recognize that it has done some things in the line of what it ought to have done, what they expected a revised tariff to do. You put hides on the free list. That was a good thing; and you are entitled to the credit for doing it. You would be entitled to more credit if you had not put the duty on hides in the first place. There never was a tariff on hides until you put it on in the Dingley Act, for the benefit of the beef trust and for no other reason [applause on the Democratic side], and you would get more credit for undoing that iniquity if you had not committed the iniquity to start with. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The objectionable features of the bill, however, are what give it its character—the unjustifiable rates of duty such as I have referred to, taken from the woolen schedule, as illustrations. For many years past sentiment has been growing in this country against the position maintained on the tariff by the Republicans who have been in control and have shown a willingness to maintain any rate of duty which has been demanded, or "settled on," to use the President's phrase, by the favored interests; and this sentiment has now grown so strong that it is about to overthrow, it seems to me, the Republican party, in punishment of those who would not heed the reasonable demands of the people. That public sentiment naturally turns to the Democratic party as the only opposition which the Republican party has upon this issue. This trend of intelligent public sentiment means that thousands of intelligent votes will be cast for and will elect the candidates of the Democratic party in the doubtful States and in many States that have never been considered doubtful. These votes naturally belong with the Democratic party. The men who cast them are really Democrats upon this issue, and they are waiting, and they have been waiting, for a chance to act with the Democratic party in accordance with their best judgment. They will not only help that party to win elections, to elect its candidates, but, what is of far greater importance, it will, with their help, be able to act with greater wisdom upon the great questions with regard to which

the party will be called to legislate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If, on the other hand, it should be the people's will that we, as a party, should remain in the minority, still it would be the part of party wisdom to stand together, and stand true on this issue—for a minority party needs strength as well as wisdom if it would serve its country well, and now for many years the strengthening of the minority in this country has been the country's great need. Without a strong, self-reliant, and courageous minority, no government by parties can rise to its highest level. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is fortunate, and doubly fortunate, that the Democratic party is in a position to appeal to and receive this intelligent, earnest, and honest support, and that this support in strengthening that party will strengthen the Government, whatever may be the result of any election. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINLAY].

Mr. McKINLAY of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of attention for about forty-five minutes to a recital by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HAVENS] of all the things that the Republican party has not done in regard to the tariff and other kinds of legislation, but I would have been obliged to the gentleman if he had consumed five minutes of his time in informing the House as to some of the things the Democratic party had done toward assisting in the passage of any kind of legislation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It seems that this subject of tariff is to be continued through the debate on the sundry civil bill, and therefore I am indebted to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for according me consideration for one hour, and in that time I desire to address my remarks to the subject of the \$250,000 appropriation asked for for the purpose of placing at the disposal of the President that amount to promote and develop the usefulness of a tariff board as provided for in the Payne-Aldrich bill.

I believe the time has come in the progress of the country when accurate and scientific business methods should take the place of the old-fashioned, haphazard way of conducting the affairs of the Nation, so long practiced by the various departments of our governmental system, and I am sure accuracy and scientific method can be employed in no place in our whole organization where greater benefit will result than when applied to the adjustment of the schedules which are embodied in our tariff system, whether the object is merely the raising of revenues or whether, in addition to the revenue feature of such legislation, the preservation of the principle of protection to American industry and labor is sought to be continued.

In every line of industry, trade, commerce, and business activity scientific methods are now being employed; and almost every day newer, finer, and more accurate ways of doing things are being developed and used in business systems. This keen competition has resulted in establishing in America the most complete and accurate business organization in the world.

Success or failure in the conduct of a business enterprise in the United States now depends more on management than upon any other factor. Sometimes the difference of a small fraction of a cent per yard or per hundredweight in the production of an article means success and dividends on the one side or failure and bankruptcy on the other. The same improvements now being used in business systems in the country must be established sooner or later in every department of the Government. In fact, already splendid progress is being made in supplanting old systems with newer and better brain and labor-saving devices.

We see a striking example of the efficiency of up-to-date business methods as applied to the Post-Office establishment, whose reports already show a large saving in expenditure over former years, which saving can be directly traced to improvements in the way of conducting the business of that department. The savings already made in the Post-Office Department give promise of the elimination of the annual deficit in the revenues by the end of the next fiscal year. In fact, every department of the Government is being rapidly overhauled and the old ways are being discarded. Waste, duplication of labor, and inefficiency are everywhere giving place to accuracy, simplicity, and effectiveness, and the departments as business institutions are being brought up to date. This is resulting in the saving of many millions of dollars annually, and at last the departments are learning how to get the most for the money expended. This is one of the prominent features of the Taft administration.

Now, the establishment of a tariff board, whose business it will be to furnish accurate data as to the cost of production of any article manufactured or produced, either in our home coun-

try or abroad, upon which a tariff is to be placed, must be a necessity if certainty and scientific methods are to be used in tariff adjustment from this time forward. Surely the experience through which the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate passed during the extra session, when the last tariff bill was framed, must demonstrate the necessity of a tariff board, whose business it will be to furnish accurate information and data to be used in tariff construction.

On the one side came the manufacturers of the country generally, protesting against any reduction of duty—no matter how high it might have been. Of course there were some exceptions. Great corporations, like the steel trust or the American Harvester trust, having control of all the useful patents and using all labor-saving devices, and by the use of such patents and devices being able to manufacture their particular products as cheaply as they could be produced in any part of the world, sent their representatives to tell the Ways and Means Committee that so far as they were concerned the tariff might be abolished altogether. And Andrew Carnegie, in a burst of patriotic fervor, was able to exclaim: "America does not need a tariff on steel any longer—I have quit manufacturing steel."

But, while the great concerns might be able to get along without the tariff, the smaller concerns engaged in the same business were not and their interests—strange to say—were entitled to consideration, just as were the interests of the great concerns which had grown so large and powerful that they could do without.

On the other hand there came the importers, naturally interested in low duties—as low as they could get them—because their business was increased by importation, and they naturally wanted as much business as they could get; so the importers protested against the high duties demanded by the manufacturers—and so the conflict waged. Who told the truth—the manufacturers demanding high duties, so that all foreign competition should be shut out and all the American market secured to the American manufacturer and laborer, or the importer, who would secure all the American market for himself and bring in his goods from foreign nations, even to the closing of every mill and factory and the pauperization of every laborer in the United States?

God save the mark. Could any patriotic American hesitate in making a choice between these alternatives? Is it any wonder, then, that, without accurate data as to the cost of production at home and abroad, mistakes were made? The only wonder was that Congress was able to do as well as it did in framing and passing the new tariff law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The necessity for accurate data to be used in tariff construction was not as great in days gone by as it is to-day. Perhaps in the framing of the McKinley bill it could have been used to some advantage. Certainly in the framing of the Wilson-Gorman bill, if the Democratic party had had accurate information as to the cost of producing many articles and commodities abroad which under that bill were admitted free or under too low a rate of duty, they might have avoided many mistakes, and perhaps saved themselves from some measure of the overwhelming defeats which overtook them in 1894 and 1896.

In the framing of the Dingley bill it would have been well if the Republican party had had the assistance of a tariff board or commission, as mistakes were undoubtedly made in placing some duties too high, as the excess of such duties was taken advantage of afterwards by American producers and manufacturers.

But no legislation can be perfect. No party can pass a law even approximately perfect. I assume when an American Congress can pass an approximately perfect tariff law the time will be at hand when there will be no need of laws, courts, or custom-houses—the time dreamed of by the splendid leader of the opposition, when the custom-houses may be razed from turret spire to foundation stone, or words to that effect.

In those days there may be a possibility of electing William J. Bryan to the Presidency of the United States; but as yet there is little chance of either perfect laws or perfect law-makers becoming a drug on the market.

Pardon the digression. The point I am trying to make is that in the process of tariff making, up until about 1890, it was not as necessary to have the services of a tariff board as it is to-day, and I believe the necessity will grow greater as the country grows greater. Up until about 1890 there was general competition throughout the country in the production of products. Competition was the rule. Of course there were exceptions. The Standard Oil and a few other great corporations were started along in the late seventies and through the decade from

1880 to 1890. But combination was the exception, and the trust era had not really commenced.

In those days, before the trust era of business, there was not the necessity for great accuracy in tariff adjustment, as home competition would secure a reasonable price, based on cost of labor, material, and profit to the home consumer, and consequently, under the Morrill tariff law and the McKinley law, we witnessed every day the refutation of the Democratic doctrine that the tariff is a tax—that the duty is placed on the goods imported and is added to the price—for there were many instances where the duty was more than the price of the goods. For instance, wire nails, with a duty of 2½ cents per pound, sold for 1½ cents per pound; steel rails sold for about the amount of the duty; and sheet tin sold 50 per cent less than the duty imposed. The illustration was very common. The reason was that home competition kept the price down to the cost of production and a reasonable profit to the producer. There were hundreds of instances where, under the Morrill and McKinley laws, a high protective tariff caused the establishment of new industries in the country, which never would have been established if the goods produced were allowed to come in from abroad under low rates of duty.

Protection has surely been one of the principal factors in building up and developing industrial America.

But that era of our country's experience has passed away, whether for good or ill. We are now in the midst of new economic forces. Competition within America has gone forever; and competition throughout the world, in many leading lines of industry, will soon follow. For the same forces of improved methods of combining and using capital, better means of transmitting intelligence, and vastly improved facilities for transporting and distributing the products of the factory, the forest, or the farm, which have made it possible for a great concern, whether a corporation, a partnership, or an individual, to consider the whole of a great country like the United States as his market, if he can secure it, will operate over the world, for national lines, after all, so far as business is concerned, are but imaginary, and world-wide combination will soon be the feature of industrial and business development. Indeed, international combination is already becoming a great factor in the business world of America, and already, in considering the proposition of placing a duty on petroleum and petroleum products, zinc, lead, and lumber the international side of the question had to be seriously considered.

It has come about, therefore, in our development as a nation that if a tariff is placed too high, in all probability a trust will use this advantage to the disadvantage of the American consumer. If a trust is not already in existence when such a tariff is placed, one would soon be formed, and instead of home competition holding the price of the article or commodity down to a legitimate level, home competition would be eliminated, and the combination securing the market, the price would be raised just to that point at which the foreign article would be excluded, and so injustice be done the American consumer.

This condition is not the fault of any political party, nor any particular law. It is just the result of industrial and economical development. But it must be guarded against, just the same.

This is the reason why the Republican party, in the Chicago platform, while not departing one jot or one tittle from its support of the principle of protection, saw the necessity of defining the measure of protection which ought to be preserved, namely, "The difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, with a reasonable profit added." Why, the very language of the plank of the Chicago platform calls for a tariff board or commission. President Taft is only carrying out the pledges of his party in recommending that Congress shall provide the necessary appropriation for the maintenance of that board. [Applause.]

But the Democratic party seems to be lined up solidly against this measure. Why? It is hard to say, unless it be for political reasons. Surely the advantages which would come from a tariff board must be apparent to them, as to Republicans, on looking over the list of appropriations for the next year as passed by this session of Congress. I see they will appropriate nearly \$1,000,000,000, including everything, and about \$345,000,000 of this vast amount must be raised by customs dues. It is a mighty good thing the custom-houses have not been as yet demolished, with Virginia and other Southern States voting down the income-tax amendment. Where should we look for relief, O Lord, if it were not for custom-houses and the protective-tariff system?

According to the estimates furnished by the clerks to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House December 9, 1909, Congress will appropriate about \$978,000,000 for the

expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911. Of course this amount will not all be expended. Some of it is in the nature of authorization, against which no warrants will be drawn. But I have in my hand the estimate of the actual disbursements of money which will be made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911. The estimate amounts to \$636,068,673. This amount is exclusive of the post-office appropriation. Adding this appropriation of \$244,000,000 in round figures—with some other small amounts not yet passed for various uses of the governmental system—the total disbursements will be brought in the neighborhood of \$900,000,000 for the coming year.

Gentlemen on the other side have sought in the past and seek to-day to make political capital out of the amount of appropriations passed by Republican Congresses. You declaim against the extravagance of the Republican party, and yet if you take your list of appropriations I doubt if you can show where any appropriation might be scaled down to an appreciable extent and still guard against the pauperization of some of the departments and maintain the high standard of efficiency of some of the others.

Take, for instance, the pension bill, this year carrying \$155,000,000 in round figures. Who could be found who would endeavor to scale down the amount carried by this bill, great as it is? Who would wish to economize in that direction? Even our friends from the other side would hardly recommend the scaling of the appropriation for the pensions of the old soldiers, and I would not do them the injustice of placing their reluctance to do this upon the ground of political expediency, but rather upon a sense of justice, right, and patriotism, because the pension bills which added to the sum total of the pensions within the last two years have only done justice to the old soldiers in this, that it gave them an increased pension to meet the increased cost of living, and the increase does no more than maintain them in the same ratio to the Nation's increasing wealth and to their consequent increasing expenditures as they were eight or ten years ago, or before those laws were passed.

Next we have the army bill, about \$95,000,000. I do not like to vote for an army bill. Ninety-five million dollars to maintain even our small army seems like waste. But we are a first-class Nation and compelled to maintain a first-class position among the nations of the world. Our experience in the war with Spain must have demonstrated to American citizens the necessity of at least maintaining the nucleus of an army. I take it, gentlemen, that the great tragedy of the war with Spain was not the loss of those who fell upon the slopes of San Juan Hill or in the jungles of the Philippines, but the poor boys who died in the fever camps of Chattanooga and Florida, and of pneumonia on the sand dunes of the Presidio at San Francisco, because the War Department was not, on the breaking out of the war, provided with sufficient munitions of war, medicine, covering, and clothing for the soldiers who were being sent across the seas to fight their country's battles. So I voted for \$95,000,000 for the use of the army, and this amount, great as it seems in amount, but small by comparison with the army expenditures of other first-class nations, will provide merely 1 soldier for over 1,000 inhabitants of the United States. When we look at the army appropriation that way, it seems that we are voting for a more than reasonable bill. I do not believe that bill would be scaled down even if the administration of the affairs of this country should be turned over to the Democratic party to-morrow.

So with the naval bill, carrying \$130,000,000. We have learned that the navy is the policeman of this country. We have heard from Democratic authority that \$16,000,000,000 of our national wealth lies within gunshot of the Atlantic coast. Therefore it is necessary to maintain our navy at its present efficiency, and if possible augment that efficiency in order that we may guard against disaster in time of war. I saw the great battle fleet sail out of the harbor at San Francisco on its remarkable cruise around the world. I saw it enter Hampton Roads on its return, after having successfully voyaged through every clime and half the seas of the world, a distance of 45,000 miles, and all without one serious accident or casualty, and my heart was filled with pride and exultation as an American citizen at its wonderful accomplishment.

But beside that battle fleet sailed the colliers of other nations; and the knowledge was brought to my heart that in case of a war with any great power, such as Great Britain, Germany, or Japan, our battle fleet would be little more than a coast guard, because of its lack of auxiliary vessels to serve as scouts, dispatch boats, hospital ships, and colliers, and this knowledge impels me to do that which will lie in my power for the restoration of the American merchant marine, so that if, unfortunately,

we should again be drawn into war, we might have a merchant marine to draw upon in time of emergency.

Next comes the appropriations for the Agricultural Department, then the rivers and harbors, the public buildings, and so on.

I notice our Democratic friends are extremely liberal when it comes to asking for appropriations for their part of the country. It was my good fortune to sail down the Mississippi River last fall with the presidential party from St. Louis to New Orleans. Everywhere we found good old Democratic Members of both the House and the Senate, who had preached economy, and even parsimony, for years, boarding our vessel and demanding that we appropriate something in the neighborhood of \$156,000,000 for dredging the Mississippi River to a 14-foot depth from the Gulf to St. Louis, and when the diminishing revenues were alluded to those same careful, economic gentlemen were not backward in advising the issuance of bonds to the amount of \$500,000,000 to carry out that and other projects. So I find, when we take up these appropriations one by one, that they are necessary. The country is developing rapidly. Our national wealth in the last fourteen years has increased from \$60,000,000,000 to \$120,000,000,000. We are no longer a small nation; we are now on a billion-dollar scale of expenditure, economize, pinch, and save as we will; and if our Democratic critics were to secure control of the administration to-morrow they would be compelled to do as we Republicans have done—appropriate approximately the same amounts for the care and maintenance of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There is one difference with them I will admit, however, and that is this: When the Democratic party comes into authority again, if they ever do, they will know it is by a fluke, as it was last time, and they will not feel the necessity of appropriating these sums or of paying the expenses of the United States. They know that soon the Republican party will return to its own again, and take care of the debts created, and by and by again properly adjust the affairs of the Government and bring everything again up to a proper business efficiency.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MCKINLAY of California. For a moment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have listened to the gentleman's very entertaining speech with great interest, and I would like to ask him what he thinks of the opinion of that usually well-informed citizen of the Republic who says that the Government could be conducted successfully at an expense of \$300,000,000 less a year than it is conducted now under a Republican administration?

Mr. MCKINLAY of California. Well, I do not care to question the gentleman's accuracy of statement, but I have never read that the gentleman had put it in that form. I think there is some mistake in the way in which the question is presented. I know there are smart people all over the United States, a great many of them, who stand on the street corners of every town and village and spend their time whittling sticks and chewing tobacco and running the United States, who think they could very much improve on the methods now used; but if any man can be found who can suggest a feasible means for a saving in the appropriations, he is an American patriot, and he should make his knowledge known. I think that would qualify him for a place in the Cabinet.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption? Putting aside the gentleman's fling at American citizens who criticize the conduct of their officials, I want to suggest to him that he will find in the RECORD the statement was made by the distinguished Rhode Islander practically the same as I have made it.

Mr. MCKINLAY of California. I do not care to dispute with the gentleman. I am satisfied to let his remark go unchallenged. I wish to hurry on, because I have many subjects to which I wish to refer in my remarks.

Now, take up the estimate of our sources of revenue and we find that there are only three or four. In the first place, from customs we must secure next year \$345,000,000; from internal revenue about \$255,000,000; from the corporation tax it is estimated about \$25,000,000; from miscellaneous sources about \$47,000,000. Gentlemen on the other side must know that if they were given charge of the affairs of this Nation to-morrow they would be compelled to raise \$345,000,000 by some kind of custom taxation.

I have heard a great deal since I have been in Congress about the desirability of income tax as a means of raising revenue; but I find that since the income-tax amendment was submitted to the States the Democratic States are just as eager to repudiate that method of raising revenue as are the Republican States. The opposition is about equally divided, and the probability is

that the income-tax amendment will not be passed, and in the future, as in the past, the chief reliance in revenue raising will be upon customs receipts. This being so, should the Democratic party achieve the right to administer the affairs of this Government, it being imperative that they must raise \$345,000,000 each year from customs taxation, they should have the services of a tariff board to furnish information on this all-important subject.

I admire the way in which the Democratic party leaders manage to get the idea infused into the country from time to time that if the Democratic party had control of the affairs of the Nation the tariff taxes would be reduced. But there would be no reduction. You would simply reduce the duty on one schedule and add it to another. You might decrease it on woolen or cotton goods, but you would be compelled to add it to some other article which under the present law is now coming in free of duty. Perhaps, if the tariff on Schedule K is excessive, you would make reductions, and instead of the present scale under that schedule you would put a duty of 10 cents a pound on tea or 10 cents a pound on coffee, or something else of like nature.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman on the other side yesterday said the first thing he would do would be to put a duty on coffee and tea.

Mr. MCKINLAY of California. Of course; and that brings us back to this proposition, that no matter which party is in power \$345,000,000 must be raised by tariff taxation. What advantage do you give the poor man if you lower the duty on his cotton goods or his woolen goods and put the same amount back on tea or coffee? It is true that under the present law, the much-abused Payne-Aldrich law, there is a larger percentage of goods coming into the United States upon the free list than under any bill ever passed, and this fact is not now being disputed.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKINLAY of California. Pardon me if I refuse to yield longer. I see my time is fast ebbing away. I will give you an opportunity if I can spare the time at the end of my remarks. So to my mind it means transferring the duty from one article to another, and no relief from tariff taxation, if tariff taxation be a burden, as is sometimes claimed by Democratic statesmen.

But it appears to me that under the protective-tariff system so many articles of general consumption and demand are allowed to come in absolutely free of duty that the burdens are lightened for the poor, as under that system such a great percentage of the articles consumed in the everyday life of the American citizens are admitted absolutely free. On the other hand, under duty, such as is being continually advocated by the Democrats—a tariff-for-revision system—I believe the burdens upon the poor are greater than they are under the protective-tariff system, because the duties, though not so high, are imposed on everything the poor man consumes—his clothing as well as his groceries—and on the whole the average is greater against the ordinary consumer under a tariff for revenue than under a protective-tariff law. But the point I wish to make is this, gentlemen: If you should be fortunate in the next election, and if ultimately you should secure control of this Government in its three branches, as you did once before within the last fifty years, you will still be compelled to raise approximately \$345,000,000 a year by your tariff for revenue. In doing this you will need the services of a tariff board, even as the Republican party will need those services if the protective-tariff system is preserved. I wish to point out this fact that the services of the board are necessary, because in the last analysis accurate information must be obtained. I was talking this morning with one who is in high authority in the Treasury Department in regard to the so-called tariff board of 1883. That board was organized for the purpose of furnishing accurate information in the construction of the tariff of 1883. That information was furnished. Seventy-five per cent of the rates advised were adopted, and 85 per cent of the language recommended by that commission was embodied in the law of 1883. This circumstance surely demonstrates the usefulness of a tariff board or commission.

In addition to the supreme necessity of a tariff board for business purposes and in the administration of the affairs of this country as a business proposition, I believe its operation will have much to do with taking the question of tariff out of politics.

I for one would like to see the tariff taken out of politics. We have had instances over and over again where the country has been seriously disturbed for months at a time, when industry has been suspended and millions of men have been thrown out of employment while Congress was adjusting and considering a new tariff bill. Nor is it necessary that a readjustment of the tariff shall be pending to throw the country into a business

panic. Democratic experimentation will throw business into spasms whenever a presidential campaign is on, and business men of the country have come to hate and fear a presidential year worse than any other disturbing factor entering into their experience. Last year it was estimated by some of the best statisticians of the country that \$10,000,000 a day were lost for three or four months while the new tariff bill was under consideration, and during that time 200,000 freight cars were lying idle on the side tracks and, worse than all that, nearly 2,000,000 men were left unemployed until the industries of the country could find out upon what basis they were to resume business operations. This experience was dreadful and should be prevented from recurring at all hazards. The waste and destruction of capital alone from such hesitancy and uncertainty must be one of the most powerful arguments for the maintenance and continuance of a tariff board, such as was created by the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, and is now being provided for in the sundry civil bill. In my opinion, not only will the establishment of a tariff board ultimately take this great question out of politics and place it on a scientific basis, but it will prevent the return of panics and business disasters arising out of the suspension of industry, and will, I believe, ultimately furnish the means whereby certain schedules of the tariff which may be wrong, because of changing conditions of production, or some such cause, may be amended from time to time as necessity may require. I believe we are the only nation in the world which every four, eight, or twelve years suspends every form of industry for the purpose of overhauling the tariff.

In California we have what is known as a code commission, consisting of three members. These members are skilled lawyers and they sit in commission all the year around. Their business is to keep continuously overhauling the codes of the State, and if at any time they find where an amendment ought to be inserted they draft it and suggest it to the next legislature. The commission does not pass the amendment, it simply suggests the amendment to the legislature, and at each session of the legislature we have many amendments, sometimes 25, sometimes 50, and sometimes more. The judiciary committees first take up the recommendation of the code commission and make their reports to the legislature, the legislature then considers the amendments suggested, the same as any other proposed legislation, and thus the codes of California are amended from time to time without serious disturbance to the legal system of the State.

The gentleman from New York declaims against Schedule K. Perhaps Schedule K is out of proportion in its relation as between the industries concerned and the consumers of woolen products. I do not know that there is much disparity of opinion on that point. I do know, however, that under the Wilson-Gorman bill, when wool was allowed to come in free of duty, and my State, the second wool-producing State in the Union, was bankrupt as far as the production of wool was concerned, wool was sold on the San Francisco docks for less than 6 cents a pound and sheep on the ranges for \$1 apiece, and the wool industry in California was destroyed by the Wilson-Gorman bill. It was possible to bring in cheap wool from Australia and South Africa. Wool produced on the great stretches of the government lands of those colonies could be raised so cheaply that it could be laid down in San Francisco docks for 5 and 6 cents a pound, and consequently wool growing in California was given up until a tariff on wool was restored by the Dingley bill, and now the industry is again flourishing.

I believe that Schedule K is out of proportion, and I believe that if a tariff commission could study the question it might at the next Congress furnish accurate information, so that the defect could be amended without doing any injury to the business of woolen manufacture.

I hope it will be some time possible that the tariff can be adjusted continuously, so that the whole subject-matter may be taken out of partisan politics. Again, the tariff question is always a sectional question and always has been since soon after the war of 1812. It became a sectional question when New England declared in favor of free trade, because New England States were engaged in commerce, because they were in the business of importing, just as we have great concerns to-day engaged in the business of importing anxious to promote that business, regardless of the effect it may have on the American laborer. But after manufacturing started in New England, and those industries became profitable, New England turned to protection and instructed her Representatives to support protective measures, and the consequent revolutionizing of the industries of New England followed.

You know the story of the discovery of the cotton gin and the effect of that discovery on the South, coupled with the teachings of Bright and Cobden that the South should raise raw cot-

ton and send it to Great Britain, and that Great Britain should be the workshop of the world and manufacture the cotton into cloth, and in that form it should be sent back for sale in America. So the South became sectional, so far as the tariff was concerned, and turned toward free trade, and protested against the high protective tariffs desired by Northern and Western States, and out of this period of development in our country great disasters and dangers to the Republic resulted, and to-day, because of the tariff question, we have a new sectionalism appearing in the Middle West. James G. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, said that, in his opinion, the day would come when the great Middle Western States would turn toward free trade, because the food products, the production of which would become the chief industry in that section of the United States, would not be competitive from other parts of the world, and the producers of that section, not being directly benefited by a protective tariff, would desire to bring in from other parts of the world at as low a price as possible products they could not produce themselves for home consumption, and in order to get such products as cheaply as possible would demand low tariffs, even if low tariff meant great importations, even to the extent that they would seriously displace American labor at home.

The time for such appearance of sectionalism in the Middle West has come, as foretold by Blaine, and nearly all the States of the Middle West, through their Representatives in Congress, are advocating a low tariff and criticising the present bill because they claim it is too high in the rate of duty. Read the criticisms of the Representatives of the Middle Western States uttered daily in the House and Senate. They want to place wool on a low tariff schedule, and gentlemen representing the cotton States of the South also desire to place cotton goods on a low tariff schedule. They desire to cut down the duties on oranges and lemons. They protest against the high duties on the dried fruit and green fruit, the nuts and the raisins and the olives and the olive oil of California, and when we take the sectionalism of the Middle West into consideration and know that if the Representatives of that part of the Nation had their way, and an opportunity to write the kind of a tariff bill they would like to write—one in harmony with the Iowa idea, the Cummins idea—they would write a tariff bill which would mean the destruction of a great percentage of the industries of California and of the entire Pacific coast. I believe that a tariff written along the lines of the Iowa idea, as we understand it from the expressions of the junior Senator from Iowa, would mean a loss to California of \$100,000,000 annually.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to use the rest of my time in saying something about the cost of production, based on the cost of labor, both within our own country and in competing lands. I have in my possession a labor report. It is a compilation of facts gathered and submitted to the governor of California by Mr. Henry Weinstock. About three months ago this report was submitted to the governor of California by Mr. Weinstock, who traveled in Europe for over a year for the purpose of carefully studying economic and labor conditions in the principal nations. Mr. Weinstock was appointed a special labor commissioner of the State of California by the governor of our State, for the purpose of securing facts and data which would be of use to the legislature of California in framing improvements to the labor laws. His report is most interesting. I shall not attempt to go into details in reference to it at this time, but at the conclusion of my address I will ask permission to embody in my remarks, as an extension thereto, some of its pages, because I believe the facts therein contained will be of distinct benefit to those who care to acquire accurate information on the subjects treated therein.

The facts shown in Mr. Weinstock's report go to establish the conclusion that in every country in Europe there is a different basis of production. In every country of Europe within the past eighteen months the price of living has risen, in some countries more than others, no doubt, but, taking all Europe, the cost of living within the past year and a half has increased from 10 to 50 per cent. Wages have risen in Italy within this time about 35 per cent; in Austria, 20 per cent; in Belgium, 10 per cent; in Great Britain also there has been an advance of wages; in fact, there are constant changes in the cost of production of commodities going on because of changing conditions of labor and the cost of living of labor. This report, most comprehensive, gives much information along these lines, and I insert some of its pages because I believe it will be of distinct interest to some of the gentlemen representing the great cotton States of the South.

In this connection I will warn the House again against the growing competitive power of the leading nation of the trans-

Pacific—the little Empire of Japan. We are apt to underrate the influence of that remarkable country, which is now leading all Asia in the science of war and the arts of peace. Representatives of the South, there are 800,000,000 people in Asia, more than one-half of the people of the entire globe. It is said that the population of this world amounts to 1,500,000,000. Eight hundred million are in Asia. For thousands of years those people were bound by the shackles of sloth and indifference to progress, of caste and creed, and extreme conservatism, but within the last twenty years there has been a great evolution going on in all Asiatic countries. Old conditions and systems are being broken up, and, led by Japan, which nation we took by the hand only a half century ago and led out of the obscurity of what we would call semibarbarism into the light of modern day, China, Korea, Manchuria, and Siam are shaking off the lethargy of scores of centuries and awakening to the opportunities and responsibilities of the modern world, and Japan is the leader of these nations of Asia. But what I say of Japan as to progress in the use of American and European methods of industrial development applies equally to China and the other countries mentioned, but in a less degree.

In Japan there are 50,000,000 people. The whole territorial area of Japan consists of only 140,000 square miles. California contains 158,000 square miles, and yet California has less than 2,000,000 inhabitants. The Empire of Japan is broken up into 600 islands, and on those 600 islands, many of them sterile and barren, there are 50,000,000 people. Those islands are volcanic in their formation, and only 10 per cent of the land can be used for agricultural purposes. Therefore you have 140,000 square miles of territorial area producing food for 50,000,000 people. Last year they produced 250,000,000 bushels of fine rice, 150,000,000 bushels of barley and rye, and other products in large proportion. Now, Japan went to war with China about twenty years ago for the purpose of obtaining territorial rights over Korea. Japan was swarming with excessive population, and she had to have territory for her surplus people. Korea is only a night's sail from the nearest Japanese coast and contains 80,000 square miles of good land. Japan desired Korea for the purpose of turning that land into a great raw material and food producing district. She went to war with China to secure this land of Korea. She soon overcame China in a brilliant series of battles on land and sea, and in a short time secured concessions from China which she believed would be respected by the nations of Europe. But the nations of Europe, led by Russia, interfered and drove Japan back to her island Empire, and themselves seized points of advantage and strategy in Korea and along the coasts of China, and by European insolence and force Japan was deprived of the fruits of her victory over China. Japan drew back and began preparations for a war with Russia, the principal offender, which afterwards astonished the world. She sent her bright young men into every capital of this earth to learn the art of war in military and naval schools and academies. She sent them into all the world's colleges of medicine to prepare them in the science of medicine and surgery, and when these young men were proficient they were brought back to teach others at home.

She built up her army and her navy swiftly but quietly, and when the time for action came Japan was ready at every point. Russia was marching on through Siberia and Manchuria to complete her line of conquest by connecting her outlying posts with Port Arthur, when, like a thunderbolt out of a clear sky, Japan commanded Russia to halt, and she emphasized that order by the thunder of the guns of her fleet against the Russian ships at Chemulpo and opened her batteries on Port Arthur.

I do not need to recapitulate the story of that war, for every reader of current history knows that as a result Japan secured all she fought for in Korea and established herself as the leader of the nations of Asia. Gentlemen of the South, to-day she is turning Korea into one great plantation. She has thousands of acres of land under cotton culture, for she is experimenting with every kind of cotton of which the world has knowledge, and already the cotton plantations of Korea are producing raw cotton for the mills of Japan. About ten years ago Japan began the construction of an industrial empire, just as Great Britain did in the beginning of the nineteenth century. She has worked along the same lines with splendid advantage, and already she is absorbing the Asiatic markets to the exclusion of America and the European nations.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman state the quantity, the number of bales of raw cotton produced by Korea?

Mr. MCKINLAY of California. I do not know the number of bales, as the gentleman suggests, but I will state that I have some articles written by Mr. Frank G. Carpenter which I will

ask to insert in the RECORD, which will give much information along that line.

As I was saying, only ten or twelve years ago this wonderful country began to build up an industrial system, following the plan adopted by England in the beginning of the last century, and if Japan keeps on in her wonderful progress as she has done since she commenced she will soon astonish the world more with her marvelous industrial, commercial, and manufacturing efficiency than she did by the might of arms against Russia in the Russo-Japanese war. Take her progress in the cotton industry alone. To-day there are over 400,000 cotton operatives in Japan. They are working with American machinery. I was in Charlotte, N. C., a few weeks ago as the guest of the manager of one of the great cotton factories there. He showed me a fine cotton loom, and he said to me: "I am the agent of the inventor and of the owners of the patents of this cotton machine. Three or four years ago Japanese buyers came over to our factory and purchased 400 of these machines to be used in their factories near Kobe. I was expecting to send some American mechanics to Japan to place the machines in position, just as we do to-day when we start a mill in the South, but the Japanese told me that we did not need to send American mechanics; they could take care of the placing of the machines themselves. So we sent 400 machines as directed."

Those were all the machines we ever sent, but they are operating thousands of them now. They took one of those machines into their machine shops and duplicated them by the thousands at far less cost than we could furnish them, and less than they could be sold for in America. To-day they have 400,000 cotton operatives working with American machinery making products that must soon come into competition with American products here in the United States and not in the markets of Asia. That is what I protest against. In that mill in North Carolina the gentleman took me into a place where the cotton was rolling off the last roller. He picked up a handful and said, "The difference of a half a cent or even less per yard in what we get for this cotton means prosperity for our business or destruction." I said to him, "What do you pay these men and women working at the looms?" and I was simply surprised to see what favorable labor conditions they have in that factory. Bright, keen young men and women were working at the looms. He told me, "We pay \$10 to \$12 a week, and they earn that money upon the machines at piecework. The price we are now getting for the cotton enables us to pay good wages, and the people you see maintain themselves in decent and comfortable homes outside of the factory gates; we are able to do this at the present price of the cotton which we sell on the market." I said to him, "Are you aware that just across the Pacific Ocean there are 50,000,000 people in Japan, 450,000,000 in China, 200,000,000 in India who will furnish labor on the same kind of machine you are using for a scale of wages at from 6 to 30 cents a day? The highest daily labor in Japan is about 30 cents a day in American money, and he works twelve hours a day. It is the sort of labor that never goes upon a strike, and that labor is already pouring its products not only into the markets of Asia, at half the price of the American production, but large shipments of every kind of cotton cloth and cotton articles are being sent in every ship that arrives from Japan into the port of San Francisco, paying the duties and still underselling American cotton products all over the Pacific coast. Already you cotton manufacturers are losing a large part of your cotton market in the United States."

Do you gentlemen representing cotton growing and manufacturing States wish to revise the cotton schedule downward, in view of these undoubted facts? Think it over. You are building up great industries in the South. You are now repudiating the old Cobden Club teaching that the South should grow cotton and ship it to England to be manufactured. You have advanced away beyond that absurd English doctrine. In the South you now build your cotton factory beside your cotton fields; your iron smelter and rolling mill at the mouth of the mine; your furniture factory and your sawmill adjacent to your timber stretches. You employ labor, and you are beginning to enjoy the payment of good wages to good mechanics. As a consequence your cities are rapidly improving, your country districts filling with desirable population, your waste lands are being cultivated, and everywhere the South is coming into her own. Does the South desire the competition of Asia in her chief line of products? I say again, think it over.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will permit me right here, I called attention yesterday to the fact that the Japanese now are competing with us in the making of baseballs.

Mr. MCKINLAY of California. At 90 cents a dozen.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. A few years ago I went into a woolen factory in Osaka, Japan. I saw up-to-date German machinery, just as fine as anything in the world, with women and men operatives. I asked the manager how many operatives they had, and he replied that they employed 600. They paid the women 20 cents and 22 cents of our money, or 40 sen and 44 sen of their money, for eleven hours of work a day. The operatives were just as skillful as I have ever seen in any factory, and I have seen a good many, and were making blankets out of Australian wool, to compete with us.

Mr. STANLEY. If the gentleman will come down into Kentucky, he will find women working right under your present system for \$3 or \$4 a week, and less.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is your Kentucky system.

Mr. STANLEY. And you will find them in other States as well.

Mr. MCKINLAY of California. I have in my hand an article written by Frank G. Carpenter, the great war correspondent, who is now traveling through Japan, China, Manchuria, Siberia, and other eastern countries. This is taken from the Evening Star of Saturday, April 10, 1909. I will insert it in the RECORD, because it gives much in the way of information along this line.

Nor is cotton the only fabric that they are paying particular attention to. You will find in every kind of industry, like the manufacture of light hardware, and all kinds of light woodenware, such as spools and clothespins, and everything of that nature, the Japanese particularly excel, and even in the heavier class of wooden and iron manufacture they are keeping up with the procession. While in Yokohama I was a guest of a Japanese colonel, home from Manchuria on a furlough. This was at the time of the armistice between Japan and Russia. This colonel took me down to the wholesale quarters and said, "Mr. MCKINLAY, in that warehouse we have 30 American flour mills." I said, "What are you doing with them?" He replied, "As soon as the war is over we are going to take those American flour mills over and put them up in Manchuria and grind the Manchurian wheat which has been piling up during the campaign." I said, "Well, I suppose you had to buy at least 30 American flour mills from the United States, did you not?" He said, "Oh, no; we buy one flour mill in Milwaukee, and we make 29 more just like it." And those flour mills have been placed in position in Manchuria; they are grinding the Manchurian wheat to-day, and if you will go back over your reports you will find exports of wheat to the Orient being displaced by those American mills made in Osaka, Japan, and, furthermore, you will find that our flour trade with Asia has gone; in fact, almost all of our Asiatic trade is gone. We are sending Asia little more than petroleum products and a small supply of cotton.

A couple of weeks ago a ship sailed out of San Francisco with 2,500 bales of cotton. Our exports of cotton to the Orient are growing less every year, because the plantations of Manchuria and Korea, which are being skillfully developed and expanded under the splendid system of agriculture practiced by the Japanese, are already beginning to send their supplies into the Japanese markets. Now, Japan has a great fleet of ships, both steam and sail, to which she pays subsidies of nearly \$9,000,000 a year. Those ships sail to Australia, to South Africa, to South America, to buy wool, hides, and lumber, and various other raw materials. These raw materials are taken back into Japan, and the Japanese Government, under the ship-subsidy system practiced, pays one-half the freight on the raw material going into Japan. The Japanese mills work up that raw material, and again the subsidized ships carry out the manufactured products to find a market in every port in the world. There are six lines of steamers now from Japan to the coasts of America—one to South America, one to Panama, one to Mexico, one to San Francisco, one to Puget Sound, and one to Vancouver—and in addition to these a Japanese company is now perfecting plans to put on an express line of 23-knot passenger steamers from Yokohama to the port of San Francisco, and through this means absolutely absorb the little balance of American trade in the Pacific. America is being driven from the Pacific by her little protégé of a half century ago, but that is another story, and I do not wish to enter into a discussion of that question at this time.

But I want to point out to you, gentlemen, that the greatest source of energy and power in all this world is in the Orient. You speak of your 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 of horsepower energy in the water courses in Maine, and your 30,000,000 of horsepower in California. What do you say of 800,000,000 of people with brains and hands and eyes that are now using American

and European machinery in making the goods and products which are consumed in the markets of the world, and particularly in the markets of the United States? You people of the South particularly must take cognizance of these facts.

If you will not listen now, they will be borne in on you in a way before long that you will not and can not ignore. I was rejoiced to see you building up your labor system. I was glad to learn, as I traveled through the South last year, that many of the statements as to poor conditions there existing were unfounded. I was glad to see you were not working your children in the factories and killing them before the age at which they should be put to labor. But you might go to working your boys and girls from 6 years of age, you could put them to work from the moment they tumbled out of the cradle, and keep them at work until the time they were consigned to their graves, and they could not compete with the labor of the Orient. And you Representatives of the South remember that the insurgent leaders of the West are demanding not only that every other manufacturing schedule should be cut, but the cotton schedule also. Reduce your tariff on cotton cloth half a cent a yard, and test the truth of the statement of the manager of that cotton mill at Charlotte. It is a difference between success and decent, profitable labor conditions on the one side, and bankruptcy, idleness for labor on the other. You Representatives from the cotton States can not afford to ignore the demand of our President that a tariff board shall be established to furnish you these facts; you need them for your own guidance and your own protection.

In every line of industry the same conditions prevail. I was in Cleveland a year ago, speaking along this line. Before I left the rostrum—

Mr. WEBB. May I ask the gentleman a question along the line he has just spoken?

Mr. McKINLAY of California. I will try to answer you later. Pardon me, if I decline to yield at this time.

In Cleveland a year ago I was speaking along this line, and calling attention to the new development of Asia, in the use of its great masses of labor by European and American capital. Before I left the rostrum a gentleman came toward me, and said, "Mr. McKINLAY, may I say something to you?" I said, "Yes." He said, "I am in the business of manufacturing electric-light and gaslight fixtures. A couple of years ago a Japanese came to my place of business and bought two dozen of my best patterns. I was glad to make the sale; but now these patterns are being shipped back into the United States in great quantities from Japan. They are paying the duty; they are underselling me, and I have been compelled to close that part of my business, and the mechanics who made them have been compelled to resort to other means of making a livelihood." No sooner had he passed by than another gentleman came forward and said, "I am engaged in the manufacture of the patent chairs with which the audience were seated. I make those chairs, or did make them, but sold some of these chairs to Japanese makers and they are now sending them back from Japan, underselling me, and I have given up that part of my business." I could cite you many, many such instances.

I represent for California one of the great lumber districts. There the redwood trees tower toward the sky 250 feet. Some of those trees are 10 and 12 feet in diameter at the trunk. You would think that railroad ties could be cut out of those trees at a cheaper cost than any place in the world. There were railroad-tie camps everywhere up and down the coast, but the Japanese began to cut railroad ties in the forests of Manchuria, and Japanese railroad ties have been sent over in subsidized Japanese ships and sold on the coasts of California for 26 cents apiece less than those produced in the tie camps of my district. Californians fear the competition of Asia, both the competition of the laborer and the products, because we know the deadly effect of it.

Two weeks ago I was on my way to Massachusetts. On the train I met a gentleman from New York going to Boston. He said to me, "Mr. McKINLAY, your Payne tariff bill has raised the devil with my business." I said, "What is your business, sir?" He said, "I have been in the business of manufacturing postal cards. I am a lithographer. We had a market for 50,000,000 postal cards in the United States. We sold 50,000,000 postal cards in the United States in a year." I said, "Where did you make those postal cards?" He answered: "We made them over in Germany. We had our factory there. We got cheap German labor and made the cards there and sent them over here for sale, and we made a great profit on them. If you had only raised the duty 40 or 50 per cent, we would not have cared anything about it, but you raised the duty 200 per cent, and so my German factories closed down, and I lost \$85,000;

but I did not care anything about that; it is a mere drop in the bucket; we had made so much money in the past ten years, while we were able to sell the German goods on the American market, that I did not care much about the \$85,000." But he said, "I have just been up to New York to see one of my agents whom we recently sent to Japan to investigate and see whether we could not move our German plant there. He has come back and reported. He said, as a result of that investigation, for \$100,000 we could send our plant to Japan and could begin the manufacture of Japanese postal cards and, with Japanese labor under Japanese conditions, we could make as many postal cards in Japan for 5 cents as we made in Germany for 25 cents; that after we could get started in Japan we could pay your 200 per cent duty and control the American market after all."

Gentlemen, these are facts that should be set forth yearly in a government report so that all concerned might learn them if they so desire. We have undoubtedly in this country what you might call a low-tariff or free-trade party, but I do not believe the Democratic party is a free-trade party. I believe the great majority of the Democratic party wants fair protection to American industry and American labor, just as does the Republican party, but you want to know the points at which you must fix the amount of protection so that great trusts in this country can not take advantage of too high a tariff and rob the American people. This is but just and right, and so in advocating the tariff board we are simply asking you to do that which in days to come will be for your benefit and your protection as well as ours. But outside of the Democratic party we have a low-tariff element, those who in this country live upon fixed incomes, people who live from rents or from interest, or on salaries that do not rise or fall quickly with the fluctuations of trade. These people are always in favor of low tariffs. They would like to have the low prices which continued from 1893 to 1897 prevail always in the United States. What difference would it make to them so long as they bought articles cheaply, and their fixed incomes purchased more than they do under better business conditions?

Allied with this portion of our people, who may be considered about 15 per cent of our whole population, we have the importers of the country. Unfortunately, to-day the importers are not merely importers, but they are manufacturers abroad also, just as was this gentleman I spoke of who was manufacturing post cards in Germany. The great importing houses of the large cities are the owners or interested in the manufacturing institutions in Germany, Great Britain, and France, and I believe they are also beginning to invest capital in Japan and China, so when a tariff adjustment or revision comes on the great importing houses send their notices out to their subordinate concerns and to their distributing agencies saying, "Protest against the raising of duty upon cotton, or upon hosiery, or upon gloves, or upon silks," or, in fact, on anything they are importing. Why? Because the operation of their mills abroad would be in some degree suspended, or their importing business lessened, and they would not make the profit they were otherwise making.

Added to these are some of the great newspapers of the country, who receive their principal support from the importing houses, and those newspapers we can easily name. They, too, are in favor of low duties. Some of those great papers receive forty, fifty, or sixty thousand dollars a month for advertising the wares of the importing houses, and so they are particularly interested. And so, adding a few theorists—college professors and professional people—and the Democrat who has not yet gotten the teachings of "before the war" out of his system, you have the combination, and if you will carefully analyze the low-tariff elements of the United States you will find that these are about all.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HAVENS] said that the majority of the American people were in favor of lower tariffs. Not so; not below the point of protection to the American manufacturer and the American laborer and a just profit to these producing agencies. Over and over again in the history of this country that great question has been fought out at the polls, and invariably, when there has been a square issue and no side issues interjected, the result has been overwhelming in favor of the maintenance and the continuance of the principle of protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Just this word in conclusion: The present administration is suffering from misrepresentation. Now, that is nothing new. It seems to be a part of Democratic policy to always carry on a campaign of misrepresentation. You see in the Democratic platform nothing but "We deplore" and "We condemn" and "We view with alarm." There is never any "We point with pride"

in the Democratic platform, but always condemnation and abuse. We do not expect that our President will escape that abuse. No Republican President ever escaped it, and I am afraid none ever will. When William McKinley came to the head of this Nation, he was followed by the vilification and vituperation of the great campaign of 1896. They never abated, until at last the brain of a crazy man was inspired and his arm was nerved, and he fired the shot that gave William McKinley his place among the martyrs of the world.

I was in Buffalo the day of his death. There were dread and fear all over that great commercial city. Men walked the streets and gathered upon the corners, and one to the other said, "What will become of the country? The policies of McKinley are working wonders in rapidly bringing the Nation back to industrial, financial, commercial, and national prosperity. Who is this young man, this broncho buster, this soldier of San Juan Hill, who now must take his place? Can he fill it?" In the uncertainty there were dread and fear all over that great city. Nor was it allayed until Theodore Roosevelt came to Buffalo and raised his hand over the cold clay of McKinley and swore that the policies of McKinley should be carried out as a whole and should not be departed from. [Applause on the Republican side.] This brought hope and comfort. But did Theodore Roosevelt escape abuse? For three years, no; calumny, cartooning, and abuse by a vicious press and by those even more vicious, who assaulted him for personal, political, and business reasons; for three years it went on, until he had carried out the policies of William McKinley, and then, after 1904, he commenced the formulation and inauguration of his own policies; and then the real storm broke over his devoted head. New problems had been developing rapidly in every business system; great corporations were forming everywhere, having their ramifications and influences in every avenue of trade and industry; railroads were making new combinations and demanding and assuming greater privileges; evils in the business and industrial systems of the country never dreamed of in the old days before combinations of capital were so common, powerful, and far-reaching manifested themselves everywhere, and these new conditions and new national problems had to be met by President Roosevelt, and he set himself to the task of formulating policies that should meet and control the new conditions; and the Republican majority of the House and Senate stood by him and voted to place that splendid series of laws on the statute books now known as the laws for the carrying out of President Roosevelt's policies, and those laws and policies are the honor and glory of the Roosevelt administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But the time came when Mr. Roosevelt was to pass on. I believe the greatest service he ever did the American people was to set his face against a certain tendency in this country toward one-man government, and when we consider the teachings of history we must admit that a tendency toward one-man government has always been a danger of republics, and often the rock upon which they have gone to pieces. It seems as if it is the fate of republics to sooner or later elevate to the position of chief magistrate some man who becomes too popular or too powerful, and the lust of power developing in such a man, retaining his office, first by favor, and perhaps ultimately by force, the principles of republicanism are undermined and the republic is destroyed. It is the common history of the republics of the world, and in setting his face and his will against any such possibility in this country President Roosevelt performed his greatest of all services to the American Nation and people, for in doing so he recognized and honored the precedent of Washington against three terms for any man in the Presidency by his act in refusing another nomination. He told some of us who called upon him and asked him to receive another nomination, "No; my day's work is done." You know that he could have been renominated and elected. You were anxious to make him a candidate yourself. Ah, how some of you Democrats love a Republican after you have abused him almost to the gates of hell; then, finding him right and honest and strong, you wish to take him up and make him your means of securing a desirable end. [Laughter on the Republican side.] President Roosevelt declined a third term; but he told us he desired that his work for good be continued. He said: "The great reforms I have tried to inaugurate I hope will be carried on, and to this end I recommend to you people of the western slope, and to the entire Nation, the nomination and election of my friend, my associate in government, William Howard Taft." [Applause on the Republican side.]

We followed his advice, and President Taft is now at the Nation's helm, and now President Taft is meeting with his share of abuse and vilification. I remember in the days of President Roosevelt, before the people came to understand

him, that he was pictured in one New York paper on the back of a broncho riding into the Senate and shooting his revolver into the ceiling, and President Taft to-day is likewise being misrepresented and cartooned. It seems as though there is a combination—I do not say that there is, but all the evidence would point to the fact that there is—a combination on the part of some of the great papers of this country to distort and misrepresent every act of the present administration. But he sits there calmly, patiently, awaiting his time when the great American heart of loyalty and patriotism will learn to know him as he is, even as it learned to know and trust Lincoln, McKinley, and Roosevelt. He waits serenely and confidently, firmly advocating his policies, for he knows that the end is sure, for righteousness is on his side, and in his chosen time God will make his worth manifest to the people. So I plead in my last sentence for the passage of this measure, the appropriation of \$250,000 for the expenses of a tariff board, so that it will aid and assist our President in carrying out one of the principal reforms of his splendid administration. [Long and loud applause on the Republican side.]

[Extracts from special labor report on remedies for strikes and lockouts as made by Harris Weinstock, special commissioner of labor, appointed by Governor Gillett, of California, to investigate labor conditions in Europe and Australasia.]

RUSSIA.

CONDITION OF RUSSIAN WAGE-EARNER.

The lot of the Russian wage-earner is the most unhappy in all the Occident, and so long as it remains the policy of the Russian Government to put a premium on ignorance, to discourage the education of her masses, to deliberately encourage, as she does on every hand, vice and immorality, in order to divert the thought and the energy of the people from politics, so long as the declaration of the Czar, of October 30, 1905, that it is his inflexible will to give to the people, among other things, the freedom of organized association, remains a byword and a barefaced, empty lie, so long must the condition of the Russian wage-earner remain the most unhappy in all the Occident.

Russia has nothing to offer in the way of hints or suggestions as to the most scientific method of preventing strikes and lockouts, other than by the most brutal use of force, by the exercise of arbitrary power, and by robbing the wage-earner of the freedom of organized association.

Russia, however, by her mediæval and brutal methods in the treatment of labor, stands out as a most valuable object lesson to the world, how best to degrade the working classes, how best to arouse in them hatred and ill will, how best to fill their hearts with disloyalty to the Government under which they live, how best to destroy their efficiency by killing the best within them and bringing out the worst within them, and how best to make it impossible, despite boundless natural wealth, to become a prosperous industrial nation.

AUSTRIA.

CONDITION OF AUSTRIAN WAGE-EARNER.

Compared with his fellow-worker in Russia, I found the condition of the Austrian wage-earner most enviable. On the whole, the Austrian workman is better off than ever before, though there is very great room for further improvement in his condition. The Austrian wage scale has for several years been upward, until the recent depression, which naturally checked this tendency; but, as yet, there have been few instances where wages have been cut, and unless trade conditions grow materially worse, there is no present likelihood of wages declining. I found, however, that this upward trend of wages in recent years was largely confined to those branches of industry which have become unionized.

There has also been a progressive increase in the cost of living, so that unorganized labor, which has not participated, as a rule, in increased wages, has been badly pinched by the increased cost of rent and of foodstuffs.

The legal hours for a day's labor in Austria are eleven. The actual average working hours, however, are nine and a quarter.

The average earnings of an industrial worker are \$240 a year, out of which he contributes \$20, or 8 per cent, to the funds of labor unions. According to the statement of Dr. Max Kaiser, the secretary of the Employers' Association of Austria, \$2,800,000 of such funds had been used for political purposes in supporting the work of the Social Democrats, and \$400,000 were used for strikes.

GERMANY.

CONDITION OF GERMAN WAGE-EARNERS.

While the average earnings of the German workman are not more than half the earnings of the wage-earner in the United States, there is a marked absence of the extreme poverty that greets the eye in British or American cities. There are no slums to be found in the cities of Germany. Nor are there to be found city districts where are to be seen the so-called submerged tenth. Even the poorest quarters of the German cities are kept scrupulously clean, the tenements outwardly present an attractive appearance, and inwardly, as a rule, will bear a searchlight inspection. This is not only due to the absence of drunkenness on the part of the wage-worker, but also to the deep and sincere interest manifested on the part of the authorities in the physical well being of the working classes.

TAXES.

By permission of American Vice-Consul General Charles A. Risdorf, of Frankfurt, Germany, I include the following statement in this report as showing the burden of taxes imposed by the several countries named therein on their respective consumers:

FOOD TAXATION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM, FRANCE, GERMANY, AND THE UNITED STATES.

In view of the various projects of taxation in Germany, an essay with the above title by S. Rosenbaum seems worthy of interest. The author examined into the duties on groceries, sugar, tobacco, and food of all kinds and the internal taxation on liquors, tobacco, and food in the several states, and comes to the following results:

The burden of taxation is shown in the following schedule, the figures meaning dollars per capita of the population:

	United Kingdom.	France.	Germany.	United States.
1870.....	\$6.85	\$3.60		\$4.55
1875.....	6.55	5.01	\$1.45	3.59
1880.....	5.92	5.60	1.79	3.54
1885.....	6.07	5.59	2.58	3.40
1890.....	5.92	5.97	3.40	3.74
1895.....	6.02	6.22	3.01	2.77
1900.....	6.85	6.50	3.54	4.61
1903.....	7.82	6.22	3.54	4.28
1906.....	7.29	6.17	3.79	4.27

This table, covering a period of thirty-six years, shows interesting details. Thus in America the burden of taxation has decreased; the Americans now pay less per capita than in the year 1870. The development in England is quite similar, but it has been disturbed by the financial effects of the war in Transvaal. Even so, the increase is moderate in this country of free trade.

Quite different results are shown in France and Germany, where the military preparations have been multiplied since 1871. In France this taxation has increased about 100 per cent, and in Germany also there is a rapid rise. These figures form a good argument for the friends of peace.

The author also calculates the amount of taxes derived from food, liquors, and tobacco in different countries:

	Food and groceries.	Liquors.	Tobacco per capita.
England.....	\$1.58	\$4.22	\$1.50
France.....	1.99	2.28	1.84
Germany.....	2.38	1.07	.34
United States.....	.83	2.58	.87

According to this schedule the taxes on food are higher in Germany than in any other state. Still there is a fault in this calculation—only the revenue is taken into consideration and no allowance is made for the increase in prices of domestic products caused by high custom-house duties. The amount of duty collected for corn does not show the real burden of taxation resting on the population; the entire consumption of corn should be taken into consideration; and then we find quite different results in France and Germany, and even more benefit to England and America. It must also be borne in mind that Germany is a federal state and that the states, countries, and communities frequently impose taxes on meat, beer, bread, etc., which are not included in this calculation.

WAGES.

The general tendency of wages has been upward. For example, the increase in wages of textile workers has been about 20 per cent. In the iron trades the increase in wages during the past ten years has been from 30 to 40 per cent. Despite all this, the wage standard of Belgium is lower than that of most other European industrial countries. To illustrate this, in Brussels, where wages, generally, are the highest in Belgium, skilled workers, as a rule, earn an average of 80 cents a day, and unskilled workers an average of 60 cents a day.

In the iron industries the rate is somewhat higher, skilled workmen averaging 90 cents a day and unskilled 70 cents a day.

Street car employees in Brussels earn a minimum of 65 cents a day, and after several years' service a maximum of 90 cents a day, with a small pension after twenty years' service.

Saleswomen employed in the great cooperative department store of Brussels, which claims to pay higher wages than its noncooperative competitors, earn at the start \$1.50 a week and after three months' service \$2.25 a week, with an increase of \$2.50 a month for every two years' additional service, until a maximum wage is reached of \$6.70 a week; this after a service of fourteen years.

A male head of department in this same enterprise, which position carries with it much responsibility and demands years of training, earns about \$11 a week.

Despite the advance in Belgium wages during the past several years the wage standard of Belgium is lower than that of France and other European countries. I was informed by a manufacturer who has a large plant in Belgium and also one in France that his Belgium wage rate was 35 to 40 per cent lower than that paid by him in France.

Belgian employers successfully fight foreign competition with low wages. Collective wage bargaining is rarely met with in Belgium. Aside from the building trades, where a minimum wage is fixed by the trade, the bargaining between employer and employee as a rule is individual.

COST OF LIVING.

The cost of living during the past several years has steadily been upward. The consensus of opinion among those who have made investigations along these lines is that the increased cost of living is fully 25 per cent. Nevertheless, it is maintained that food products are cheaper than in France or elsewhere on the Continent, due to the fact that, aside from customs duties placed on a few luxuries, Belgium is practically a free-trade country.

FRANCE.
SOCIALISM.

The labor question in France is hopelessly entangled with socialism, and socialism in that country stands for political action.

At the last general French election the Socialists cast 896,000 votes and they have to-day 76 representatives out of 584 members of the lower house. This has brought about a tendency on the part of the French workman to devote his energies to politics rather than to economic unionism, and this in turn has led to much disappointment on the part of many socialistic wage-earners who expected much in the way of a betterment in their material conditions as the result of political action, and who now advocate the direct and sudden strike instead of looking for relief to politics. This strong leaning in the direction of the strike is encouraged by the anarchistic elements among the Socialists and the unionists.

WAGES.

The tendency of wages in France since 1906 has been upward in the printing and building trades, and either stationary or downward in all the other trades.

The average wage for an unskilled workman in Paris is 80 to 90 cents a day, and for skilled labor from \$1.60 to \$2 a day. The average wage for all of France in the printing trades is 90 cents a day. The building trades pay 16 to 18 cents an hour, with ten hours' work a day in summer and about one hundred and ten hours' work a month in winter. Pick and shovel men earn from 75 cents to \$1.10 a day in the provinces. In Paris, owing to the extraordinary demand caused by the building of the subway, these workers have been receiving from \$1.25 to \$1.50 a day. Paris wages, however, are not a guide for the wages in France.

The secretary of the labor federation made the statement that in the making of clay pipes, for example, at Omar, a town about 120 miles from Paris, a team of three, consisting of a man, woman, and boy, will earn, collectively, but \$5.60 a week, with a working day of twelve hours. A strike is now on in this industry for an increase in wages for the team of 5 cents a day. He also stated that women are employed in the provinces in making watch chains, for example, for which they receive 25 cents a day, while the same sort of work in Paris commands a wage of \$1.50 a day.

HOURS OF LABOR.

The legal working day in France is twelve hours, though the iron workers have a ten-hour day, and the printing trades, as a result of a national strike in 1906, have a nine-hour day.

COST OF LIVING.

All sides agree that the cost of living in France has increased materially, some authorities placing the increase at from 10 to 15 per cent, and some putting it as high as from 25 to 30 per cent. Figures published during my sojourn in Paris by the assistance publique, or poor law department, which manages the public hospitals and is consequently a very large buyer of all kinds of food supplies, show that the cost of living for foodstuffs has increased by 18 per cent during the last four years.

ENGLAND.

LIVING CONDITIONS OF BRITISH WORKMEN.

The conditions under which the British workman, as a rule, lives are better than are the conditions generally under which the continental worker lives. The English policy of free trade means cheap and abundant food for its people, due to the fact that the food producers of every clime are in constant competition with each other for the English trade. Most continental countries, on the other hand, having large agricultural interests, have deemed it essential to establish for their protection high tariffs against foreign foodstuffs, thus enhancing the cost of living of their wage-earners.

While there are yet tens of thousands of British workmen, especially among the nonskilled, who live in congested and insanitary districts in the large British cities, such as London, Glasgow, Liverpool, and Manchester, there are many other tens of thousands who are more comfortably housed than are the continental wage-earners. Even in thickly populated London miles upon miles of streets are lined with wage-earners' cottages, where, at a reasonable rental, each one may live with his family under comfortable and sanitary conditions. Single cottages for wage-earners are almost unknown in the large continental cities, where great numbers of workmen are housed in tenements with but two, and rarely three, rooms to a family, however large the family may be.

LABOR UNIONS IN POLITICS.

Some fifteen years ago the tendency began on the part of British labor to enter politics as an independent political body. To-day the latest British Government report shows that in 1906 and in 1907 wages increased in every group of trades, but that this upward tendency was arrested early in 1908.

According to the fifteenth report of the British labor department for 1907 the prevailing wages in England in various industries were as follows:

Compositors, \$9 per week; bookbinders, \$7.75 per week; bakers, \$9.25 per week; dock laborers, 16 cents per hour; street car conductors, 10 cents per hour; street car motormen, \$1.18 per day; laborers, \$5 per week; painters, \$6.75 per week; letter carriers, \$4.50 to \$7.50 per week, according to length of service; policemen, \$8.50 per week; farm laborers, \$4 to \$5 per week; iron foundry, \$10 per week; carpenters, 18 cents per hour; bricklayers, 20 cents per hour; plumbers, 20 cents per hour; plasterers, 16 cents per hour. (Fifty hours constitutes a week's work.)

According to the same report the sliding scale of wages which for years prevailed in some industries, notably in coal mining, is going out.

ITALY.

Since the creation of the agricultural unions, which have given rise to many big and closely contested strikes, there has been a marked advance in the wages paid to farm hands, raising them in some districts from 13 cents per day to 65, or a gain of about 500 per cent, and nearly everywhere the pay has nearly or more than doubled, but it is not even claimed by the unionists that this marked difference is wholly due to organization. In many regions, notably in the southern provinces, emigration is mainly responsible, as labor has become very scarce and can command its own price; in other parts where the emigration phenomenon has not made itself felt, factors have been the high degree of prosperity which has prevailed in Italy as elsewhere for the last few years, the higher price commanded by many products, migrations to cities, due to the increased industrial activities, and the general increase in the cost of living due to the diminished purchasing power of money. The opponents of unionism indeed maintain that there is little relation between the growth of unionism and the increase of wages other than that of coincidence, but it is generally admitted that unionism has had its share in raising the standard of living.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sunday, May 15, 1910.]
JAPAN REACHES OUT FOR AUSTRIAN TRADE.

VIENNA, May 14.

Steadily Japan pushes her commercial organization into every corner of the globe. Her latest move is to establish direct Austro-Japanese shipping communication between Trieste and Yokohama. A Japanese agent has been here in the last few weeks, talking over arrangements with the minister of commerce. The negotiations have given promise of mutual trade advantages and an extension of commercial exchanges, by making the import regulations as easy as possible at each port.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Saturday, April 10, 1909.]

BIG MONEY FROM JAPANESE COTTON FACTORIES—THE BIG BUSINESS OF THE KANEGAFUCHI COMPANY—IT HAS 19 MILLS, WITH 300,000 SPINDLES—A CAPITAL OF \$7,000,000—HOW IT TREATS ITS EMPLOYEES—FREE HOSPITALS, KINDERGARTENS, AND THEATERS—WORK AND WAGES—MEN AT 30 CENTS A DAY, WOMEN AT 20, AND CHILDREN AT 10.

[Copyright, 1909, by Frank G. Carpenter.]

KOBE, 1909.

If you want to see how wide awake the Japanese are, come with me and take a look at the Kanegafuchi cotton mill, which lies on the outskirts of Hiogo. It is the biggest spinning establishment of the Empire, and it belongs to a company which has a capital of seven million gold dollars and paid last year a dividend of 22 per cent. The company has altogether 19 mills in operation and in course of construction. It has already more than 200,000 spindles at work, and the four new mills now building will add to this 98,000 more. It is putting up mills for weaving as well as for spinning, and when all are completed it will still have a million dollars worth of working capital to go on.

The company began its work twenty years ago by erecting a spinning mill at Tokyo. It has now two there and is building a third. It has silk mills at Kyoto, which are rapidly approaching completion, and it will soon have 16,000 spindles in operation there.

Of all the establishments of this big corporation the one here at Hiogo is the largest. It covers many acres and employs 4,000 hands. Its works run day and night, and they turn out cotton yarn by the thousands of bales annually. Much of the product is consumed here in Japan, but a great deal goes to the rapidly developing market of China, where it competes with that from our country.

Hiogo is the native city for which Kobe is the port. It has, all told, more than 300,000 people; and in going to the cotton mill, our jinrikishas take us through several miles of Japanese stores, over the bridge which crosses the river and almost into the country. We can see the great smokestack of the works long before we come to it. It rises high above the low warehouses and spinning mills, and its dense volume of black smoke poisons the air. The smokestack is made of iron, instead of brick, as in the United States. This is that it may the better withstand the earthquakes which occur here every few days, and which at times are so great that they might send a tall brick stack to the ground. For the same reason the large mills are almost all of one story. They are built of brick and are so walled with glass that they are splendidly lighted.

I do not know the acreage, but I went through a wilderness of moving pulleys, whirling spindles, cotton-opening machines, and other works of various kinds, which took more time than a Sabbath day's journey. Single buildings seemed to reach on and on till one could hardly see the end, and in all was the busy hum of machinery and of Japanese men, women, and children working away.

I have seen many of our great mills in the United States, but none in which the cotton is more rapidly and efficiently handled than here. I doubt if we have any in which the work is done with less labor. The finest of up-to-date machinery is employed, and when it wears out it goes to the scrap heap. In some rooms, covering an acre, no more than two score men were at work, and one little girl was tending to every machine. In the spinning and reeling rooms there were more, and in some I saw hundreds of girls and women at work.

I asked whence the machinery came, and was told that some was from the United States, but that more came from England. Japan has not yet begun to manufacture cotton machinery, although it is experimenting with work of all kinds. For instance, the engines which run these big works were constructed at Tokio. One of them is of 1,500 horsepower, and it is as fine as any engine of the kind anywhere.

Connected with the establishment is an experimental weaving mill, which will soon be increased to 400 looms. As it is now, the cotton comes into the mill in bales, being imported from China, India, and the United States, and it goes out in smaller bales of cotton yarn, ready for weaving. In the near future much of it will go out in the shape of cotton cloth for the markets of Japan, Korea, Manchuria, and China.

During my visit I went through 12 great cotton warehouses which are packed full of bales, from the ground to the roof, and the manager tells me that at certain times in the year he has as much as \$3,000,000 worth of raw cotton on hand. The greater part of the cotton used comes from India, although much is from the United States. Kobe, which is one of the chief ports of the empire, lands about \$40,000,000 worth of cotton every year, and of this, \$20,000,000 worth comes from India, \$6,000,000 from China, and over \$10,000,000 from the United States. Our cotton is the best, but the Indian product is cheaper, and the two are mixed in the making of these yarns. The manager complained to me about the bad packing of our American bales, and showed me some of them side by side with bales from Bombay. The latter were beautifully put up and so wrapped that no cotton could be lost. Our bales were broken and torn and the lint was falling out.

As I walked through the mills I asked as to wages and hours of work. There are two shifts—one during the day and the other at night. The hours of actual work are ten, and there are rest hours at 9 a. m., at noon, and 3 p. m. The rest times consume about two hours, and with them the working day is twelve hours long. This company does not work its hands on Sundays, as is common with many of the industries of Japan. It believes in night work. Its managers tell me that almost all the cotton mills work both day and night, and that this custom is a great benefit to the spinning industry. As it is now, the demand for cotton yarns is so great that night work is a necessity, but in times of depression it is possible to stop the night work until the demand requires it again. By this double work the Japan mills are producing twice as much per capital and machinery as mills of other countries, where day work only is used. This fact may be one of the reasons for the big dividends which nearly all the companies are now paying.

I asked as to wages of the mill hands and was told they are from 22 to 60 sen a day. This means from 11 to 30 cents of our money, or from a little more than 1 to 3 cents for each working hour. At that they are higher than in some other mills, the general wage of cotton spinners throughout this district being about 21 cents for women, 30 cents for men, and 6 cents for children.

As I went through the mills I saw a great many children at work, and many of the child workers were under 14. I had a photograph made of myself, standing beside some little almond-eyed tots who could not have been more than 10.

According to the government reports, there are now 325,000 hands in the textile factories, and of these almost 290,000 are females. There

are also 26,000 girls and 2,000 boys who are under 14 years of age. This is not a large proportion of children, and the number grows less from year to year.

The Kanegafuchi Company is about the most advanced of all in Japan as to its methods of handling its employees. It has tenement houses, which it rents out at low rates, and also dormitories for men and dormitories for women. I visited one of the latter buildings. It was a two-storied structure, surrounding a beautiful garden. Its walls were of framework, covered with paper, with outer walls of pine wood. It had accommodations for 800 girls sleeping in Japanese fashion on the floor, with several girls in each room. As the night shift was sleeping, I was not able to look at many of the rooms, but the few I saw were carpeted with the whitest of mats and warmed by hibarchis, or Japanese fire boxes. Outside this they had practically no other furniture. The bedding consisted of fures, or thick-wadded comforters, which were packed away in cupboards when not in use. The girls have neither bedsteads, tables, nor chairs, and they sit and sleep Japanese fashion upon the floor.

From here I went to one of the large dining rooms which the company has established for its employees. Here several hundred men and boys were eating with chopsticks steaming rice, vegetables, and fish. They were enjoying the meal and were apparently satisfied. As I looked, the manager told me that they furnished board at a little less than cost price, and that the men were given three meals for 5½ cents per day. This is not quite 2 cents per meal, nevertheless they work all day and grow fat. The manager told me that they lose about 2 cents per day on each man in thus feeding them, and when I asked whether the food was uniformly good, the reply came quickly: "Of course it is, and we have to keep it so or we should soon hear from the men."

The company has also a store, where it furnishes its employees such merchandise as they want at cost price. This store handles all sorts of Japanese goods, though the men may buy elsewhere if they will. It has food, clothing, notions, and every thing that appeals to the taste of such people.

This company is anxious to keep its men in a good humor. It trains its employees for its work and does all it can to make them loyal to the establishment. It takes great pride in the fact that it has some of the best workmen in Japan, and leaves no stones unturned to increase its reputation in this regard. Among the special institutions at the mills is a theater with a large stage and a full equipment of scenery. The house will seat, I should say, about 1,000, the audience sitting on white mats on the floor. There are galleries with similar seats, and the floor rises under them, so that the people can see uniformly well. The company brings actors and lecturers here at its own expense, in order to amuse its employees.

There is also a two-story school building in the works, a large part of which is given up to a kindergarten for the little children whose mothers are employed in the mills, and there is a technical school, where picked boys are taught the scientific theory of cotton spinning and practical millwork under competent teachers. This is with the object of supplying intelligent overseers and foremen for the future.

Another institution which all the Kanegafuchi mills have is a first-class hospital with a corps of physicians and nurses, who attend the sick without charge. The hospitals have spring beds and are thoroughly ventilated and lighted. The one here had a laboratory connected with it for the study of microbes and the investigation of special diseases. The company proposes to build a sanitarium at Takasago, one of the seaside resorts, for its convalescent operatives. It has appropriated \$15,000 for the building, and this is now under construction.

In addition to the above, these mills have a pension fund, which now amounts to \$142,000, a fund for the welfare of the employees of more than \$100,000, and a sanitary fund of \$25,000. The workmen have also societies organized under a company for mutual relief and for the promotion of the general interest of the members. One of these societies has a large income from its members' fees, including a subsidy from the company, and another has a capital of \$100,000.

I am told that all the cotton mills of Japan are doing well. In addition to the establishment which I have described there are many others which work day and night and which propose to increase their capacity and to extend their trade throughout the Far East. They look upon China as their especial market and say that they have the advantage of all other peoples in understanding the written characters used in the languages of the two countries, and also in their general knowledge of the Chinese people and their customs. There are now Japanese going over China investigating the markets for cotton, and there are steamship lines which connect Kobe with the big cities on almost all the Chinese rivers. The demand for cotton goods at home is steadily increasing, and there a great effort will be made to push the trade in Korea and Manchuria.

At present there are 118 mills in the country devoted to spinning alone, and these have more than 1,500,000 spindles. They make almost a million bales of cotton yarn annually, and have a profit therefrom of nine or ten million dollars. I have before me figures showing some of the dividends paid. In 1905 every cotton mill in Japan paid from 10 to 40 per cent, and in 1906 there were 10 companies which paid all the way from 16 to 45 per cent. In 1907 there were two which paid 50 per cent, and the Tokio Grand Yarn Company has paid as high as 70 per cent. Nearly all these companies are adding to their surpluses and are charging off good amounts to the depreciation of their buildings and machinery.

So far the Japanese have not done a great deal in weaving cotton, but they are now making enough sheeting every year to carpet a road as wide as Pennsylvania avenue, in Washington, for a distance of 60,000 miles. Such a carpet would reach twice around the world at the equator and leave more than enough over to cover a similar pathway through its center. There are now a number of large mills with something like 10,000 looms. They grew rapidly during the war with Russia, for the army then needed quantities of goods and the prices rose. The cost of blankets went up 100 per cent, and some of the mills were kept making khaki. Of what the war required it is estimated that Japan supplied 70 per cent and only imported 30 per cent.

In addition to the work of the weaving factories, an enormous amount was done in the houses on hand looms. There are now almost a million homes in which weaving is carried on, and there are hundreds of thousands of people who work these. The number was more than a million ten years ago, but it is gradually decreasing, and more and more of the work is being done in the factories. It is this house weaving industry which consumes a great part of the cotton yarn manufactured here, and it is on hand looms that the most of that which is exported to China and Korea is woven. Many small mills are springing up, some worked by steam and others by water power

and electricity. The center of the weaving industry is about Osaka, which is also the center of the spinning industry. That city has more than 20,000 houses in which weaving is done. It has scores of large factories, and the smoke from their stacks makes the town seem more like Pittsburg than any in Japan. Osaka is now as big as Philadelphia, and it has grown greatly within the past few years.

This region is the center of the matting industry. There are many factories about Osaka Bay and here in Kobe which make millions of yards of matting for export and millions of mats for home consumption. The Japanese do not use matting like that exported to the United States. The most common carpet here is made up of white straw woven into mats an inch thick, a yard wide, and 2 yards long. These mats are the unit of surface measurement for almost everything. The rooms of the houses are rectangular and their sizes are estimated at the number of mats it takes to cover them. When a man orders a house built he directs that it be one of so many mats, and the cost of construction is based upon that estimate. These mats are bound with black cloth, and as they fit closely the floor is covered with a number of these white rectangles surrounded by black. Japan uses over 14,000,000 such mats every year, and also 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 pieces of ordinary matting of the same shape. The value of the whole is several million dollars.

As to matting for export, the manufacture of that began less than twenty years ago, and it now brings in something like \$5,000,000 a year. Almost the whole of this export is to the United States, our purchases of Japanese matting annually amounting to something like 20,000,000 yards. The most of this is cheap and coarse, but other varieties are as fine as a Panama hat. They are now making new patterns with raised figures. I have just ordered a roll sent home, which looks like brocade silk woven of straw.

This matting is made out of a reed which grows about here. It has no knots and is much like rice, although its seed has no value. It is planted and cultivated in the same way, and is well dried and bleached before it is sold. The matting is dyed with aniline colors. It is woven like cloth, but all the pieces have to be put in by hand. The work is tedious, and of the finer varieties two men and an assistant can make not more than three rolls per month.

The Japanese are now weaving beautiful straw rugs in flowers and other patterns, and these are exceedingly cheap. I have bought some about 6 by 10 feet in size at 50 or 60 cents each, and the highest price I have paid for any matting is less than 20 cents gold per yard.

The most beautiful cottons made here are intended for native consumption. They are not much more than a foot wide and are artistically printed in designs far different from the loud figures used on the goods intended for the United States markets. The cotton crepe for home use is beautiful, and it would have a big sale in the United States for curtains if it were sent there. The Japanese use it for their everyday summer kimonos.

Another interesting manufacture of cotton is that which the native people employ here for toweling. These have gay figures printed in white and blue. Every firm has its own design, and not a few of the native hotels give away towels of this kind to their guests. Within the past few years quite a craze has sprung up among the foreign ladies visiting Japan to make collections of these towels, and I know many who buy pieces of them for use as fancy tablecloths and napkins.

FRANK G. CARPENTER.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 33.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in Statuary Hall, upon the acceptance of the statue of Francis H. Pierpont, presented by the State of West Virginia, 16,500 copies, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives and the remaining 1,500 copies shall be for the use and distribution of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of West Virginia.

The joint committee is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall procure suitable copper-process plates to be bound with these proceedings.

The message also announced that Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. TALLAFERRO were excused from further service as conferees on the part of the Senate on the bills S. 5237, S. 5573, and H. R. 19403, and that the presiding officer had appointed Mr. SMOOR, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. TAYLOR in their place.

The message also announced that Mr. McCUMBER and Mr. SCOTT were excused from further service as conferees on the part of the Senate on the pension bills H. R. 20490, H. R. 21754, S. 607, and S. 6272, and that the presiding officer had appointed Mr. SMOOR and Mr. CURTIS in their place.

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

S. 8101. An act to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and erection of a post-office and custom-house at Plymouth, Mass.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19070) to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia.

SENATE RESOLUTION AND SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate resolution and Senate bill of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 8101. An act to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and erection of a post-office and custom-house at Ply-

mouth, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Senate concurrent resolution 33.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in Statuary Hall upon the acceptance of the statue of Francis H. Pierpont, presented by the State of West Virginia, 16,500 copies, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 copies shall be for the use and distribution of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of West Virginia.

The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall procure suitable copper-process plates to be bound with these proceedings.

—to the Committee on Printing.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3360. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I once heard of a man who by ways that were devious and by tricks that were vain became indebted to almost every person in the community and then made an assignment, with no visible assets to discharge his obligations. His outraged and incensed creditors met and in their anger and desperation determined to cut up his body and parcel it out among themselves as a punishment and in part payment of his debts. At this juncture a man stepped forward and said, "Gentlemen, as his largest creditor, I demand his gall." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

During the latter years of its existence, assertion and misstatement have been the chief stocks in trade, the principal assets with which the Republican party has sought to discharge its obligations to the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And even now the Republican majority, which must of necessity see the handwriting on the wall so far as the coming congressional elections are concerned, is holding all sorts of consolation parties, called banquets, and making all sorts of speeches, and singing all sorts of songs, and whistling all kinds of tunes to keep up its courage as it goes marching through this legislative slaughterhouse to an open political grave. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I will digress for a moment to notice a remark made by the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINLAY], who just addressed the House. He said, in substance, that Democrats always tell what the Republican party has not done, but can not tell anything the Democratic party has done. The founders of the Democratic party wrote the Declaration of Independence and breathed into the Constitution of our country the spirit of liberty, that same Constitution which one of the founders of the Republican party declared was a covenant with death and a league with hell, and the Republican party ever since that declaration has been trying to abolish the Constitution by judicial construction. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party, by wise statesmanship, added to this Union its largest and fairest territory—a contiguous territory of homogeneous people—the productivity of whose soil is the marvel of the world. The Republican party, in the interest of predatory wealth, gave to the railroad corporations, without money and without price, 160,000,000 acres of that fair domain which should have been reserved as homes for the toiling masses. The Democratic party fought the war with Mexico and planted the flag of our country upon the battlements of the Montezumas, and added many of the largest and brightest stars to the galaxy of this Union.

The Democratic party saw Cuba prostrate under the heel of the oppressor and said, "We are our brother's keeper," and by the patriotic insistence of Democratic leaders Cuba became free.

The Democratic party declared that this is a government of the people, by the people, for the people, and that the creator has a right to control and regulate the creature, and the result was the interstate-commerce act.

The Democratic party declared that aggregated wealth should bear its just part of the burdens of Government, and favored an income tax, and the Republican party, following in the footsteps of Democratic wisdom, submitted to the States an amendment to the Constitution to bring about that result.

The Democratic party declared that it is for peace and not for war, for peace and not for ships and cannon and the upturned faces of dead men slain in useless battle, and the result was The Hague International Peace Conference.

The Democratic party declared the vast material resources of this Nation should not be wasted by exploiting corporations, but should be preserved, and the result was the act of conservation.

The Democratic party declared for the right of trial by jury and unalterable opposition to government by injunction, and the Republican platform and Republican president promised that this Democratic principle should be given life by statutory enactment.

The Democratic party said there were trusts, the Republican party declared there were not, and now when the Standard Oil trust and the American Tobacco trust are brought before the Supreme Court for violation of the antitrust law the Republican President and Republican party seek to give them new life as federal corporations, that they may continue their careers of pillage.

The Democratic party declared in favor of the guarantee of bank deposits, and if that could not be done then it favored a postal savings-bank system so enacted as to leave the deposits in the locality and the result is, the Republican party again following the leadership of Democratic statesmanship, is trying to enact a postal savings-bank law.

The Democratic party declared in favor of amending the rules of this House so as to deprive the Speaker of his czar-like power in the enactment of legislation, and the Republican party promises to do that thing if the people will only give it a little longer lease of power.

The Democratic party has always contended that the tariff is a tax paid by the consumer, and that no more taxes should be levied than is necessary to carry on the government economically administered. To levy more is robbery, and for years the Democratic party has insisted that tariff duties be lowered and the Republican party, pretending to heed the voice of the people, promised before the election a revision of the tariff downward, and then violated that pledge after the election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Republican party has lived by the crystallization of ideas fished from Democratic platforms and Democratic statesmen, and its only hope of renewed vitality and continued existence is the enactment into law of Democratic measures. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Had I the time I could tell a hundred good things the Democratic party has done. It has felled the forests and sowed the seed and tilled the soil of almost every legislative reform, while the Republican party has reaped the harvest and been given the glory. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party is coexistent with this Government. It has stood at the cradle and the coffin of every political party that has existed in this country, and it will be a pallbearer, but not a mourner, when the Republican party passes forever out of existence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has been a target in this House for Republican as well as Democratic sharpshooters, but I believe that he is as good as his party. He has the courage of his convictions, and the Republican party has not the courage of its convictions. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If he has wielded the party lash, it is because the Republican majority elected him Speaker and put the whip into his hand. If he has been autocratic, it is because the Republican majority elected him Speaker and enacted the rules and demanded that he enforce those rules. It is unfair and unjust for the majority to offer him as the sole vicarious sacrifice to atone for the political sins of the entire Republican party when he and it together are guilty of the same offenses. I suspect that the chief misfortune of the distinguished Speaker is that in his younger days he was removed from the State of North Carolina to the State of Illinois. In Illinois he got the wrong kind of education. He fell in with bad political associates, and unfortunately became a Republican. If he had remained in the State of North Carolina, as he ought to have done, no doubt, instead of being a Republican and getting "cussed" by everybody, he would have grown up to be a Democrat and an ornament to society. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, on a former occasion the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL], who always stands picket, musket in hand, on the outposts of protectionism and Cannonism, in a speech in the House in answer to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], stated that their arguments would not appeal to any person except the man who dwells at the forks of the creek, and added that their arguments would not appeal to any reasonable or thinking man. Therefore, according to his dictum the man who dwells at the forks of the creek and who is usually a farmer, is just a little lower than the animals and can not think or reason. Such is the opinion of this advocate of the predatory interests of the farmers of the country.

A few days since the gentleman from bleeding Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] gave vent to this highly amusing and interesting statement. He said:

The Democratic party is now threatening the country with another Democratic tariff. They make this threat without blushing. The danger that they shall have another opportunity to carry out the threat is not great. The certainty of the disaster that will follow a Democratic tariff if they enact one is beyond question. Excepting alone the war tariff of 1812 with which the Democratic party has had anything to do with the making, has resulted in exactly the same way—not sufficient revenues to defray the expenses of the Government in a time of peace, industries throughout the country idle, labor throughout the country out of employment, business men bankrupt, business enterprises in the hands of receivers, the government borrowing money with which to defray its running expenses.

Mr. Chairman, that statement ought to be deposited in the Smithsonian Institution or in some museum as a curiosity and a standing example of Republican exaggeration and misstatement. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Not long since the distinguished gentleman from Illinois with the avuncular title and bucolic countenance [Mr. CANNON] put a chip on his shoulder and descended from the Speaker's throne to the floor of this House and proceeded to administer an allopathic dose of Danville soothing sirup to the terrified standpatters and a castigation to the insurgents. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman on that occasion defended that law of abominations, the Payne tariff law, and they all defend it; and certainly if anything on the face of this earth needs defense, and lots of it, it is the Payne tariff law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In the course of the distinguished gentleman's remarks in defense of the Payne tariff law he said that under the operation of the Payne tariff law labor is universally employed. He did not stop at that; he emphasized and reiterated that statement. That declaration was the statement of an alleged condition and an alleged cause—the alleged condition being the universal employment of labor, the alleged cause the operation of the Payne tariff law. At the very moment the distinguished gentleman made that statement there were numerous strikes in various parts of this Union. Three hundred thousand coal miners the very day before laid down their picks and shovels and demanded an increase of wages to meet the increased cost of living under the operation of the Payne tariff law. One hundred thousand of those miners were in the State of Pennsylvania alone, the citadel of protection and the bulwark of Republicanism. At the very moment the distinguished gentleman made that statement 72,000 coal miners were idle in the State of Illinois, and in his own county of Vermillion hundreds of coal miners quit work, demanding more wages to meet the increased cost of living. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. Has not the gentleman learned that a few little facts like those he states do not interfere with the rounded periods of Republican orators in this day of necessity?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. It does not interfere with their rounded periods, but it is going to interfere with them at the election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. OLMSTED. The gentleman has referred to strikes. Is it not a fact that during the four years from 1893 to 1897 there were less strikes than in any other period for the last half century?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. I want to say to the gentleman that I will come to the question of strikes directly and will give the facts and figures upon strikes, and I will show from Republican figures taken from the Statistical Abstract that there were more strikes in Harrison's administration than there were in either of Cleveland's administrations.

Mr. OLMSTED. Because men can not strike when they are out of work.

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. The gentleman's statement is a fallacy. For years the Republican party has contended that the number of strikes during Cleveland's administration was an evidence of hard times, low wages, and dissatisfied labor conditions, and the Republican party has persistently and falsely asserted that the number of strikes during that administration and the number of men out of work were the largest in the history of the country, and when the official figures contradict that statement they seek refuge in the statement that men can not strike when they are out of work. Strikes are an evidence of low wages, long hours, and conditions that are unsatisfactory to the labor world.

During the administrations of McKinley and Roosevelt and the operation of the Dingley law, which the Republican party assured the country was the best tariff law ever enacted, and

would insure constant employment and high wages to every laborer in the land, the strikes and number of men thrown out of employment more than doubled that of any period in the history of the country, according to the official figures. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But I started to talk a little more about Mr. CANNON. Before he makes another speech on the labor question he should visit Danville, his own home, and inform himself. The miners in his own county have been on a strike since the 1st of April under the operation of the Payne tariff law, and I see from an Associated Press dispatch that only a few days since two companies of militia were sent to Westville, in his own county, to suppress striking miners under the operation of the Payne tariff law. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The political physicians of the Republican party know that the patient is very ill and near death's door, but they can not agree on a diagnosis of the case. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The distinguished Speaker asserts that under the operation of the Payne tariff law labor is universally employed, while the author of that monstrosity, Mr. PAYNE, the heavy artillery of the Republican party, recently came out of cold storage long enough to declare on the floor of this House that many of the paper mills of the country are closed by strikes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Here is what he said:

We are criticised because we did not fix the duty at \$2 a ton and close our paper mills, in the vain hope that Canada might remove her embargoes on exports of wood pulp. Now she is extending her embargo, and, with a great many of our mills closed by strikes, there is a scarcity of paper.

The Speaker says that labor under the operation of this law is universally employed. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] says that a great many of our mills are closed by strikes. At the time the Speaker made that declaration there was a strike on hand among the street-car men of the city of Philadelphia, the city of Republicanism and protection, of brotherly love and riots [laughter and applause on the Democratic side], involving from 20,000 to 150,000 men. At the time he delivered that utterance there was a strike in the tobacco factories at Louisville, the largest leaf-tobacco market in the world. At the time he delivered that utterance the men at McKees Rocks, in Pennsylvania, who are held almost under a system of peonage, were on a strike, and had been for twelve months. At the time he delivered that declaration 10,000 men were striking at Bethlehem, Pa., the home of the steel trust, one of the largest contributors to the campaign fund of the Republican party. They were on a strike; they are still on a strike. What are they getting at Bethlehem? Talk about high wages! Here is a report about the conditions at Bethlehem, and that report shows that men are working twelve hours a day at 12½ cents an hour in those mills—\$1.50 a day for twelve hours' labor and \$1 a day for eight hours' labor—under the operation of the glorious Payne tariff law, which raises the wages of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman state that there is a report that shows these facts? What is that report, may I ask?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. That is the report on the strike at the Bethlehem Steel Works at South Bethlehem, Pa., Senate Document No. 521.

Mr. SABATH. A Senate report?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Yes, sir. It is numbered 521.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARDY. Is it not also a fact that the labor of those Bethlehem people is a very dangerous, onerous, and health-destroying labor?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Certainly, it is; and I might add that if a man wants to see the real benefits of protection and the operation of the Payne tariff law with regard to the working people of this country, all he has to do is to ride along the railroads in the State of Pennsylvania and observe the miserable hovels that shelter the wretched workmen under this protective system.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Is not this report made by the Bureau of Labor, after a thorough, special investigation into the subject there?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Yes, sir; and this report, Mr. Chairman, shows a condition of slavery. You may talk about the beneficiaries of the protective system raising the wages of labor. The tariff never caused the wages of a single laborer

to be raised a single cent in this country. The beneficiaries of the tariff system raise the wages of labor only when they are forced to do so by strikes and by labor organizations. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And before they will raise their wages they will starve them out, if possible, and resort to all character of injunctions.

This alleged raising of the wages of labor by the beneficiaries of this tariff system reminds me of an anecdote. An old negro went to a judge and said: "Jedge, I want to get a divorce." "Why," the judge said to him, "what is the matter with you and Aunt Dinah that you can not get along?" "Oh," he said, "that woman just worries me to death. One day she will ax me for a dollar, and the next day she will ax me for another dollar, and she just worries me to death all the time." "Well," said the judge, "what does Aunt Dinah do with all of this money?" Old Jim replied, "Well, I dunno. I ain't done never give her none yet." [Laughter and applause.]

So that is the condition so far as raising wages is concerned by the beneficiaries of the tariff.

And I might in this connection relate another anecdote. A man had a faithful servant who had been with him for sixteen years. He had paid him a very low wage. He went to the stable where he was currying a horse, and he said to him, "Well, Sam, how are you getting along?" He said, "Fair to middling, boss." Then he suddenly looked up and said, "See here, boss, me and this here horse have been working for you for sixteen years; we have done your work; we have been here together, and last week me and the horse took sick and you sent for a doctor for the horse and docked my pay." [Laughter and applause.]

Now, I promised the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] that I would give a few figures for his information and the general information of the Republican party. The Republican party for years has gone about this country talking about the administration of Cleveland, and absolutely misrepresenting the facts. When Mr. Cleveland came into office he inherited the McKinley bill, a panic, and a deficit of over \$60,000,000 in the Public Treasury. The McKinley bill was passed in October, 1890, and upon the 11th day of November, 1890, a panic began, and upon that day the New York Clearing House Association issued certificates to the banks in its association, to keep them from failing. The same was done in Philadelphia; the same was done all over the country; and soon after the steel mills in Pennsylvania began to fail. Times went on from bad to worse, and in 1892, before the election of Cleveland, the great Homestead strike took place, under the McKinley law and under the administration of Harrison. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is what Cleveland inherited. The Republican party ought to be absolutely ashamed of itself to go about over the country and try to make the people believe that the panic, which reached its height in 1893, was caused by a law that was passed in 1894. That is just what you have been doing all the time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I heard a Republican upon this floor yesterday say that before Mr. Taft came into office there were 400,000 empty freight cars standing on the side tracks in this country. Under whose administration was that? That was under the administration of Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt's administration left Taft in about the same condition that Harrison's administration left Cleveland's. Roosevelt's administration left Taft with the Dingley law, with an empty Treasury, and a deficit estimated to be \$100,000,000 to \$150,000,000.

We have heard a great deal about strikes. During the administration of Cleveland, from 1885 to 1888 the strikes and lockouts were 4,716. During his next administration the strikes and lockouts were 5,100. But during the administration of Harrison, from 1889 to 1892, the strikes and lockouts were 6,153, over 1,000 more strikes during his administration than there were during the administration of Cleveland. During the administration of Mr. McKinley, from 1897 to 1900, the strikes numbered 5,885, 785 more strikes during the administration of Mr. McKinley than there were during either of Cleveland's administrations.

But let us see how our prosperity increased. These figures do not seem to interest the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED]. [Laughter.] During the administration of McKinley and Roosevelt there were 12,319 strikes, an increase of between 130 and 140 per cent over the administration of Mr. Cleveland; and in 1905, during the administration of Mr. Roosevelt, there were 2,186 strikes.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. OLMSTED. I admit that there were more strikes during the administration of Mr. Harrison than there were during the

administration of Mr. Cleveland from 1893 to 1897, because men were at work and struck for higher wages. During Mr. Cleveland's administration 92,000 railroad men were discharged, an army about the size of that which fought the battle of Gettysburg; and they were discharged all over the country. When men are out of work they can not strike.

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. So, I suppose, that is the gentleman's understanding of prosperity—that men have to strike, to be thrown out of employment, to get increased wages to enable them to live. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And these railroad men who were thrown out of work lost their jobs under the McKinley law, which the Republicans assured us would bring prosperity, plenty of work, and high wages. During the life of the McKinley tariff law the average yearly number of strikes was 1,417.

During the first eight years of the Dingley tariff law the number of strikes was 18,596. In other words, under the McKinley law the average yearly number of strikes was 1,417, and under the Dingley law 2,334, while under the Wilson bill the yearly average was only 1,106. I insert tables as a part of my remarks, showing the strikes, lockouts, and men thrown out of employment during the Cleveland and Harrison administrations and under the McKinley and Wilson tariff laws and the first eight years of the Dingley tariff law.

TABLE 1.—*Strikes and lockouts.*

	Strikes.	Lockouts.	Total.
Cleveland, 1885-1888.....	4,419	297	4,716
Harrison, 1889-1892.....	5,923	230	6,153
Cleveland, 1893-1896.....	4,895	205	5,100
McKinley, 1897-1900.....	5,710	175	5,885
McKinley and Roosevelt, 1901-1904.....	11,887	432	12,319
Roosevelt, 1905.....	2,077	109	2,186

TABLE 2.—*Strikes under McKinley, Wilson, and Dingley laws.*

Strikes under McKinley tariff law:		
1891.....	1,717	
1892.....	1,298	
1893.....	1,305	
1894.....	1,349	
Total.....	5,669	
Yearly average.....	1,417	
Strikes under Wilson tariff law:		
1895.....	1,215	
1896.....	1,026	
1897.....	1,078	
Total.....	3,319	
Yearly average.....	1,106	
Strikes first eight years under Dingley tariff law:		
1898.....	1,056	
1899.....	1,797	
1900.....	1,779	
1901.....	2,924	
1902.....	3,162	
1903.....	3,494	
1904.....	2,307	
1905.....	2,077	
Total.....	18,596	
Yearly average.....	2,324	

TABLE 3.—*Men thrown out of employment under the McKinley, Wilson, and Dingley laws.*

Men thrown out of employment under McKinley tariff law:		
1891.....	298,939	
1892.....	206,671	
1893.....	265,914	
1894.....	660,425	
Total.....	1,431,978	
Yearly average.....	357,987	
Men thrown out of employment under Wilson tariff law:		
1895.....	392,403	
1896.....	241,170	
1897.....	408,391	
Total.....	1,041,964	
Yearly average.....	347,321	
Men thrown out of employment first eight years Dingley tariff law:		
1898.....	249,002	
1899.....	417,072	
1900.....	505,066	
1901.....	543,386	
1902.....	659,792	
1903.....	656,055	
1904.....	517,211	
1905.....	221,686	
Total.....	3,769,270	
Yearly average.....	471,158	

TABLE 4.—*Strikes under Cleveland's administration, 1893 to 1896.*

	Strikes.	Estab-lish-ments.	Strikers.	Employees thrown out.
.....	1,305	4,555	195,008	265,914
.....	1,349	8,196	505,049	660,425
.....	1,215	6,973	285,742	392,403
.....	1,026	5,462	183,813	241,170
Strikes.....	4,895	25,186	1,169,612	1,559,912
Lockouts.....	205	1,601	67,968	78,914
Total.....	5,100	26,787	1,237,580	1,638,826

TABLE 5.—*Strikes under McKinley's administration, 1897 to 1900.*

	Strikes.	Estab-lish-ments.	Strikers.	Employees thrown out.
.....	1,078	8,492	332,570	408,391
.....	1,056	3,309	182,067	249,062
.....	1,797	11,317	308,367	417,072
.....	1,779	9,248	399,656	505,066
Strikes.....	5,710	22,366	1,222,550	1,579,531
Lockouts.....	175	2,939	79,949	99,450
Total.....	5,885	25,305	1,302,499	1,678,981

Strikes under McKinley-Roosevelt administration, 1901 to 1904.

	Strikes.	Estab-lish-ments.	Strikers.	Employees thrown out.
.....	2,924	10,908	396,280	543,386
.....	3,162	14,243	653,143	659,792
.....	3,494	20,248	631,682	656,055
.....	2,307	10,292	375,754	517,211
Strikes.....	11,887	55,696	1,856,859	2,376,444
Lockouts.....	432	7,355	203,801	240,556
Total.....	12,319	63,051	2,060,660	2,616,999

Strikes under Roosevelt's administration, 1905.

	Strikes.	Estab-lish-ments.	Strikers.	Employees thrown out.
.....	2,077	8,292	176,337	221,686
.....	109	1,215	68,474	80,748
Total.....	2,186	9,507	244,811	302,434

TABLE 6.—*Total strikes and lockouts, 1881 to 1905.*

	Strikes.	Estab-lish-ments.	Strikers.	Employees thrown out.
.....	36,757	181,407	6,728,048	8,708,824
.....	1,546	18,547	716,231	825,610
Total.....	38,303	199,954	7,444,279	9,534,434

In 1893, under the McKinley bill, the greatest amount of commercial failures occurred in the history of the country, amounting to the appalling sum of \$346,779,889, and under the operation of the McKinley law in 1894, before the Wilson bill went into operation, the greatest number of men in the history of the country, 660,425, were thrown out of employment; and under the Dingley law in 1902 659,792 were thrown out of employment, and in 1903 656,055 lost their jobs under the same law. Strikes became of such frequent occurrence during the administration of McKinley and Roosevelt and the operation of the Dingley law that the Bureau of Labor ceased to gather strike statistics, and there has been no official reports since 1905. During the panic of 1908, which the Republicans are pleased to call a little financial flurry, the greatest number of financial failures in the history of the country—15,690, involving 1,425,000 business concerns—occurred.

According to the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] a workingman is most prosperous when he is compelled to strike in order to obtain living wages to enable him to meet the increased cost of living under the operation of Republican tariff laws. The laboring man could always get work if he would accept the hard conditions imposed, the long hours required, and the starvation wages of-

ferred by the beneficiaries of protective-tariff robbery. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Republicans may talk of the operation of the Payne tariff law in its relation to labor, but the facts are that for years and years labor has knocked in vain at the portals of Republicanism, demanding an adjudication of its grievances and a recognition of its rights, only to be turned away with a sneer or given a stone for the promise of bread, while predatory wealth has been an invited and welcome guest to the innermost sanctuary of the temple. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What has become of the vast majority of measures introduced here for the benefit of labor? They are still in committee. They are unreported. They have been given the usual Republican oplate of Cannonism, and now lie entombed in the ceremonies of that legislative death which will not know any resurrection at this session of Congress. What has become of the anti-injunction bill promised to labor by the Republican platform and the Republican President? It is still in committee. If it is ever called out it will most likely be brought forth as the spawn of monopoly, to give statutory recognition and legislative sanction to the very abuses and tyrannies of which labor complains. You may talk of the operation of the Payne tariff law, you may talk of economy and the simple life, of good times and higher wages and better times to come, but the stubborn fact still remains that the great majority of the laboring people of this country are unable to reach above the barriers of commercial and industrial despotism erected by the rapacity of the Republican protective system into any promised Eden land of prosperity beyond. You may say that the golden stream of our material wealth flows with ceaseless activity, and that may be true; but its current is forever turned into the channels of the trusts and monopolies and corporations and the idle rich, and those who live off the earnings of others through the operation of unjust, unequal, and oppressive Republican legislation such as the Payne tariff law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, it would take me a week to tell all the bad things I know about the Republican party. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Every time I think of the President of the United States I am reminded of the old couplet about the King of France:

The King of France marched up the hill
With twenty thousand men;
The King of France marched down the hill,
And ne'er went up again.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The President and the Republican party marched up the hill before the election into the confidence of the public by making many promises, and after the election they violated those promises and marched down the hill, never to march up again into the confidence of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, no doubt Hamlet Taft, in the deep hours of the night, as he treads the deserted corridors of the White House, meditating upon the melancholy failure of his administration and the uncertainty of the political future, soliloquizes:

Now is the winter of my discontent,
And to go or not to go; that is the question.
Whether 'tis better to stay at home and suffer
The slings and arrows of outrageous insurgents,
Or go to Indiana and beard the lion BEVERIDGE in his den,
And take up arms and wage hot war
Against this sea of troubles dire,
And, by opposing, end them all; that is the question.
To grunt and sweat under this unjust Payne law,
With dread of something at the election,
Makes me rather bear the ills I have
Than fly to others that I know not of.
Thus is the native hue of my resolution
Sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
And questions of great pith and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry and lose the name of action;
While before my troubled vision looms
A mighty hunter's lusty form,
From Elba bound; and after Elba comes Waterloo.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, some time since the President of the United States gave his opinion as an expert on the subject of whisky. He might try his hand and give us an expert opinion of what is a Republican. Republicans, you know, used to sarcastically inquire what is a Democrat; but a more pertinent inquiry is, What is a Republican? And it is a question more unsolvable than the proposition, How old is Ann? [Laughter.]

The President as an expert might tell us how many of his aggregation are pure, how many are mixed, how many are blended, how many are rectified, how many are in bond, how many are out of bond, and what proportion of illicit or moonshine Members he has among his aggregation. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLINE. And how many are straight?

Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky. Yes; we have straight Republicans, we have progressives and ultraprogressives, and reac-

tionaries and ultrareactionaries, and we have insurgents. Gentlemen, we have three kinds of insurgents. There are "insurgents" and "near" insurgents, and there are "sometimes" insurgents. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The insurgents—and they are very scarce—are those who are insurgent all the time. The "near insurgents" are those who go up to the fence, and you would think they were going to jump over and run clear away and never come back, but they back off and do not jump at all. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] "Sometimes insurgents" are those who once in a while kick up their heels, run against the fence, knock it down, and run clear off the reservation. You would think they were never coming back; and that reminds me of an anecdote.

A man had a house that was reputed to be haunted, and he could not rent it. He hired an old negro by the name of Jim and gave him \$5 to stay in the house all night and show the neighborhood that there were no ghosts there. The sun was shining brightly and Jim took the money and went away. About dusk the master of the house concluded to take Jim a pint of whisky and go over and see how he was getting along. When he got there Jim's teeth were chattering and his eyes were bulging out so that you could knock them off with a stick. He said, after giving him the pint of whisky, "Jim, are you scared?" "Oh," he says, "no; Massa John, I'se not scared, but I'se powerful glad you brought that liquor." The next morning he went back, but Jim could not be found, but instead there was a sash of glass all knocked out and lying about 15 feet from the house. They searched for Jim for three days, and at last the master of the house saw a dejected looking fellow, ragged and woebegone, coming across the field. When he came up he recognized him to be Jim. He said to him, "Jim, is that you?" Jim says, "Yes; Massa John, this is me." "Well," he says, "where on earth have you been these last three days?" He says, "Massa John, I'se been acoming back." [Laughter.] And so with the "sometimes insurgents." As sure as chickens come home to roost they return to the reservation in the nick of time when needed by the grand old party.

The trusts are violating the Sherman antitrust law every day with impunity and will so long as the Republican party is in power. The President of the United States instituted proceedings against the embattled farmers of Kentucky, who are fighting the tobacco trust, and sent special representatives of the Government to Kentucky to prosecute them. Yet the tobacco trust and the Standard Oil trust have not been convicted, and these cases have been reassigned, and no doubt it will be a year yet before they are passed upon. The President went to New York to get a new grip on the name of Lincoln and assured Wall street that he would do nothing to disturb business conditions, and then appointed Hughes a justice of the Supreme Court—Hughes, the friend of Rockefeller and the trusts; Hughes, who vetoed the 2-cent maximum passenger rate in New York and defeated the income-tax measure—and assured the country that Mr. Hughes would properly decide the question of an income tax should he have to pass upon that proposition. The next day after he made the appointment, J. E. Hutton & Co., connected with Wall street, sent out a trade letter to the country in which they declared that the appointment of Hughes gave general satisfaction to the financial interests, and that decisions in such cases as the Standard Oil and American tobacco would be in safe hands. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Governor Hughes publicly expressed his opinion against an income tax in a message to the New York legislature, and effected a combination by which the submission of the amendment was defeated, and the President's declaration that he would properly decide such a question according to the evidence reminds me of an anecdote of an Irishman, Mike McGinnis, who was summoned as a jurymen in a murder case. "Mike," said the judge, "have you formed or expressed any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant?" "I hev not, yer honor," replied Mike. "Mike," said the judge, "have you any conscientious scruples against the infliction of capital punishment?" "Yer honor," replied Mike, "I hev not in this case." Conceding the absolute uprightness and integrity of Governor Hughes, yet when I consider his bent, his education, his way of thinking, his associations, and his previously expressed opinions, I believe such cases as the Standard Oil and the tobacco trust will be safe in his hands, and that he will have no conscientious scruples against inflicting capital punishment on the Constitution should he have occasion to decide an income-tax proposition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The immortal Lincoln declared a short time before his death that corporations were being enthroned, that an era of corruption had set in, and he feared for the safety of this Republic. It is a far cry from Lincoln to Taft, and the Republican party and Republican President have repudiated the practices and

principles of Lincoln, and use his name only as a shibboleth to delude the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Republican President assisted in the election of CANNON as Speaker and helped fasten the present rules on the House. He promised a revision of the tariff downward and signed the Payne tariff law, declaring it the best tariff law ever passed. He declared for an income tax, and then sent a message to Congress advocating the passage of a corporation tax, the avowed purpose of which was to defeat the income tax. He declared for a central bank of issue, and is trying to burden the country with ship subsidy, and is making an effort to fasten a federal incorporation law as a saddle on the backs of the American people, on which the trusts, booted and spurred and whip in hand, can ride them to death. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

He is having trouble in his own party. Occasionally he stiffens his backbone sufficiently to give himself a hypodermic injection of independence, and when the potion takes effect he proceeds about the country and makes political speeches defending his policies and castigating the insurgents as at Winona. When the potion ceases to effect him his courage, like "Bob Acres," oozes out the ends of his fingers and he keeps away from Indiana. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

After the appointment of Hughes he declared the Supreme Court sacred. I have all proper respect for the courts of our land and believe all their just powers should be upheld within proper bounds, but there has never been a sacred person on earth since the immaculate Jesus was tried, condemned, and crucified in obedience to the mandate of a judicial tribunal. If the star of American liberty ever goes down in the night of despotism, the abolition of the Constitution and the enlargement and centralization of federal power by judicial construction will be among the chief contributing causes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Warren Hastings, when arraigned by the British Government for looting India, declared that when he considered his opportunities he was amazed at his moderation, but the Republican party can not plead the immunity of moderation as a defense for its long career of legislative pillage. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Not long since, in a speech in this House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] declared that the increased output of gold and its consequent decrease in value is the cause of high prices, and that this condition is world wide. There is no doubt but that this is to some extent true, but in 1896 and subsequent years the Republican party asserted that gold is a stable, unvarying measure of value. The increased output of gold can not account altogether for high prices. If it could, the rise would not only be world-wide, but would be equal; but the beef trust sells meat much cheaper in England and the continental countries, after paying the freight, than it does in America, while American manufacturers ship and sell their products in foreign countries much cheaper than they do to the American consumer, owing to the beneficent effects of a protective tariff. The American farmer buys what he consumes, under the burden of a protective tariff, and sells his surplus in the free and open markets of the world in competition with producers who buy their farm machinery from American manufacturers much cheaper than the American farmer can buy them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The President recently in a speech asserted that the tariff had been reduced on articles of consumption costing many million dollars. The statement is absolutely incorrect. The Payne tariff, as a whole, is slightly higher than the Dingley tariff. There was a trifling change of rate in a number of articles, but the rate was left still practically prohibitive, and in this way the public was deceived. The rate on the article was lowered a little, but the cost of the goods to the consumer has not been lowered. Wire nails was one of the items that went into the President's list of articles on which there was a reduction. There is somewhere about \$27,000,000 worth of wire nails consumed in this country, and the rate was reduced but one-tenth of a cent per pound, or \$2 a ton, a reduction so small as to cut no figure whatever in the price of nails, and the price has not been lowered since the tariff reduction was made. There has been no reduction in the price of nails, because the tariff enables the steel trust, which pays \$1 a day for eight hours' labor, to fix the price, and at the same time the trust is protected by a duty of \$20, \$25, and \$35 per ton on the wire out of which the nails are manufactured. This is a fair sample of all the alleged reductions cited by the President. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in a recent speech boasted of the fact that the Payne bill admits 300,000 tons of Philippine raw sugar into the United States free of duty, and cites this as an instance of what the Repub-

lican party is doing for the welfare of the little brown men. A former Republican administration purchased 408,000 acres of land from the friars in the Philippines at an average price of \$18 per acre, justifying the purchase on the ground that large holdings by religious bodies are prejudicial to the best interests of the islands. The organic act passed in 1902 forbids the sale of more than 40 acres of land to an individual and more than 2,500 acres to a corporation in the Philippines, but this administration, which seems bound by no law human or divine, sold 55,000 acres of that land to agents of the sugar trust at \$6 per acre. The removal of the tariff on 300,000 tons of raw sugar at 63 cents per ton amounts to about \$11,000,000 annually, which is a rich prize for the sugar trust, and the consumer will get no relief. The organic act was absolutely violated in the sale of this land. This act was intended as a defense to the Philippine people and a protection to the islands from exploitation by unscrupulous corporations, but its provisions have been nullified and set aside by this administration for the benefit of the sugar trust; and this, and not the welfare of the little brown men, is the milk in the cocoanut, the sugar in the gourd of this provision in the Payne tariff law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This Republican administration is the weakest and most unsatisfactory to all the people, regardless of politics, in the history of the country. The President before election was hailed as the learned judge and traveled and experienced statesman by Republican newspapers and party associates. They declared that his vast experience and knowledge of men and affairs made him peculiarly available and fitted for the Presidency. Now that his administration is a disappointment and an admitted failure, they say he is the victim of bad advisers and absolutely place him in the rôle of "Simple Simon." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Republican party and the trusts are in full partnership in the operation of this Government and the people are the victims of the unrighteous alliance. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The trusts and monopolies furnish the Republican party with the sinews of political war in the shape of campaign contributions and the Republican party reciprocates by the enactment of legislation by which the trusts can successfully pillage the people. But the people are awakening to the true condition of affairs, and the day of reckoning is near at hand. Republicans everywhere who hold country above party are deserting the rotten and sinking ship. The Republicans of Massachusetts and New York and the North are joining hands with the stalwart men of the West and South in repudiating the party which has repudiated the principles of Jefferson and Lincoln and is held together only by the cohesive power of public plunder. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The people are beginning to think and act for themselves, and when they become fully aroused Republicanism will become an iridescent dream. The lash and scourge and ridicule of party bosses can no longer hold them in line. They are determined to take charge of this Government and restore the principles of Jefferson and make it a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES].

Mr. AMES. Last March I introduced a resolution which went before the Committee on Ways and Means, indicating the judgment of the House as to the advisability of freer and better trade relations with Canada. I endeavored to get a hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means in season and out of season. Finally I circulated a petition and submitted it with a written request for a hearing. I desired to submit the following communication from myself to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and one from him to me in connection with the attempt to get the committee to hold a hearing and if possible to report that resolution; and, in addition, some of the statements, as I remember, made by the chairman to me and by myself to him. If I have understated or misstated his statements, I hope to be corrected. Otherwise this situation that I have met with before the chairman of the committee is a typical one, and for the information of this House in particular and the public generally I desire that everyone may understand and appreciate the attitude of the Committee on Ways and Means as represented by the chairman.

The following is my letter to the chairman:

MAY 10, 1910.

Hon. SERRENO E. PAYNE,
Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to request a hearing, by your committee, on House resolution 564, a copy of which I send inclosed. Inclosed is a petition, signed by 77 Republican Members of the House of Representatives, requesting that your committee favorably report the above-mentioned resolution.

I have not seen all the Republican Members, and a number that I have seen, while favoring the resolution, preferred not to sign the petition, but chose to speak to members of the Committee on Ways and Means in its favor.

Very respectfully,

BUTLER AMES.

The petition read as follows:

We, the undersigned Republican Members of Congress, believing in the advisability of the adoption of House resolution 564, request the Committee on Ways and Means to report the same with favorable recommendations. (Signed by 77 Republican Members.)

The reply of the Committee on Ways and Means is as follows:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1910.
(Dictated by S. E. P.)

HON. BUTLER AMES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Yours of the 10th instant was duly received. I can not see how the fact that 77 men have signed your petition changes at all the situation in regard to your resolution. It does not change the attitude of the members of the committee with whom I have conferred, nor does my conversation with some of the signers of your petition strengthen your position.

Yours, very truly,

SERENO E. PAYNE.

Last night, Mr. Chairman, I wrote a reply to that communication, a copy of which I sent to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means this morning. It reads as follows:

MAY 19, 1910.

TO THE HON. SERENO E. PAYNE,
Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In answer to your letter from the Committee on Ways and Means, of the 17th instant, I would call your attention to the fact that on three separate days I approached your august person and asked verbally and politely for a hearing by your committee on House resolution No. 564, which was introduced in the House March 31, 1910, and which reads as follows:

"Resolved, That it is the sense and judgment of this House that negotiations with Canada should be instituted at this time, with a view to establishing closer commercial ties and freer trade relations with that country; and

"Ordered, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States."

To my first request you arrogantly insisted (if I remember correctly) that, as far as you could find out, no one wanted the resolution, and that it was not good political sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota to give me a little more time.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I can not give the gentleman any more time. I have already given away all the time that I have.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Minnesota will allow the gentleman from Massachusetts the pleasure of reading the rest of the letter.

Mr. TAWNEY. He has the privilege, under the order of the House, of printing his remarks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Perhaps he does not want to put this communication into the Record in that way, as it refers personally to another Member.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. AMES (reading):

Believing that your lack of courtesy was inexcusable and that you were unable to understand or appreciate that many Republican Members of the House not only wanted the resolution passed, but who, not yet having lost all touch with the present desires of the party and the country generally, did believe the resolution to be good political sense, I went to the unusual labor of circulating in person a petition, which I inclosed with my written and last request for a hearing.

This petition was signed by 77 Republican Members of the House. It certified not only to the "advisability" of the adoption of the resolution, but also requested your committee to favorably report the same.

To this written evidence of the error of your assumed position you give no consideration.

My last request for a hearing was made in letter form at the suggestion of a member of your committee.

Is it properly to be assumed that you did not intend in the beginning to consider or act upon this resolution? The President wrote you a letter, dictated in my presence and in that of a third party, indicating his approval of the resolution, though not specifically asking therefor lest his request might embarrass the House or lest the House might embarrass him by refusing its indorsement. It was and is his intention to proceed with such negotiations whether the House acts upon the resolution or not.

The President's letter was written as the result of a second interview in an endeavor to convince you that he favored the resolution.

You stated on two occasions that "the President did not want the resolution," and when I suggested that there must be some misunderstanding you graciously illuminated the situation by telling me "that the President knew more what he wanted than did I."

I twice suggested going over with you the letter you had received, and which I had heard dictated.

On one of these occasions you informed me that "your relations with the President were such that when he wrote you such a letter he did not want the resolution."

If that be true, then Representative FISH and myself were both deceived, and I assure you that it is not even to be assumed that either intentionally or unintentionally the President would be lacking in sincerity or straightforwardness.

I am surprised that the written request of more than one-third of the Republican membership, including every one of the Massachusetts

Republican delegation, should not be sufficient to secure a hearing by your committee. I am loath to believe that the Committee on Ways and Means is either hidebound in their own opinions or indifferent to the desire of a large number of the Republicans in Congress.

The fact remains, however, that I have used every and due diligence and courtesy to secure such treatment and gentlemanly consideration as any Member of the House should and does expect of other Members. Your statement that "your conversation with some of the signers of my petition does not strengthen my position" is at once ungentlemanly and insulting.

It implies either that I misrepresented the case in circulating the petition among the Members signing the same, or that I had made it a matter of personal appeal, and that the signatures were given to relieve them of my importunities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that if the gentleman had indicated to me that it was his purpose to personally attack a Member of this House, I would not have yielded to him. The gentleman stated he wanted to make some general observations.

Mr. AMES. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I asked him for five minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; for some general observations.

Mr. AMES. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield forty-five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may conclude his remarks.

Mr. TAWNEY. I shall object to that.

Mr. AMES. I have but five or six lines more.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would be very willing indeed to have the gentleman read the rest of his letter. I have never seen it, and I am curious to know what he is going to say.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have yielded forty-five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. AMES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to finish the reading of these five or six lines here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. AMES (reading):

I resent any such imputation. Your whole attitude has so lacked in common courtesy and a proper sense of proportion that I feel forced to make this written protest thereto.

Your letter, if freely translated, should be interpreted to read—the desires of many Republican Members and the public be damned.

It is just such hidebound intolerance of the desires and rights of others that is forcing Members to advocate, against their better judgment, a committee of committees in the House, in order to purge itself of such individual misrule and abuse of power.

It is just such domination and disregard of the public desire that is fostering the movement of insurgency not only in the House, but also the widespread insurgency with which we are now face to face.

Very respectfully,

BUTLER AMES.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to get into a personal controversy with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES]. When he first came to me with this request I stated to him that the subject of a reciprocity treaty with Canada had been taken up by the Executive, and it had been so published and announced to the country, and I thought it was the most proper thing in the world that the Executive should take up those negotiations. After they were concluded it would be the work of Congress to pass a law to enable them to be carried into effect, and then would be the time for Congress to act. Now, I stated that to the gentleman, not with my hat in my hand, but as politely and as suavely as I could state it. I did not exhibit any contempt of the gentleman, who, I understand, is to be the next Senator from Massachusetts, if he gets votes enough. I did not do anything of that kind, but I treated him or tried to treat him politely. When he brought the petition to me, I met a few gentlemen here on the floor whose names were signed to it, and I said to some of them, "I see you want Congress or the Ways and Means Committee to take up the subject of reciprocity with Canada and pass a resolution or, at least, report it to the House, in favor of taking up the question of reciprocity with Canada, or of commending the Executive to do it or something of that kind, backing him up," and some of them responded that they had been asked to sign a petition of some kind; that they did not understand what it was. Now some intelligent Members of the House said that. Others said they did not care anything about it, one way or the other, but they signed the petition because it came along. I did not see, so far as I investigated it, that there was a crying demand in the House of Representatives for the Committee on Ways and Means to take up this resolution, which, if they passed it, would have no effect whatever except, perhaps, to convince Canada that we were very anxious on our part for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and it might hamper the

Executive in bringing the question before the Canadian authorities.

I could see no use in it, but I consulted the majority members of the committee on the subject, and I found none of them had a different opinion, although I did find one of them who was in favor of reciprocity with Canada. I told the gentleman myself I had been on the joint high commission in 1900 or 1899, and while the subject of reciprocity was closed before I got on the commission, while I was in favor then of trying to make some reciprocity agreement, that was cut out because we met the question of the Alaskan boundary, and that we had to meet and pass upon and agree upon as best we could in our extended work on that commission. As far as I was concerned myself, I did not propose by my vote in the committee to bring up the question of tariff in any way during this session of Congress, and to that I adhere. [Applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield forty-five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there is upon the calendar ready for the consideration of the House what is generally known as the ship-subsidy bill, reported by the majority of the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The minority of that committee has reported a substitute bill, so that for the first time since I have been a Member of Congress the question as to the necessity of legislation upon this important subject is admitted by the Democratic party. Therefore, it is not my intention to take up any time to-day in discussing the necessity for such legislation. I shall speak upon these two bills. Especially do I desire to talk upon the Democratic substitute bill. It is different from any bill that has been introduced in Congress for the last twenty-five years. I shall first consider the Republican bill.

THE HUMPHREY BILL.

This bill, the majority bill, the one I introduced for the encouragement of our merchant marine, is not the result of my own unaided effort. It is not the bill that I would write upon the statute books, had I that power. Like all legislation, where there is room for many opinions, it is the result of compromise. After consultation with various business interests in every part of the country, and with many men who believe, as we do, that the present position of our merchant marine on the high seas is a menace to both the prosperity and the peace of the Nation, the majority of our committee concluded that under all the circumstances this bill was the best one that had yet been presented. This bill is simple and plain in its provisions. No one who desires can fail to understand it. It contains three principal features:

First. An amendment to the ocean mail act of 1891 permitting the Postmaster-General to pay to second-class vessels, on routes of 4,000 miles or more, to South America, China, Japan, the Philippines, and Australasia, the same rates now paid to first-class vessels; that is, \$4 per mile outward voyage.

Second. An increase of the tonnage dues in the transoceanic trade.

Third. What is usually termed "free ships," but for the foreign trade only, and such ships not to receive any aid from the Government.

The first of these features is by far the most important. It is a remarkable fact that with all the agitation of this question for the last ten years many who have even attempted to discuss the situation do not know of the existence of the ocean mail act of 1891, of which this bill is an amendment, although every steamship on the Atlantic flying the American flag is today running under the provisions of this act of 1891, except two small steamers running to Haiti under special privileges granted them by that Government. So well has this law of 1891 worked that no one has ever criticised it. We have heard many denunciations on the floor of this House on the system of subsidy as a system of favoritism and graft, but the most radical of these vocabulary performers have never dared suggest the repeal or even the amendment of the subsidy law we already have. Could higher praise be bestowed upon the workings of this system?

I do not believe there is another law upon our statute books of equal industrial importance that has received so high a tribute to its fairness, its honesty, and its success. Let those who are afraid of this bill to amend that law remember these facts and be comforted. After nineteen years of experience not a single vessel is to-day running under the provisions of the act of 1891 upon a 4,000-mile route outward voyage. Certainly no man will contend but what this fact absolutely demonstrates that the present law is inefficient for this trade on these long voyages. This bill proposes to permit the Postmaster-General, under the terms and conditions of the act of 1891, to

pay to second-class vessels on these long voyages the rate now paid to first-class vessels upon shorter routes. The longer the route the more expensive it is to operate vessels in proportion to their earning capacity. A first-class vessel is one of iron or steel, of 8,000 tons or over, of 20 knots speed or more. A second-class vessel is one of iron or steel, of 4,000 tons or more, of 16 to 19 knots speed. In all things except size and speed the requirements of each class are the same. They must be of the highest rating known to maritime commerce. No vessel can secure pay from the Government except in open competition after notice given in the newspapers at the leading ports of the country. Such contracts must be awarded to the lowest, the best, bidder, and if the service can be secured upon any route for less than \$4 per mile it will be secured. Four dollars is the maximum that can be paid. Every safety and every precaution is thrown around these contracts as is thrown around all government contracts. Open competition is guaranteed. There is no chance for favoritism. The amount that can be expended in any one year is specifically limited to the estimated revenues from the foreign mail service for that year.

NOT A SUBSIDY BILL.

Section 1 of the majority bill is not only the most important section in the bill (in fact, without this section the bill would amount to nothing), but it also contains what the opponents of the bill call the "subsidy" feature. I never apologize or stutter when I use that word subsidy. In truth, I take rather a malicious delight in using that word because of the enemies it has. The opponents of American shipping delight in using it. They think that its use injures the cause. The prejudice against this word is the only effective argument that the enemies of this legislation have ever used. They have always attempted, and do now, to arouse the passion and prejudice of the unthinking and uninformed against this legislation by repeating the word "subsidy." It is the only argument and the only answer they have ever made to this proposed legislation. It is the only one they are making to-day. But the truth is that this bill is not a subsidy bill. None know this better than its enemies who call it such. I usually refer to it myself as a subsidy bill. But it is neither fair nor honest to insist that this bill proposes to give to private interests certain assistance or privileges without demanding any direct service for the Government in return. This is the real test of a real subsidy. If this bill demanded from the ships receiving this assistance nothing in return, then it would be a subsidy in the true meaning of that word. The Democratic substitute bill, as I will show before I am through, is a real subsidy bill. We have plenty of illustrations of true subsidies paid by the Government. The money appropriated to destroy the cotton boll weevil is a true subsidy. It is given to a particular locality for a particular purpose. No service is demanded in return by the Government. Our Democratic friends were very anxious for this subsidy—so much so that they demanded, as claimed by the department, twice as much as they could spend. This was a real subsidy, yet my Democratic friends were anxious to secure it. The name "subsidy" did not make it smell any less sweet when it benefited their section directly.

The millions paid by the Department of Agriculture to assist farming is a subsidy, a real subsidy, paid by the Government. Nothing directly is demanded in return. The improvement of rivers and harbors is also a true subsidy, especially of rivers; a subsidy largely for local benefit, with no direct return to the Government. The rural free delivery is another real subsidy in the true meaning of the word—a mail subsidy—yet I have never heard any man on either side of this House condemn any one of these subsidies. They are in favor of a mail subsidy on land, but vicious in their opposition to it on the sea.

Is it possible that the iniquity of a subsidy depends entirely upon the locality in which it is to be expended? Is it possible that subsidies are only to be condemned when the "pork-barrel" system of the division of it can not be applied? The most striking illustration of a true subsidy is the vast subsidy paid to the publishers of second-class mail matter in this country. Here is a subsidy estimated by the Post-Office Department at \$64,000,000. It is paid by the Government to a great private industry. It is a real subsidy, for no conditions are imposed by the Government. No services are demanded in return. I am not arguing that this subsidy or any of the real subsidies which I have mentioned are wrong. I am not saying that the Government should not pay them all. But how inconsistent it is to defend and praise these subsidies and denounce the payment of a ship subsidy, even if this was contemplated. Especially is this inconsistent with a certain class of magazines who are now so valiantly defending their own subsidy and at the same time denouncing the proposed subsidy to be paid to

others. If a subsidy is a steal, then these gentlemen ought, at least, to give up the loaf before they denounce others for trying to snatch a crumb.

If subsidy is favoritism, if it is a graft, if it is a steal, then these "holier than thou" editors, who have been feeding and fattening at the Public Treasury, and are now whining for fear that that privilege will be taken away, are hardly the gentlemen to be shouting it from the house tops. But whether a subsidy is right or wrong, this bill is not a subsidy. It does not provide for the payment of a subsidy such as I have mentioned. It provides for a payment for services to be rendered. It pays a stipulated amount to ships, but it demands that these ships shall first perform government service, and it demands full value for the money paid. This service is direct and of highest importance to the Government. These vessels must carry the mail on schedules fixed by the Government. They must be constructed upon plans and specifications approved by the Secretary of the Navy. They must carry American boys and train them in seamanship. They must be constructed so that they can be economically and speedily converted into auxiliary cruisers. They must be capable of carrying at least four 6-inch cannon. They must be of high speed and of a construction the highest known to maritime commerce. They must be ever at the call of the Government in time of war. What higher service can be rendered than is here imposed, that of protecting the Government? If the payment under this bill is a subsidy, then the money paid for constructing a navy is a subsidy; then the maintenance of an army is a subsidy, for they are all for one and the same purpose—the common defense. If the payment under this bill is a subsidy, then our salary is a subsidy, for we perform no higher service for the country than would these vessels in the case of war, the only difference being that with these ships the country gets the best service it can for the money. Again, I say that it is neither fair nor honest to call this a subsidy bill in the sense in which that word is generally used; that is, a payment to private interests without requiring any direct service to the Government in return.

TONNAGE TAXES.

Sections 4 and 5 of the Humphrey bill are as follows:

Sec. 4. That a tonnage duty of 12 cents per ton, not to exceed 60 cents per ton per annum, is hereby imposed at each entry on all vessels which shall be entered in any port of the United States from any foreign port or place not in North America, Central America, the West India Islands, the Bahama Islands, the Bermuda Islands, or the coast of South America, bordering on the Caribbean Sea or Newfoundland, not, however, to include vessels in distress or not engaged in trade.

That so much of section 36 of the act approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," as conflicts with this section is hereby repealed.

Sec. 5. That on proof to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Navigation that a vessel of the United States has on any foreign voyage carried a boy or boys, a citizen or citizens of the United States, under 21 years of age, suitably trained during that voyage in seamanship or engineering, in the proportion of one for such vessel, and in addition one for each 1,000 tons of her net registered tonnage, there shall be paid to the owner or owners of the vessel, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an allowance equivalent to 80 per cent of the tonnage duties paid in respect of the entry in the United States of that vessel from that voyage.

The tonnage taxes of the United States are among the very lowest of any of the nations of the world. It is proposed to increase these tonnage taxes only on vessels engaged in the transoceanic trade. There are very few American vessels running on these over-seas lines. Last year while the tonnage taxes paid in this trade amounted to \$884,377, but 4 per cent of this sum was paid by American ships, or only \$34,419. By the adoption of this section of the bill about \$1,000,000 a year will be paid into the National Treasury, and every dollar of this will be paid by foreign ships if the few American vessels running in this trade will take advantage of the rebate provision, which allows them 80 per cent of the tonnage duties paid if they will carry American boys, one for each thousand tons of the vessel. It seems to me that there can be no objection to thus making foreign subsidized ships help to pay the subsidy to American ships that will run in competition with them. Foreign ships are to-day carrying 95 per cent of our commerce. They are receiving more than \$200,000,000 a year from the American people for this service. They are charging exorbitant rates and making enormous profits. For these foreign ships very largely we maintain our light-houses and other aids to navigation. These foreign ships receive the advantage of the improvement of our rivers and harbors, upon which we are expending \$50,000,000 a year. We pay German ships a subsidy for carrying our mails more than two and a half times as much as these German ships pay us in tonnage taxes. We pay Japanese vessels a subsidy for carrying the mails four times as great as the amount of tonnage taxes we receive from Japanese vessels. Why should not these foreign vessels, receiving so many favors, carrying our commerce at figures so profitable, help bear some of the burdens?

FREE SHIPS.

Section 6 of the bill is as follows:

Sec. 6. That section 4132 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4132. Vessels built within the United States and belonging wholly to citizens thereof, and vessels which may be captured in war by citizens of the United States and lawfully condemned as prize, or which may be adjudged to be forfeited for a breach of the laws of the United States, and seagoing steel steamers of 2,500 gross tons or over, wherever built, and to engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippines, being wholly owned by citizens of the United States, and no others, may be registered as directed in this title. Foreign-built vessels registered pursuant to this act shall not be entitled to mail compensation under the act of March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce,' or to any compensation under this act, and shall not engage in the coastwise trade or transport from one port of the United States to another port of the United States either directly or via a foreign port or for any part of the voyage passengers or merchandise under penalty of \$200 for each passenger so transported, and the forfeiture of the merchandise so carried."

This is the "free-ship" section of the bill. It permits American citizens to buy a foreign-built ship and run it exclusively in the foreign trade without any government aid and with no change whatever in our navigation laws under the American flag. I have never believed in free ships. I do not believe in them now. It will not give us a merchant marine. It is wrong in principle. Even if "free ships" would give us a merchant marine, it would be one of which, as an American citizen, I would be ashamed. Free ships will not give us a single vessel to South America, to the Orient, or to the Philippines.

The great value of the "free-ships" clause will be that by trying it we will demonstrate its utter worthlessness. If this bill is passed with this "free-ships" clause in it, in the future we will not be met, as we are to-day, by the continual assertion that "free ships" is the solution of the question. Not a single American vessel has been built in an American yard exclusively for the foreign trade within the last seven years, and not one is being built to-day. So any vessel admitted under this section could not injure in the slightest degree any American shipyard. Conditions are such at present in Central America that if this section is passed there is a probability of getting a line of American-owned ships, now running from New Orleans to Central America under foreign flags, to run under the American flag. I can see no objection to this, as these vessels, if they should come under the flag, would not increase in any degree the competition against other American vessels. They would be compelled to employ American officers and pay them American wages, and in time of war they might be of great service to the country. Therefore I am in favor of this section. In favoring it I do not think that I am inconsistent in my attitude that I have heretofore assumed against "free ships." Consistency does not mean being the same to-day, yesterday, and forever. That is not consistency, but death. True consistency is to meet the situation as it exists at the time the question is presented, regardless of what may have occurred in the past. The Central American situation to-day is a condition that we have never met before. If by taking advantage of this situation we can bring under the American flag a single vessel that will not in any way injure any American interests and that will be of some advantage to the Nation, then I believe in doing it.

I am in favor of this section for the specific reason that I have been assured by the representatives of the United States Fruit Company Line that their vessels running from New Orleans will immediately take the American flag if this bill is passed. This section will benefit that great Gulf port, I believe, and I hope it will, but I do not believe it will benefit any other part of our country.

RAILROADS.

Section 2 is as follows:

Sec. 2. That a contract pursuant to this act or hereafter pursuant to the act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce," shall not be made by the Postmaster-General for the transportation of the ocean mails by any steamship which shall be owned or controlled by any railroad company or railroad corporation or to which any railroad company or railroad corporation shall extend any favor, privilege, or advantage which is not also extended on the same terms to any other American steamship. The Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel any such contract upon evidence satisfactory to him that any provision of this section has been violated.

On theory we admit that this section can not be defended. Theoretically, if the railroads will run American vessels and fulfill the requirements of the law—in other words, give the service demanded—they should be permitted to do it. Unfortunately, it is not always wise to pass laws theoretically right in this selfish and man-controlled world of ours. Experience has demonstrated that it is very likely to discourage, if not destroy competition if railroads are permitted to own and run steamship lines also. Whether true or not, the belief that the

railroads in such instances would in some way, in spite of laws and regulations, favor their own is so strong that it greatly discourages independent lines. For these reasons the committee believe that this section should go into the bill.

NO MONEY PAID TO SHIPS NOW RUNNING.

One thing I want to make clear and emphatic, so clear that hereafter no man may be mistaken, and that is that under the provisions of this bill not a single vessel now running will receive a dollar—not one. It has been charged again and again that the mail pay provided in this bill would go to existing lines. I say without qualification that this statement is not true. This statement has been made many times, but such statements no doubt were made through mistake, most of them undoubtedly by those who have never taken the trouble to read the bill. But I intend that hereafter no man shall have the excuse that such a mistake is the mistake of ignorance. I am not urging anyone in this House to support this bill if it does not appeal to his judgment, but I do ask, and I think I have a right to ask, that both the friends and the enemies of this bill tell the truth about it. No man who reads this bill and acquaints himself with the facts will claim that a single dollar will be given to any ship now running. I hope that I have made this point clear, for while these misrepresentations have been made, as I believe, unintentionally, yet they are misrepresentations that have been unjust and have misled the public.

This statement made in the minority report is the only one that I feel I am fully justified in condemning; and in taking exception to this statement, I want it understood that I do not in the least reflect upon any member of the minority of my committee. But they are simply mistaken in regard to the facts. It seems to me that it took a great deal of assurance on the part of the minority to make that statement, when the subsidy bill which they report as a substitute would not give a single dollar to an American-built ship except to those now running—not one.

WHAT WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED.

I do not claim, nor does anyone who favors this bill claim, that it will give us a great merchant marine; but it will help to give us from 20 to 40 new modern, swift, up-to-date vessels. It will give us some mail lines to South America, to the Orient, and to the Philippines, and these lines to South America will be far better and faster than any now running. They will give us a far better service on the Pacific than we now have. It is true that these lines will not be able to carry a very large percentage of our commerce, but they will have a powerful influence on the freight rates, both upon the Atlantic and the Pacific. On both oceans to-day, foreign ship combinations have been formed; have pooled their earnings, and are charging exorbitant rates. These foreign trusts are discriminating against American products. They are practicing all the infamies known to trusts and combines. All of them are levying tribute on American commerce. Even a single line of American ships to South America or across the Pacific will be of tremendous value as a regulator of freight rates. Using an illustration not my own—an American line on either ocean would be like driving a pin into the heart of a giant. Foreign ship combinations to-day charge an American merchant on the Atlantic between here and South America twice as much for the same service as they charge his European competitor. By the action of these combines the freight rates to-day between the United States and South America are the highest water rates in the world. On the Pacific these foreign combinations for carrying freight from America to Europe charge, not twice as much, but five times as much as they charge for carrying freight from Europe to America.

It is into the heart of this foreign, infamous, giant trust, preying upon American commerce, that we would drive the pin. For this purpose alone it would be worth many times the entire amount that could possibly be expended under the provisions of this bill. These vessels on the Atlantic would cost about \$1,400,000 each. On the Pacific they would cost from \$1,800,000 to \$2,500,000 each. Here is investment for American capital. They would all be constructed in American yards. Here is employment for American labor. Each of these vessels would give employment to American officers, to American sailors, and would train American boys. Each in time of war would be at the service of the Government. Even 20 of these modern vessels would be worth untold millions to us in case of war. In the war with Spain we paid \$13,000,000 for a few old, slow, dilapidated foreign vessels sufficient to carry 10,000 troops to Cuba. Twenty new, modern vessels might be sufficient to make our navy of highest value, while in its present condition, in case of a contest upon the Pacific, it is practically worthless. And remember one thing always, that under the provisions of this bill

the Government takes absolutely no chances. The vessel must be built, must give the service, before a single dollar is paid.

THE DEMOCRATIC SUBSTITUTE SUBSIDY BILL.

Once a wise man, in his weariness and vexation of spirit, exclaimed, "Oh, that mine enemy would write a book!" And as I have listened for the last five years to the continual stream of criticism, denunciation, and condemnation of every attempt made on this side of the House to assist our merchant marine I have wished that the Democrats would introduce a bill.

A few days ago this circumstance, so devoutly to be wished, materialized. As I have already said, we now have a Democratic bill, a minority bill, for the upbuilding of our merchant marine. During the last five years I have heard every word of denunciation, of execration—I might almost say of villification—that the English language contains applied to proposed subsidy legislation with reference to our merchant marine. And yet, after all this flood of Democratic denunciation, it has remained for the Democratic minority to introduce and advocate a subsidy bill, genuine and undefiled, the only exclusively subsidy bill that has come before Congress within the last seven years. The minority bill is a subsidy bill, and it is nothing else. Not only is it a subsidy bill—that is not its worst feature—it proposes to give that subsidy exclusively to foreign-built tramp ships and to American ships now running. If any evidence were needed to demonstrate that the Democratic party is solely a party of opposition, that it is utterly incapable of constructive legislation, this bill has demonstrated it in full measure. The prophet of old, when he exclaimed, "Study me, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made!" must in his prophetic vision have looked down the ages and seen this bill. This bill is entitled:

A bill to encourage the development of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes.

It should have been, if the title were intended to be an index of what the bill contained, "A bill to subsidize foreign-built tramps to encourage Chinese crews to reduce the revenues of the United States, and for other purposes."

The first section of this bill reads:

Be it enacted, etc., That a reduction of duty of 5 per cent of all the customs duties now or hereafter imposed by law shall be allowed on all goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States in vessels of the United States owned and controlled by citizens of the United States or corporations organized and chartered under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof and whose stockholders are all citizens of the United States; but said reduction of duty herein provided for shall not apply to cases where goods, wares, and merchandise are transhipped or transferred from a foreign vessel or port or place to a vessel of the United States for the purpose of evading the provisions of the customs laws of the United States. And any and all clauses in existing treaties with foreign countries in contravention hereof are hereby abrogated, and all acts of Congress in conflict herewith are hereby repealed: *Provided,* That said reduction of duties shall take effect and be in force from and after the time specified in section 2 of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this section.

Talk about special privileges being given to private interests! Talk about taxing the many for the benefit of the few! I challenge any man to find a more complete example in the history of the legislation of this country than is found in this section. What duties to the Government are these ships called upon to perform for these special privileges which they receive? Here is the true test of a true subsidy. Are they required to carry the mail? Is any speed required? Must they run upon any schedule? Must they carry American boys? Must they have American crews? Must they be built on plans approved by the Secretary of the Navy? Must they be constructed so that cannon can be mounted? Are they at the command of the Government in time of war? What duty do they owe to the Government that gives them this privilege? What service will they perform? None whatever.

And yet our Democratic friends talk about being opposed to a subsidy. This section requires nothing but that these vessels must be owned by an American citizen, company, or corporation in order to receive this subsidy. While this is the worst subsidy measure under this section that has been introduced in the House since I have been a Member of it, it is not so objectionable as section 3, which reads:

Sec. 3. That section 4132 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 4132. Vessels built within the United States and belonging wholly to citizens thereof, and vessels which may be captured in war by citizens of the United States and lawfully condemned as prize, or which may be adjudged to be forfeited for a breach of the laws of the United States, and seagoing vessels, whether steam or sail, wherever built, and to engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine or other island possessions of the United States, being wholly owned by citizens of the United States or corporations organized and chartered under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, and whose stockholders are all citizens of the United States, and no others, may be registered as directed in this title. Foreign-built vessels registered pursuant to this act shall not be entitled to mail compensation under the act of March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to provide for

ocean-mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce, and shall not engage in the coastwise trade; but such vessel shall be entitled to all other benefits and privileges given to vessels of the United States."

Or, in other words, any American citizen, company, or corporation can go aboard, buy a foreign-built ship operated with a Chinese crew, take the American flag and get the same subsidy under this Democratic substitute bill as a vessel built in an American yard by American labor and manned by an American crew.

There is nothing whatever to prevent any railroad company or the Standard Oil Company, that the minority has so often condemned, from going abroad and buying these cheap foreign-built tramps, man them with Chinese, take the flag, and get the full benefit of this subsidy. Nothing whatever. That is the plain provision of the Democratic bill. And I challenge any man upon either side of this House to dispute the correctness of that statement. Yet this is the subsidy bill that the Democratic party presents to the country for the upbuilding of our merchant marine, a bill to subsidize foreign-built ships with Chinese crews.

Mr. SULZER. I want to ask the gentleman who introduced the bill to which he refers?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is the minority bill.

Mr. SULZER. The bill the gentleman is referring to?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am referring to the substitute bill that was reported by the minority of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and offered as a substitute for the bill that was reported by the majority of that committee.

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman does not contend that that bill, or the Spight bill, as it is called, is a subsidy bill in any way?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I assert it is a subsidy bill absolutely.

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman is entirely in error about that. The first provision of the bill provides for discriminating duties.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman is mistaken himself. It provides that money shall be given to these ships. What is the difference, whether you stop it before it gets into the Treasury or take it out after it gets in? Not a single performance is required. You make it a gift, an absolute gratuity to these vessels; you ask nothing in return. You require no service whatever as a condition of the payment of this subsidy.

Mr. SULZER. Does the gentleman consider that a discriminating duty is the same thing as a subsidy?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Of course a discriminating duty is a subsidy. A subsidy is anything that is paid by the Government to a private interest without demanding from that private interest anything in return. That is precisely what the Democratic substitute bill does.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the gentleman says that the reduction of taxation contemplated by the Spight bill is a subsidy. I should like to ask the gentleman from Washington when his party put hides on the free list and thereby reduced the tax on hides, whether they intended to give a subsidy to the shoe manufacturers?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. My reply to that is, that the Republican party had to have Democratic aid to do it, and I think they made a great mistake when they did it; for I have not noticed any reduction in the price of hides or shoes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My question is, if the gentleman regards the reduction of the tariff on hides as a subsidy to the manufacturers of shoes?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would call it a subsidy if you gave them the direct benefit of it without demanding any service in return.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When you reduce the duty on hides, you give the benefit of it to the manufacturers who use hides as their raw material; and if we allow American ships to bring in goods at a 5 per cent reduction of the tariff and do not give that privilege to foreign ships, in competition with them, that would result, it seems to me, in giving the benefit of the reduction to the American ships or to the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That may be true. However, if this Democratic substitute bill were to pass, not a single vessel would be built under its provisions in American yards—not one. The American ships upon the Pacific Ocean which would receive the advantage of this bill would be those of the Pacific Mail, owned by the Southern Pacific Railway, and the *Minnesota*, owned by the Great Northern Railway, each operated by Chinese crews. This subsidy, however, that would go to these vessels, would be insignificant in amount. On the Atlantic it would go only to American vessels, with the exception of two

small ones running between here and Haiti, already running under contract with the Government and receiving pay from the National Treasury under the subsidy act of 1891. But I will tell you where practically all of the benefits of this bill would go.

If this bill were to become a law, any railway corporation or other corporation could buy a vessel built by foreign, cheap labor, in foreign yards, man these vessels with Chinese crews, and get the subsidy paid by the American Government; and these vessels would be of the slow, tramp freight type, and even these vessels would be run only between here and Europe, and these slow vessels would not even give us the benefit of trying to find a market for our products, but they would be constantly trying to find a market in this country for dutiable goods from other countries. Not even these tramp vessels, under this bill, would run to South America, to the Philippines, to the Orient, for from these countries most of our imports are on the free list; therefore, there would be no inducement for these vessels to go there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that if the gentleman will compare the clause in the Spight bill with the differential clause in the first tariff act ever passed he will find that the language is almost identical.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am very well aware of that fact, and I am aware of the fact that the first subsidy bill ever passed was the only bill ever written on the statute book that provided for a reduction downward upon goods carried in an American ship, and it was repealed at the very next session at the first opportunity.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If my friend will allow me, he must remember that at the time the discriminating duties were adopted, in the beginning of the Government, the duties were so low that, in order to discriminate, you had to put an upward discrimination, but our duties are so high that if you want to make a discrimination you are bound to cut it down.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman from Alabama will listen I will demonstrate that the position he takes is more absurd to-day than it was at the time to which he refers.

The distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD,] as I am reminded, a few days ago made a speech upon this question. I read it with much pleasure. I regret that I was not present when it was delivered. It was a splendid speech. It showed research and study. In this particular it was in striking contrast to many that I have heard delivered upon this question upon both sides of this aisle. When you can make the atmosphere so uncomfortable that you can get our Democratic friends to study a question you have accomplished much. It is a hopeful sign. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Alabama in his speech seemed to contend that the policy of the minority bill was the policy tried in the early years of the Republic. The east is not farther from the west than was the policy of the "fathers" from the policy of the minority bill. The discriminating duties of the "fathers" was an increase duty always—not a decrease duty—except the first attempt, and that lasted only two years. It was then promptly abandoned, as I have stated, and this in itself is positive proof of its failure.

An increase and a decrease in a discriminating duty is as opposite in effect and in principle as are the poles. The difference in the two methods is the difference between an efficient remedy and one that will accomplish absolutely nothing. The two remedies are as different as the wrong way and the right way; that is to say, the two remedies are as different as the right way and the Democratic way. Our forefathers may have done some things not wise, but they never did a thing as absurd and as utterly ridiculous as to attempt to build up the merchant marine by a discriminating duty of 5 per cent reduction on goods carried in American ships, even in those years when the dutiable list was much larger than it is to-day.

Remember that more than 47 per cent of our imports from the Orient and more than 75 per cent from South America are upon the free list, and these are the countries where we most want to extend our trade. These are the countries where we most want to send our goods and our mails. These are the countries where there is the greatest need for a line of American ships.

Let us take a few illustrations as to how this discriminating duty of 5 per cent reduction on goods carried in American ships would work.

I know it is not poetic, it is not even kind, it is pitiful to puncture the glowing prophecies of what a 5 per cent differential upon goods now dutiable would do by citing a few facts. Figures and prophecies are often strangely at variance. In this case it is the difference between imagination and truth.

In the actual workings of the plan as stated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] merchants and others would absorb at least a portion of this 5 per cent. But in presenting the figures that I shall give, I will assume for the sake of illustration that the 5 per cent differential would be entirely absorbed by American vessels and that they would receive the entire benefit. The figures that I quote have been furnished me by the Treasury Department. They are not estimates. They are the actual figures taken from actual transactions.

ON THE PACIFIC.

Take, first, the American vessels on the Pacific Ocean. What would they have earned under this minority bill during the last year? The figures show that the great vessels of the Pacific Mail Line for the long voyage via Hawaii to the Orient, and occasionally to the Philippines, would have received under the Democratic substitute \$6,205 per voyage for the round trip of 15,000 miles or more. Their Japanese competitors receive \$89,356 per trip, or almost fifteen times as much as the American vessels would have received if the proposed substitute had been upon our statute books. Does any sane man believe that this insignificant sum, even if completely absorbed by the ships, would add another American vessel on this line to the Orient?

The only result would be, from the port of San Francisco, to give a gratuity to the vessels of the Pacific Mail owned and run by the Southern Railway and operated by Chinese crews. Think of it! A gratuity to this line given by a Democratic bill, after all the condemnation and denunciation we have heard from that side of the aisle upon this particular question. Heretofore a proposition to pay this line even for services rendered has been characterized by the Democratic party as the sum of all infamies.

There is one other American vessel upon the Pacific Ocean, and one only. It has the brave distinction of being the only vessel under the American flag running exclusively in the foreign trade without government assistance or government favor. It is the third largest vessel on the sea. It is the largest freight and passenger boat that the world has ever seen. This vessel, the *Minnesota*, is owned and operated by the Great Northern Railway. What would have been the benefit to this magnificent vessel had it had during the last year the benefit of a law such as is proposed by the minority bill? The figures that I shall give will certainly gladden the heart of that great man and distinguished Democrat, Mr. James J. Hill. This great vessel last year made four round-trip voyages of 13,000 miles or more. I give the date of its arrival in Seattle and the amount it would have received for each voyage.

For the voyages ending on the dates given, at Seattle, it would have received the following princely sums, respectively:

February 6	\$331.85
June 5	738.65
September 1	2,102.60
December 2	2,089.90

Or this great and splendid vessel would have received under the proposed Democratic legislation for the year 1909, \$5,262.90.

In competition with the *Minnesota*, for many years going from the same wharves in Seattle, over the same course, have run three small Japanese steamers, built by Japanese cheap labor, run by Japanese cheap labor. The combined tonnage of these three vessels does not equal that of the *Minnesota*. Yet these small and slow vessels have received for several years in gold from their government \$25,150 for each voyage. Each of these small vessels received \$109,000 per year in gold or twenty times as much as the *Minnesota* would receive under the proposed legislation by the minority. If the *Minnesota* received pay equal to these Japanese vessels in proportion to her tonnage and speed, she would receive \$350,000 annually.

I understand, however, that this line of Japanese vessels referred to, having driven out of business every American vessel on the north Pacific except the *Minnesota*, and having now established business relations with the Great Northern Railway, having almost a complete monopoly, it is now proposed to reduce slightly the subsidy heretofore paid. However, another new line of Japanese vessels has just been put on running to Puget Sound. These new vessels are even slower than the old Japanese vessels, having a speed of only 14 knots, and each of these small and slow vessels is receiving \$23,234 per voyage, or about five times as much as the *Minnesota* would receive for an entire year. This proposed Democratic legislation will certainly strike terror to the hearts of the Japanese on the Pacific. They certainly will feel that, if this bill is passed, their supremacy is menaced.

No doubt Mr. James J. Hill, good Democrat as he is, would heartily indorse this Democratic bill, and if it becomes law would soon start a mighty fleet under it across the Pacific, as it is understood that his losses on the *Minnesota* is not more

than \$750,000 annually. Under the Democratic bill of \$5,000 per year assistance the temptation to add more vessels would probably be too great to be resisted by so wise a financier. But in view of the many Democratic statements that have been made, I think it is well to point out the fact that, however meager the assistance might be to vessels running across the north Pacific, under the provisions of the proposed Democratic legislation, what little there was of it would go to a vessel already running, a vessel owned by a railroad and employing Chinese crew.

ON THE ATLANTIC.

What the effect of the proposed legislation would be on vessels between here and Europe I have not the figures to show in detail, but the figures furnished by the department do show that the average vessel running between here and Europe, with an average cargo, would receive \$2,195 for the round voyage—a sum utterly insignificant toward supporting or establishing a line of fast mail ships. It is possible that this sum might be sufficient between here and Europe to encourage the running of a few slow tramp vessels, but, as heretofore pointed out, such vessels would be constructed in foreign yards and would be run with the cheapest crews obtainable. It is also well to again point out the fact, in view of the statements that have been made by our Democratic friends and repeated in the minority report to the bill now before the House, that whatever was paid would be paid to ships now running and to ships that are already receiving mail pay from the Government and to foreign-built ships manned by foreign crews.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to say to the gentleman that I do not think his comparison is a fair one. The vessels he refers to are passenger ships, vessels like the *Minnesota*, the *Mauretania*, and the *Lusitania*. They are not freighters. It takes all of their cargo room to carry coal, and they carry comparatively little freight in proportion to size and investment; but if the gentleman will make a comparison with freighters, vessels that carry nothing but freight, he will find that 5 per cent would amount to a considerable inducement. The comparison the gentleman makes is to subsidize a freight train and then compare it with a passenger train that carries no freight.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I thank the gentleman for making that interruption just at this time, for I have here a table of freight ships that I will read in a moment, and the gentleman has a greater surprise coming to him than he has yet received.

SOUTH AMERICA.

But if such insignificant aid is given to American vessels running to the Orient under the proposed legislation where we have only 40 per cent of our imports on the free list, contemplate what a magnificent assistance it will be toward establishing lines to South America with 78 per cent or more of our imports on the free list.

From the commercial standpoint alone it is more desirable, perhaps, that we have a line of steamships running to South America than to any other country. Let me show you how this substitute would encourage the establishment of such lines; how profitable it would be for American citizens to run vessels to South America under this bill. I will now read the table to which I referred in my reply to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. For the purpose of this illustration I have selected the ships running from South America to New York for the month of November, 1909. And they are freight, not passenger ships. Of course, in this illustration, I can not use American ships on any of the long voyages, for the reason that no American ships run to South America on any voyage of 4,000 miles or over. These figures for the month of November are a fair illustration and beyond all doubt a sufficient illustration of what the workings of the substitute bill would be. Here it is, giving the name of the vessel, the date of its arrival, the tonnage of the vessel, and what it would have received if it had been given a 5 per cent discrimination upon all dutiable goods.

Merchandise imported into the port of New York from South America.

Date.	Vessel.	Port of departure.	Tonnage.	Value of goods.	Five per cent differential.
1909.					
November 1	Caracas	Venezuela	1,870	\$73,663	\$10.00
November 9	Zulia	do	1,079	126,308	5.45
November 13	Capac	Peru	2,338	22,848	\$48.75
Do.	Clement	Brazil	2,166	1,499,098	80.05
November 14	Afghan, Prince	do	4,794	1,185,572	0.00
November 15	Foxton, Hall	Chile	2,915	71,066	0.00
November 16	Coppenname	Brazil	2,027	3,271	0.00

The papers state that on March 4 the *Clement* again arrived in New York with a cargo valued at \$6,000,000, and did not pay one cent of duty.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, the gentleman is taking South American vessels that bring in imports on which there is no tariff taxes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly, that is exactly the trouble.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But you can not get any reductions when you have not any tariff to reduce; but you take the vessels coming from Europe, where there are duties to be paid, or vessels coming from countries where they bear a rate of duty, and you would get a reduction.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly, but under the bill which the gentleman has defended, it would be of no benefit except between here and Europe, and all the subsidy paid there would go to foreign-built ships, manned by cheap foreign crews, or to American vessels already running under the subsidy act of 1891.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; but the bill would increase the number of American ships and gradually put them under the American flag, and that is what we are after.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the gentleman entirely wrong. But even if he is correct, if it is necessary to get ships under the American flag that we shall buy ships built in foreign yards by foreign cheap labor and manned by Chinese crews, and then pay these ships a subsidy, I for one am willing to go without a merchant marine rather than pay that price. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman wants to make a fair comparison he must make a comparison of ships not bringing goods in free, but he must take the average ship that brings in duty-paid goods. If he makes his estimate on coffee-laden ships from South America, of course there can be no proper comparison, as there is no tariff duty on coffee.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But we want ships between here and South America more than anywhere else, perhaps. We have not a single American ship running to South America from this country on one of these long voyages beyond the Caribbean Sea. We have but very few vessels across the Pacific to the Orient, and the subsidy bill of the minority would be of no assistance except possibly between here and Europe, and there it would aid only foreign-built tramp vessels and vessels now running under the subsidy act of 1891, as I have already pointed out. The gentleman complained that I did not take freight ships. I am using freight ships to make the comparison, and it is a fair comparison because the person who furnished me with the statement selected the period covered by the figures without suggestion from me, and did not know for what use I desired them. Now—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is a free-trade cargo you are making a comparison of?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly; it is the only kind we can have from South America.

Brazil is one of the countries where we are especially anxious to build up our trade and to have running to that country our own ships. I find that in 1908 our imports from Brazil were valued at \$74,577,864. If all these imports had been carried in American ships, for the carrying of that vast quantity of goods American ships would have received under the Democratic substitute at the average rate of duty the munificent assistance of \$2,877,55. That sum for carrying all our imports from Brazil for an entire year.

How that Democratic substitute bill would crowd the sea with American ships struggling for the South American trade!

A vessel coming on the long voyage from South America with a cargo of coffee for the "poor man's breakfast table" of constant Democratic solicitude, of 10,000 tons, would not receive as much for the entire cargo under the proposed Democratic measure as a cheap tramp vessel from Europe would receive for carrying a single case of champagne. A vessel on one of these long voyages from South America, with a full cargo of rubber or of hides for the "poor man's shoes" would not receive as much for carrying this cargo as a foreign-built tramp ship from Europe, with a Chinese crew, would receive for carrying a single bottle of perfume for my lady's handkerchief.

This Democratic substitute bill would not even give sufficient pay to run a canoe between here and South America.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit, as I understood the gentleman, the man who sent him this evidence did not know what you wanted it for.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did you sign your own name to the letter inquiring for this information?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I certainly did.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the gentleman believe there is a single individual in the United States who got a letter from the gentleman about that subject but would know what the gentleman was up to?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I may have made a mistake in my statement and said what I did not intend, but what I meant to say was that the gentleman furnishing the figures was not told to cover any particular period.

If the gentleman thinks the Treasury Department would furnish me figures that are false, I do not agree with him. I used such material as came to my hands.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me you are minimizing yourself, because you are the most famous proponent of ship subsidy on the floor of the House, and when anybody gets a letter from you about ship subsidy they know exactly what you want.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman certainly will not, if he calls into question the correctness of the figures, call into question the fact that they are approximately correct. The gentleman himself will not call into question the statement that under this Democratic subsidy bill vessels going between here and South America would receive practically no compensation, because the goods are so largely upon the free list.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want to interrupt your speech, but I will tell you what I do know: That by just exactly that proposition we built up the second greatest merchant marine there ever was on the high seas, and we can do it again.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I beg the gentleman's pardon. He is mistaken entirely. The system under which we built up a merchant marine on the high seas was a discriminating duty upward and not downward, and I will say to the gentleman now, if he wants to enact a bill of that character, I will help him; for that bears equally upon all, whether they are goods that are free or dutiable.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The trouble with that is that in this Payne bill the tariff rates are too high now, and I will not vote to put them higher.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The difficulty with that proposition is the same as with all propositions that come from that side of the House, that when it comes to a question of voting for anything that will really assist the merchant marine you refuse to do it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no; that is not it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Democrats have had an opportunity, as I know, at least for the last seven years, to bring in some proposition here that would benefit our merchant marine, and this is the first one ever brought before the House by them. And this proposition reduces itself to an absurdity. There is not a man upon that side of the House who, after he looks at these figures, will stand upon the floor of this House and assume to defend it. Not one of you.

Mr. CARLIN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARLIN. Does that side of the House favor a ship subsidy?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am not the keeper of the consciences of this side of the House. The gentleman can go and ask the whip of the House.

Mr. CARLIN. You referred to this side of the House. Do you favor a ship subsidy bill? You have a majority there.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I doubt if we have a majority. I take issue with the gentleman on the question of fact. [Laughter.] Personally I am decidedly in favor of the bill reported by the Merchant Marine Committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did not the Republican platform of 1896, on which McKinley was elected, demand the discriminating duty, just exactly like the minority substitute which you now condemn, and did not McKinley in his letter of acceptance indorse it? And I will put another question: Did not the committee on platform in the Republican convention of 1896 vote down the proposition to have a ship subsidy? It is a little past history.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman is correct about what the platform stated, according to my memory, but that was thirteen years ago. I congratulate the Democratic party that it has arrived within thirteen years of the Republican party in its march of progress. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Probably in twenty-five years from now you will be in favor of a mail subsidy, as every other civilized nation on earth is to-day. But the discriminating duty proposed was not, as the gentleman has stated, of the character of the minority bill. The minority bill provides only

for discriminating duties downward upon goods carried in American ships. We never proposed any such plan.

Mr. KITCHIN. You say we have got to within thirteen years of the Republican party. Did the Republican party in convention or its platform ever indorse a ship subsidy such as you are now contending for, or ever indorse ship subsidy in any shape, fashion, or form?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think they indorsed it in the very words of the bill before this House, so far as the ocean mail section is concerned.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will vote for the bill if you will show that the Republican platform contained that. Is it not a fact that since 1863, in every Congress except three, there has been a bill for ship subsidy introduced by a Republican, and that a Republican Congress has failed to pass since that time any measure looking toward ship subsidy?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. KITCHIN. No measure looking toward the ship subsidy?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The subsidy law of 1891 has been on the statute books for nineteen years.

Mr. KITCHIN. That law was introduced and enacted simply as a mail subsidy.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is on the statute books, nevertheless, and it contains all the subsidy provisions of the bill now on the calendar.

Mr. KITCHIN. And if it is a subsidy in the sense in which you favor subsidy, it has failed, because you say that there are no ships between here and South America running under that act and none running under it on the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The subsidy is not sufficient to secure ships for these long voyages. This is the necessity of the pending bill. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question? Is he in favor of the subsidy bill of the minority?

Mr. KITCHIN. No, sir; I am not in favor of subsidy in any form.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Then, there is no room for argument between us upon the proposition of the minority subsidy bill.

No, the "fathers" nor the Republican party never proposed anything so utterly absurd as that proposed by the minority bill now brought forward. A discriminating duty such as our "fathers" had, adding 5 per cent to the value of all goods carried in American ships, would be of some assistance, but if a duty of 5 per cent were charged upon all goods carried in foreign ships in addition, it would help greatly. It might give us a merchant marine.

I do not believe that anyone would claim that it would be profitable under the bill now presented by the minority to waste time in discussing the injury that might arise from the violating of existing commercial treaties. Neither would it be profitable, until we have a bill of more merit than is now presented, to take time to discuss the principle of the policy of discriminating duties—a policy that at best accomplishes indirectly what a direct subsidy would do directly. Discriminating duties in favor of goods carried in American ships is wrong in principle, for its policy would seek to make this country a market for the products of other nations, while what we want is to make other nations a market for our products. So I repeat that the Democratic substitute, if it became a law, would not build a single ship in an American yard, it would not cause a single vessel to run between this country and South America or between this country and the Orient.

Upon the Pacific Ocean what assistance it would give to American vessels would be to those already running—vessels owned by railroads and operated by Chinese crews. On the Atlantic whatever assistance it might give to American vessels would be to vessels now running under the act of 1891 and paid from the National Government. If it places the flag upon a single vessel, it would be on a foreign-built tramp, manned by foreign cheap labor. It would reduce the revenues of the Government and permit American ships between here and Europe to increase freight rates. I do not believe that there is a single Member of this House upon either side of the aisle, if he had the power, who would place such a law upon our statute books for the purpose of benefiting our merchant marine. He might do it to reduce the tariff, but not to build up American shipping. To urge this bill as a remedy for the humiliating condition of our merchant marine is "to play such fantastic tricks before high heaven as make the angels weep."

No man will defend the minority bill. No man can defend that Democratic measure. To repeat what I have already said, this proposed Democratic legislation may be epitomized in a

single sentence. The Democratic bill proposes to pay a subsidy to tramp ships built in foreign yards by foreign cheap labor, run by Chinese and other cheap foreign crews, and to ships now running owned either by railroads and manned by Chinese crews or to vessels receiving subsidy under the act of 1891. To these vessels, and to these only, will a subsidy be paid by the Democratic bill if enacted into law. It would be of no value whatever between this country and South America or between this country and the Orient. If it was of any value, it would be only to encourage foreign tramp vessels with foreign crews to run between here and Europe. No man can refute the correctness of these statements. I challenge any man to demonstrate that these statements are not true. [Applause.]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY RESPONSIBLE.

The condition of our merchant marine to-day is distinctly discreditable to the Republican party. This condition is disgraceful, dangerous, and inexcusable. The Republican party can not escape the responsibility for this condition. There is no justification or extenuating circumstance for us. Not only does this humiliating condition of the merchant marine condemn us, but a long series of promises made in every national platform for many years stand unredeemed. The condition of our merchant marine to-day is solely due to the system of protection as established and maintained by the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In other words, by the system of protection we have here the highest-priced labor in all the world. [Applause on the Republican side.] The American citizen is compelled to employ this high-priced labor to build his ship, and is compelled to largely employ this high-priced labor to operate his ship—that is to say, he is compelled, without protection to his own industry, to meet the most direct and the fiercest competition of all of our industries, to employ high-priced protective labor to meet foreign free-trade competition. The Republican party should have protection both upon land and sea, or it should have free trade both upon land and sea. If protection is right, it can not be wrong to protect all. Our Nation can not permanently prosper with this unjust discrimination against one of our greatest industries, and one that is vital not only to the prosperity but to the safety of the Nation.

The Democratic party in its preaching, if not in its practice, has at least the advantage upon this question of the very questionable virtue of consistency. They stand for free trade both upon land and sea; that is, when they are talking. I know that it is said that the Republican party in its last national platform did not say that it was in favor of this particular form of legislation. It is true that it did not specify this bill by number and title; it is true that it did not specify the particular routes; it is true that it did not say that we should pay exactly \$4.60 per nautical mile for second-class ships on routes of 4,000 miles or more; but here is what the Republican party did say upon this question in the last national platform:

MERCHANT MARINE.

We adhere to the Republican doctrine of encouragement to American shipping, and urge such legislation as will advance the merchant marine prestige of the country, so essential to the national defense, the enlargement of avenues of trade, and the industrial prosperity of our own people.

There has been no honest effort made to redeem the promise in that plank of the platform. At the dictation of a small minority of our party we have refused to take any action. It is sometimes said that this legislation is desired only by those who live near the sea. Even if this were true, more than one-half of the people of the United States live within 25 miles of the ocean. This great number of American citizens certainly have some right to have their interests considered, even admitting that it is of no advantage to the interior.

If it is claimed that our platform pledge does not mean the form of legislation proposed by the bill that has been reported by the Merchant Marine Committee, then it is the duty of those who oppose it among the Republicans to bring in such legislation as they think will be in keeping with the platform. If the Republicans who are opposed to the bill reported will bring in a bill that the majority on this side think will redeem the pledges of the party, I will most willingly support such a bill, and so will the other Republicans who are in favor of the bill now upon the calendar. Until those Republicans who oppose the bill now presented are willing to present something better and submit it to caucus, they must not complain if their sincerity is doubted. The people of this country are not going to listen any longer with patience to those who are simply against something. The time has come when the American people are going to demand that Congress be in favor of something. No honest man will contend that to do nothing is an honest compliance with our platform promises. We must do something,

and we ask those Republicans who are opposed to this bill to bring before this House something better. I challenge the Republicans who are opposed to this bill to agree upon some other bill and to bring it before this House, or forever stop talking about keeping the promises of the party. I say to them: Do it, or stop talking about carrying out the Roosevelt policies. Do it, or stop talking about passing the legislation that President Taft wishes. Every Republican President for the last twenty years has urged this legislation.

Roosevelt and Taft have urged the specific legislation in the exact terms that form the main features of the bill now upon the calendar. We hear some whispers on this side of the House from some of the most active enemies of this legislation that the policies of Roosevelt are being abandoned. There was no subject that President Roosevelt urged more insistently than the exact legislation sought by the first section of this bill. His messages demonstrate this fully. How does it come about that some of the Roosevelt policies which he mentioned only in general terms are so sacred and some that he specifically recommended are to be abandoned? Can it be that the value of the Roosevelt policies is determined by their popularity in certain districts? The discreditable failure of the Republican party to keep our flag upon the ocean is the one blot upon the most glorious pages in the political history of the world. In this failure there is a difference most striking between the records of the Democratic and the Republican parties. The Republican party sometimes makes a mistake. The Democratic party is never right. A single Democratic success would be as conspicuously lonely as this, the single Republican failure. It is the only promise that stands unredeemed against the Republican party.

I realize that the upbuilding of our merchant marine—to my mind the greatest question before the American people to-day—is going to be a great undertaking. There is great wealth, great power, interest, and prejudice arrayed against it; but the Republican party has met every other great question that has come before the country for the last fifty years. Met it honestly, without evasion, and has successfully solved it. It has settled all the difficult questions in the past and settled them correctly in spite of the opposition of the Democratic party. We do not regard this merchant marine question as a partisan one. It is not so regarded to-day by the members of the Senate in either party. We would like to have our Democratic friends join us in this great work, but whether it is Democratic help or Democratic opposition, the Republican party is going to keep its platform promise. As I have said before upon the floor of this House, it is going to redeem its pledge made to the American people by placing on our statute books a law which will restore the ancient prestige and greatness of our merchant marine, a law that will cause American ships once more to traverse all the highways of the ocean, our sails to whiten every sea and our flag to fly in every port of the world. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

THE OCEAN MAIL ACT OF 1891 THAT IT IS PROPOSED TO AMEND BY THE HUMPHREY BILL.

An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into contracts for a term not less than five nor more than ten years in duration, with American citizens, for the carrying of mails on American steamships, between ports of the United States and such ports in foreign countries, the Dominion of Canada excepted, as in his judgment will best subserve and promote the postal and commercial interests of the United States, the mail service on such lines to be equitably distributed among the Atlantic, Mexican Gulf, and Pacific ports. Said contracts shall be made with the lowest responsible bidder for the performance of said service on each route, and the Postmaster-General shall have the right to reject all bids not in his opinion reasonable for the attaining of the purposes named.

Sec. 2. That before making any contract for carrying ocean mails in accordance with this act the Postmaster-General shall give public notice by advertising once a week for three months in such daily papers as he shall select in each of the cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, St. Louis, Charleston, Norfolk, Savannah, Galveston, and Mobile, and when the proposed service is to be on the Pacific Ocean, then in San Francisco, Tacoma, and Portland. Such notice shall describe the route, the time when such contract will be made, the duration of same, the size of the steamers to be used, the number of trips a year, the times of sailing, and the time when the service shall commence, which shall not be more than three years after the contract shall be let. The details of the mode of advertising and letting such contracts shall be conducted in the manner prescribed in chapter 8 of title 46 of the Revised Statutes for the letting of inland mail contracts so far as the same shall be applicable to the ocean mail service.

Sec. 3. That the vessels employed in the mail service under the provisions of this act shall be American-built steamships, owned and officered by American citizens, in conformity with existing laws, or so owned and officered and registered according to law, and upon each departure from the United States the following proportion of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, to wit: During the first two years of such contract for carrying the mails, one-fourth thereof; during the next three succeeding years, one-third thereof; and during the remaining

time of the continuance of such contract at least one-half thereof; and shall be constructed after the latest and most approved types, with all the modern improvements and appliances for ocean steamers. They shall be divided into four classes. The first class shall be iron or steel screw steamships, capable of maintaining a speed of twenty knots an hour at sea in ordinary weather, and of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 8,000 tons. No vessel except of said first class shall be accepted for said mail service under the provisions of this act between the United States and Great Britain. The second class shall be iron or steel steamships, capable of maintaining a speed of 16 knots an hour at sea in ordinary weather, and of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 5,000 tons. The third class shall be iron or steel steamships, capable of maintaining a speed of 14 knots an hour at sea in ordinary weather, and of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 2,500 tons. The fourth class shall be iron or steel or wooden steamships, capable of maintaining a speed of 12 knots an hour at sea in ordinary weather, and of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 1,500 tons. It shall be stipulated in the contract or contracts to be entered into for the said mail service that the said vessels may carry passengers with their baggage in addition to said mails and may do all ordinary business done by steamships.

Sec. 4. That all steamships of the first, second, and third classes employed as above and hereafter built shall be constructed with particular reference to prompt and economical conversion into auxiliary naval cruisers, and according to plans and specifications to be agreed upon by and between the owners and the Secretary of the Navy, and they shall be of sufficient strength and stability to carry and sustain the working and operation of at least four effective rifled cannon of a caliber of not less than 6 inches, and shall be of the highest rating known to maritime commerce. And all vessels of said three classes heretofore built and so employed shall, before they are accepted for the mail service herein provided for, be thoroughly inspected by a competent naval officer or constructor detailed for that service by the Secretary of the Navy; and such officer shall report, in writing, to the Secretary of the Navy, who shall transmit said report to the Postmaster-General; and no such vessel not approved by the Secretary of the Navy as suitable for the service required shall be employed by the Postmaster-General as provided for in this act.

Sec. 5. That the rate of compensation to be paid for such ocean mail service of the said first-class ships shall not exceed the sum of \$4 a mile, and for the second-class ships \$2 a mile, by the shortest practicable route, for each outward voyage; for the third-class ships shall not exceed \$1 a mile, and for the fourth-class ships two-thirds of a dollar a mile for the actual number of miles required by the Post-Office Department to be traveled on each outward-bound voyage: *Provided*, That in the case of failure from any cause to perform the regular voyages stipulated for in said contracts, or any of them, a pro rata deduction should be made from compensation on account of such omitted voyage or voyages; and that suitable fines and penalties may be imposed for delays or irregularities in the due performance of service according to the contract, to be determined by the Postmaster-General: *Provided further*, That no steamboat so employed and so paid for carrying the United States mails shall receive any other bounty or subsidy from the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 6. That upon each of said vessels the United States shall be entitled to have transported, free of charge, a mail messenger, whose duty it shall be to receive, sort, take in charge, and deliver the mails to and from the United States, and who shall be provided with suitable room for the accommodation of himself and mails.

Sec. 7. That officers of the United States Navy may volunteer for service on said mail vessels, and when accepted by the contractor or contractors may be assigned to such duty by the Secretary of the Navy whenever in his opinion such assignment can be made without detriment to the service, and while in said employment they shall receive furlough pay from the Government, and such other compensation from contractor or contractors as may be agreed upon by the parties: *Provided*, That they shall only be required to perform such duties as appertain to the merchant service.

Sec. 8. That said vessels shall take, as cadets or apprentices, one American-born boy under twenty-one years for each 1,000 tons gross register, and one for each majority fraction thereof, who shall be educated in the duties of seamanship, rank as petty officers, and receive such pay for their services as may be reasonable.

Sec. 9. That such steamers may be taken and used by the United States as transports or cruisers, upon payment to the owners of the fair actual value of the same at the time of the taking, and if there shall be a disagreement as to the fair actual value of the same at the time of the taking, between the United States and the owners, then the same shall be determined by two impartial appraisers, one to be appointed by each of said parties, they at the same time selecting a third, who shall act in said appraisement in case the two shall fail to agree. Approved March 3, 1891.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONS FAVORING MERCHANT-MARINE LEGISLATION.

The resolutions following were unanimously adopted by the delegates composing the Gulf States Merchant Marine League convention, which assembled at New Orleans February 14 and 15, 1910:

Whereas there is a universal demand on the part of the people of the United States of America for the restoration of the American merchant marine; and

Whereas on March 3, 1891, there was passed by the Congress of the United States an act authorizing the Postmaster-General to contract with vessels built in American shipyards, under the supervision of the Navy Department and in harmony with navy specifications, and owned and operated by Americans, to carry the American mails and pay therefor the sum of not more than \$4 per outgoing mile, said ships to be not less than 8,000 tons capacity and of not less than 20 knots speed; and

Whereas said law, which has now been in successful operation from New York, Boston, and Philadelphia for nearly twenty years, and to which is directly attributable the operation of the few ocean vessels at present flying the American flag in the foreign trade on the Atlantic Ocean, has been entirely restricted to the "short" routes to Mexico, Cuba, Europe, etc., owing to the fact that the greater rate of compensation intended for the "long" routes to South America, China, Australia, and the Philippines, and which was incorporated in the original bill, was stricken therefrom by the House of Representatives when said act was passed; and

Whereas the Humphrey bill, which has recently been reported favorably by the House Committee, provided, among other things, that compensation not exceeding \$4 per mile on routes of 4,000 miles and over be paid to 5,000-ton vessels of 16 knots speed, built and operated

under the government requirements mentioned, thus making possible the operating of said long routes; and

Whereas said Humphrey bill further provides that the total expense to be incurred in transporting said foreign mail shall not exceed the revenues derived therefrom; and

Whereas the said bill also includes a "free-ship" provision as a concession to the opinion that a large number of the American people entertain, that this method will remedy existing conditions, and likewise includes a differential tonnage tax, also believed by some to be an effective remedy for the upbuilding of our merchant marine; and the "free-ship" feature is such as safeguards the mail ships and coastwise service; and

Whereas the Humphrey bill thus treats respectfully and recognizes the various opinions of our people as to the best way of accomplishing the result which all desire and offers an opportunity for testing all the methods that have been proposed for this purpose, to the end that, through experience, the really best means may be learned; and

Whereas under our present economic system, coupled with the American standard of living, some such provisions as those contained in said Humphrey bill must be adopted by our people if we are to compete with the subsidized mail ships of foreign countries, with their cheaper-paid, cheaper-fed, and cheaper-housed crews; and

Whereas the restoration of the American merchant marine at the very earliest possible moment is the most vital problem before the American people to-day, involving, as it does, our prosperity in peace and our security in war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, as delegates to the Gulf States Merchant Marine League in convention assembled, urge upon our Senators and Representatives in the National Congress to support and vote for said measure, which, in our opinion, is the only practical beginning toward the restoration of our flag to the seas, now largely controlled by vessels of foreign countries, and which would also result in the upbuilding of a fleet of auxiliary cruisers so indispensable to our needs in the event of war; and be it further

Resolved, That the time has arrived in the history of our country when this all-important matter must be considered as a patriotic movement, that we strongly protest against its being made a partisan measure in any sense; and be it further

Resolved, That we vigorously protest against any attempt being made by any caucus to influence adversely the judgment of our Representatives in Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That we emphatically protest against the activities of such representatives of foreign shipping interests as are working for the defeat of the Humphrey bill.

PETER A. LAWTON,
Chairman Resolution Committee.

C. H. ELLIS,
HORACE TURNER,
H. H. WEFEL, JR.,
LOUIS P. BRYANT,
HORACE L. FITCHER.

NEW ORLEANS, February 15, 1910.

Fortieth annual meeting National Board of Trade, held in Washington, D. C., January 25, 26, 27, 1910.

The National Board of Trade believes that the greatest commercial question involving the interest of the entire country is in the re-creation of the American merchant marine, and it deplors that no action has been taken by Congress.

The carrying trade of the United States is practically monopolized by aliens who have established their lines from its ports to all parts of the world.

The board advocates that proper encouragement be given to creating an American-built steam and sail tonnage, so necessary to the extension and protection of the commercial growth of the country.

An adequate merchant marine is of inestimable value in times of peace and absolutely essential in times of war: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National Board of Trade:

First. That in our judgment the commercial interests of the country require prompt legislation, such as will result in the reestablishment of the American merchant marine.

Second. That we ask of Congress not only the immediate establishment of American owned and managed mail and freight lines to our dependencies and the leading commercial countries of the world, but also proper legislation which will enable our citizens to build, operate, and maintain steamers and sailing vessels on an equal footing with any other maritime power.

Adopted by vote of the meeting.

W. R. TUCKER, Secretary.

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the present reduced condition of our foreign merchant marine is a source of national weakness, lessening the efficiency of our navy, as confessed by our naval board, by 90 per cent, thus exposing us to foreign aggression and making practically impossible offensive operations against an over-sea enemy; and

Whereas lack of adequate postal and passenger facilities is greatly hindering the development of our over-sea trade, particularly in manufactured products: Therefore, both on patriotic and business grounds, be it

Resolved, That this body urge upon Congress such action as will provide sufficient postal compensation to establish swift and regular service in American-built steamships to the principal countries of South America, Africa, Australasia, Japan, China, the Philippines, and the Levant: Furthermore, as the Panama Canal is being constructed at great expense by the American people and should be used to advance American prosperity, therefore be it likewise

Resolved, That this organization memorialize Congress to secure for American-built ships flying the American flag, free passage through the canal and to provide that the ships of other nations using that waterway shall pay such tolls as will most adequately meet the interest upon the cost of constructing and the charges of maintaining said canal.

Adopted unanimously by the Dayton Chamber of Commerce at its monthly meeting January 10, 1910.

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, assembled in conference at their monthly meeting on the 6th day of January, 1910, records itself emphatically in favor of the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine.

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg recommends that the National Board of Trade urge upon Congress the consideration and passage of such legislation as will encourage and develop our merchant marine, in order that our commerce may be carried under the American flag, in vessels manned and owned by our people, and as auxiliary to our navy in time of war.

Above resolution unanimously approved by the Chamber of Commerce, at its regular meeting, December 10, 1909, for presentation to the National Board of Trade meeting, to be held in Washington, D. C., January 25, 1910.

Resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Philadelphia Bourse at a meeting held January 12, 1910, relative to the American merchant marine and indorsing the principles of House bill No. 16362, second session, Sixty-first Congress:

Whereas the national safety requires that the United States shall maintain a strong and efficient navy; and

Whereas the efficiency of the navy is absolutely dependent upon the auxiliary ships required for transport of men, munitions, and supplies; and

Whereas the American merchant marine is notoriously deficient in number and character of ships suited for the purpose of serving as auxiliaries to our war navy; and

Whereas ships of the type required for such use could not be purchased after a declaration of war, and in consequence of such inability and the nonexistence of a sufficient number of American merchant ships a large part of our naval fleet would be rendered helpless and become non-effective; and

Whereas it is undoubtedly better and cheaper for the Government to create such a fleet of auxiliary ships available for naval use at all times and thoroughly up to date and well maintained, by the payment of a moderate retaining fee or subsidy, than for the Government to itself own and maintain in idleness a fleet sufficient for the purpose; and

Whereas the commerce of the United States has reached a point where expansion outwards is a necessity and such foreign commerce demands and can not successfully exist without established lines of communication by sea: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Philadelphia Bourse heartily indorses the principles underlying House bill No. 16362, introduced in the second session of the Sixty-first Congress on January 4, 1910, being a bill "to promote the American merchant marine in foreign trade and the national defense," etc., and earnestly urges upon the representatives of the people in the Congress to enact the said bill, or one incorporating substantially the same features, into law.

WASHINGTON CAMP, No. 345, PENNSYLVANIA,
PATRIOTIC ORDER SONS OF AMERICA,
Germantown (Philadelphia), Pa., January 6, 1910.

Congressman HUMPHREY:

SIR: On above date this camp heartily and unanimously adopted the following:

Resolved, That we heartily indorse and urge the adoption by Congress of the ship-subsidy bill introduced in the House of Congress on Tuesday, January 4, 1910, by Representative HUMPHREY, of Washington.

W. P. HUMMEL,
C. J. WENTZ,
G. M. CHATBURN,

Committee Governing Resolutions.

Official seal of the camp affixed.

Attest:
[SEAL.]

T. H. KEAST, Recording Secretary.

GERMANTOWN, PHILADELPHIA, January 17, 1910.

Congressman WILLIAM E. HUMPHREY.

DEAR SIR: Our camp's resolution indorsing your great ship-subsidy bill was published in the North American, of Philadelphia, as per clipping inclosed. The American flag over American ships should be on every sea and in every port of the world.

Attest:

[SEAL.]

T. H. KEAST, Recording Secretary.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTH AMERICAN:

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted this evening at a stated meeting of Washington Camp, No. 345, P. O. S. of A., of Germantown, Philadelphia:

Whereas we have followed with interest the North American's exposé of the "National stock" scheme;

Resolved, That this camp thanks and also congratulates The North American as one of the greatest bulwarks of American principles; and further

Resolved, That we heartily indorse and urge the adoption by Congress of the ship-subsidy bill introduced in the House on January 4, 1910, by Representative HUMPHREY, of Washington.

Official seal of the camp affixed.

W. P. HUMMEL,
C. J. WENTZ,
G. M. CHATBURN,

Committee Governing Resolutions.

GERMANTOWN, PHILADELPHIA, January 6, 1910.

THE SPRINGFIELD COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Springfield, Ohio, January 7, 1910.

HON. W. E. HUMPHREY,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed please find copy of resolutions passed by the Commercial Club of this city at their meeting January 6, 1910, relative to your bill, No. 10941.

We sincerely trust that said resolutions may be of some service to you in your efforts to have the bill become a law.

Yours, very truly,

J. FRED ANDERSON, Secretary.

THE SPRINGFIELD COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Springfield, Ohio, January 7, 1910.

At a meeting of the Springfield Commercial Club, held January 6, 1910, the undersigned committee was appointed to draft a suitable resolution indorsing House resolution No. 10941, offered by Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington, entitled "A bill to promote the American merchant marine in foreign trade and the national defense, and for other purposes." Representing the Springfield Commercial Club, composed of a large majority of the manufacturers and merchants of Springfield, as you are well aware, we herewith notify you of the unanimous passage of a resolution indorsing the above measure. We are authorized by the Commercial Club to request you to use your utmost effort by voice and vote to secure the passage of this measure. Your knowledge of the industrial interests of your district will lead you to realize and appreciate the importance of this measure to it.

Very respectfully,

T. E. MONTANUS,
CHAS. S. KAY,
CHAS. P. KALBFUS,
Committee.

To Hon. J. WARREN KEIFER,
Member of Congress Seventh District,
Washington, D. C.

Be it resolved, That we, the executive committee of the National Piano Dealers' Association of America, urge the passage by Congress of the measure now pending known as the Humphrey ocean-mail bill, which would do much to bring a material development of our merchant navy; and be it further

Resolved, That it be the purpose and interest of the individual members of these committees to assist in every possible way to the end that this bill shall become a law, believing that its passage would be of great benefit to the people of the United States.

Passed at the National Piano Dealers' Association convention, January 18, 1910.

Be it resolved, That we, the members of the Philadelphia Piano Trade Association, urge the passage by Congress of the measure now pending known as the Humphrey ocean-mail bill, which would do much to bring a material development of our merchant navy; and be it further

Resolved, That it be the purpose and interest of the individual members of this association to assist in every way possible to the end that this bill shall become a law, believing that its passage would be of great benefit to the people of the United States.

Philadelphia Piano Trade Association: Blasius & Sons, 1618 Chestnut street; James Bellak's Sons, 1129 Chestnut street; Cunningham Piano Company, 1101 Chestnut street; Estey Company, 1118 Chestnut street; Jacobs Brothers, 1029 Chestnut street; Ludwig Piano Company, 1105 Chestnut street; Henry F. Miller & Sons' Piano Company, 1107 Chestnut street; F. A. North Company, 1306 Chestnut street; Painter & Ewing, 1105 Spring Garden street; J. G. Ramsdell & Son, 1305 Walnut street; N. Stetson & Co., 1111 Chestnut street; N. Snellenberg & Co., Eleventh and Market streets; G. Herzberg, 1717 Chestnut street; H. A. Weyman & Son, 1006 Chestnut street.

I, Charles E. Miller, president of the Commercial Club (Incorporated), of the city of South Bend, in the county of Pacific and State of Washington, do hereby certify that at a meeting of said body, regularly called and held at the city hall in said city of South Bend, on Friday, December 31, A. D. 1909, the following resolution was regularly introduced, moved, seconded, and unanimously passed, to wit:

Whereas the encouragement and upbuilding of the ocean commerce is of vital importance to the Pacific coast, and laws which will encompass this object will reopen our shipyards and all allied interests will immediately feel the effect of a revival of American shipping, and the bill introduced in Congress by the Hon. W. E. Humphrey, and now pending, is a step in the right direction to secure this relief: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we indorse the proposed legislation, known as the Humphrey ship-subsidy bill, as necessary, intelligent, and effective in its objects, and that we respectfully urge the Members of Congress from the State of Washington to use all just means at their command to secure its passage.

Dated South Bend, Wash., January 1, A. D. 1910.

CHAS. E. MILLER, President.

Attest:

A. S. BARTLETT, Secretary pro tempore.

DOCK AND COTTON MEN'S COUNCIL,
New Orleans, January —, 1910.

At a regular meeting held on December 30, 1909, the following resolutions were adopted:

Whereas the carrying trade for the products of the United States is almost entirely in the hands of other countries, who control foreign markets by means of subsidized ships; and

Whereas no relief can come to the manufacturers, merchants, and farmers of the United States until the American flag may be found floating from vessels on every sea and in every foreign port: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Dock and Cotton Men's Council, That Congress be memorialized and requested to enact such legislation as will tend to the reestablishment of the American merchant marine in such form as will advance the mercantile and other interests of the United States, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives of Louisiana in Congress, with the request that they present same to the Senate and House of Representatives, and support such bill or bills having the above purpose in view, as may best cause laws to be enacted on the subject; and be it further

Resolved, That the commercial bodies of the Gulf ports direct the attention of their Senators and Representatives to the importance of providing new legislation for the rebuilding of American merchant marine.

The following is the text of a resolution adopted by the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association No. 98, of New Orleans, and the Crescent City Local, No. 15, Masters, Mates, and Pilots:

Whereas the carrying trade for the products of the United States is almost entirely in the hands of other countries, who control the foreign markets by means of subsidized ships; and

Whereas no relief can come to the manufacturers, merchants, farmers, and mariners of the United States until the American flag may be found floating from merchant vessels on every sea and in every foreign port: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Crescent City Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, No. 15, That Congress be memorialized to and requested to enact such legislation as will tend to the reestablishment of the American merchant marine in such form as will advance the licensed officers of merchant vessels and other mercantile interests of the United States, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives of Louisiana in Congress, with the request that they support such bill or bills as have the above purpose in view.

Resolution of American Mining Congress, adopted at Goldfield (Nev.) session, September 27 to October 2, 1909:

Whereas it is the sense of the American Mining Congress that the creation of a great merchant marine will benefit the mineral industry by expanding markets and by attracting foreign ores, mattes, and other metallic products to this country for reduction by reason of the advantages of ballast rates which are afforded for such products when a large shipping exists; and

Whereas such imports would enlarge the opportunities for the investment of capital in smelters and refineries, and thereby provide a wider and more advantageous market for domestic ores and mattes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Mining Congress respectfully request the President of the United States to make known to Congress the sentiment of this organization in favor of stimulating the growth of an American merchant marine by suitable legislation.

Resolved, That this association recommends to Congress the passage of a bill similar to the ocean-mail bill introduced in the last Congress and advocated by President Taft, providing for sufficient postal compensation to establish a swift and regular service in American-built steamships to the principal countries of South America and to the ports of Australasia, Japan, China, and the Philippines.

Adopted at the fourteenth annual convention of the National Association of Manufacturers, New York, May 17, 18, 19, 1909.

Resolution of New Orleans Stock Exchange, adopted December 22, 1909:

Whereas the Gulf States are vitally interested in the restoration of the American flag to the high seas on account of the expected large increase in tonnage from all parts of the world which will come inevitably with the opening of the Panama Canal, about 1915; and

Whereas there will undoubtedly be such an impetus to commerce as will make the Gulf ports the most important in the United States when this long-hoped-for event comes to pass: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Orleans Stock Exchange gives its emphatic support to the Humphrey ocean mail bill, and urges its Representatives in Congress to support the passage of the aforesaid bill.

Resolutions of the Oakland (Cal.) Chamber of Congress, December 7, 1909:

Whereas the disappearance almost entirely of the American flag from the oceans of the world has resulted in great losses to the financial, commercial, and manufacturing interests of our entire country, as well as to our national pride; and

Whereas this country would be helpless to move its exports and imports if the marine tonnage of other nations was withdrawn from neutral service by reason of war or for any other reason; and

Whereas California, with its great length of coast line and splendid harbors, is vitally interested in maritime commerce and is desirous of moving its products in vessels flying the American flag: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce, in meeting assembled, This date indorses the act (No. 2694) of the House of Representatives, now before Congress in session assembled and introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington, which calls for a modification of the postal act of 1891, by amendment, which, if it becomes a law, will very materially tend to restore the American flag over the foreign trade and without cost to the country, and will permit American interests to participate in trade running into millions of dollars from which it is now excluded, besides establishing direct communication with countries with which such communication does not now exist; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oakland Chamber of Congress prays that Congress in its wisdom will, by passing this act, give immediate relief, and again restore the American flag upon the oceans; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to our Representatives in Congress, with a request that they use their utmost endeavors to provide for a renewal of the American flag upon the oceans of the world.

Resolutions of Crescent City Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, No. 15, passed December 28, 1909:

Whereas the carrying trade for the products of the United States is almost entirely in the hands of other countries, who control foreign markets by means of subsidized ships; and

Whereas no relief can come to the manufacturers, merchants, farmers, and mariners of the United States until the American flag may be found floating on merchant vessels on every sea and in every foreign port; and

Whereas it is the desire to accomplish the construction of our American ships in the shipyards of America, so that skilled American mechanics and artisans of the shipbuilding trade may have increased opportunities for work; and

Whereas there has been a feeling of lethargy among our Senators and Representatives in Washington toward legislation creating an auxiliary to our navy of American bottoms, which can be used as transports, troops ships, dispatch boats, colliers, etc.; and

Whereas it is the unanimous sentiment among Americans engaged in the maritime service that American officers and seamen be employed on ships owned and operated by Americans. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the trades of the maritime industries of the United States both deplore and condemn the policy of our national Representatives in discouraging the opinion of the brawn and sinew of our Nation in favor of American shipping legislation; and be it further

Resolved, by the Crescent City Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, No. 15, That Congress be memorialized and requested to enact such legislation as would tend to the reestablishment of the American merchant marine in such form as will advance licensed officers of merchant

vessels and other mercantile interests of the United States, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives of Louisiana in Congress, with the request that they support such bill or bills having above purpose in view.

HARRY L. MACPHERSON, *President.*
C. A. DELCOZAL, *Secretary.*

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the recent meeting of the Musical Industry Merchant Marine League, held at the Hotel Astor, Tuesday, December 28, 1909:

Resolved, That the feeling of the officers and members of the executive committee of the Musical Industry Merchant Marine League is in accord with the desire of those members of our industry who are striving for deep waterways systems, and their belief is that the greater promotion of the industries and resources of any one section of our country is of benefit to all other sections.

An appreciation of the endeavors of those working for the advancement of trade and commerce should be and is expressed. Support is offered, as far as it is within the power, individually, of the officers of the league and members of the executive committee.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Resolved, That the St. Paul Commercial Club does hereby indorse and urge the passage by Congress of the bill amending the ocean mail act, which amendment is known as the Humphrey bill, as amended by the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That the total expenditure for foreign mail service in any one year shall not exceed the estimated revenue therefrom for that year."

Whereas the carrying trade for the products of the United States is almost entirely in the hands of other countries, who control foreign markets by means of subsidized ships; and

Whereas no relief can come to the manufacturers, merchants, and farmers of the United States until the American flag may be found floating from merchant vessels on every sea and in every foreign port: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Merchants' Marine League of Louisiana, That Congress be memorialized and requested to enact such legislation as will tend to the reestablishment of the American merchant marine in such form as will advance the mercantile and other interests of the United States, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives of Louisiana in Congress, with the request that they present same to the Senate and House of Representatives, and support such bill or bills having the above purpose in view as may best cause laws to be enacted on the subject; and be it further

Resolved, That the commercial bodies of the Gulf ports direct the attention of their Senators and Representatives to the importance of providing new legislation for the rebuilding of American merchant marine.

TRENTON, March 2.

Senator Ackerman, majority leader of the upper house, yesterday introduced the following concurrent resolution in favor of a ship-subsidy appropriation by Congress:

Whereas the time has come to act seriously to work to make the ocean mail service of the United States correspond with its prestige and commercial development; and

Whereas wise statesmanship recognizes the fact that ocean steamships and their crews required for such service are valuable additions to the sea power of a nation, and that it is the duty of a first-class power, as far as practicable, to carry its ocean mail under its own flag; and

Whereas the legitimate expenditure of public money for the necessary performance of the ocean mail service of the Nation will create great benefits to our foreign commerce, to the shipbuilding industry, and to the domestic trade of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved (the house of assembly concurring), That the people of the State of New Jersey, as represented by their legislature, earnestly and respectfully request their Representatives in Congress to use their influence to extend the provisions of the ocean-mail act of 1891, which act has stood some years free from successful criticism of its principle and purpose, so that the Postmaster-General may be permitted to contract with American vessels for the transportation of American mails to South American, Australian, and oriental ports, thus creating an opportunity which may place the United States in the first rank of successful maritime powers; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to each one of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Resolutions adopted by members of the Chattanooga Manufacturers' Association:

Whereas the almost total decadence of the American merchant marine, exclusive of our coastwise shipping, is a matter of vital interest to American commercial progress; and

Whereas the commercial supremacy of the United States is seriously threatened by reason of the superior traffic facilities enjoyed by European nations with the people of the American continent and the countries of the Far East; and

Whereas the governments of other nations engaged in international commerce are aiding and assisting their merchant marine by various rebates and subsidies, thereby making it possible for their ships to drive our commercial vessels from the high seas, and compel American producers to export their goods in foreign bottoms, a condition which, notwithstanding our natural resources, prevents us from selling our products abroad and gives to the foreign lands the trade which, under favorable conditions, would belong to the United States; and

Whereas the United States Navy, of which this Nation is justly proud, is compelled to rely upon vessels flying foreign flags to supply them with fuel on any extended cruise because of the fact that there are no available merchant vessels of American register for this purpose, which condition would, in time of war, seriously hamper, if not absolutely destroy, the efficiency of our navy; and

Whereas the growth and development of the United States demands increased facilities for commerce with the nations of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the manufacturers and business men of Chattanooga, Tenn., in meeting assembled, do hereby respectfully petition the

Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will most effectually change these conditions and encourage the rehabilitation of our merchant marine.

We believe the bill introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, of Washington, on January 4, in the House of Representatives, to be a step in the direction of promoting American interests, both in commerce and for the national defense, and we respectfully urge our Representatives from Tennessee to work and vote for the passage of this measure.

Resolved, further, That a copy of these resolutions be suitably prepared and presented to the Representatives and Senators from Tennessee, and that a copy of the same be forwarded to the President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate of the United States.

Respectfully submitted this 22d day of February, 1910.

Resolutions adopted by the American Hardware Manufacturers' Association at its annual meeting held at Atlantic City, N. J., October 15, 1909:

Whereas this association in convention in Atlantic City November 20, 1903, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas efforts have been and are being made to revive the American merchant marine through directing public attention to the need of such action, thus impressing upon the Congress of the United States the necessity of passing a bill providing for the payment of a reasonable subsidy to American shipping interests: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association recognizes in this movement benefits for American industry, as well as to the shipping interests, and indorses the movement as worthy of the favorable action of Congress.

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be sent to the proper committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and also to all commercial and other bodies interested in foreign commerce;" and

Whereas President Taft in a recent public address revives interest in this most important matter; be it therefore

Resolved, That we now reaffirm the position taken by us in 1903 and urge the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will effectually rehabilitate the American merchant marine.

The following resolution was adopted by the Pittsburg (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce at its regular monthly meeting, December 15, 1909:

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg recommends that the National Board of Trade urge upon Congress the consideration and passage of such legislation as will encourage and develop our merchant marine, in order that our commerce may be carried under the American flag, in vessels manned and owned by our people and as auxiliary to our navy in time of war.

Resolutions adopted by the Illinois Manufacturers' Association on January 22, 1909, at one of the largest and most enthusiastic meetings ever held in the city of Chicago:

Whereas the national neglect of the American merchant marine in overseas trade has brought on a condition that menaces not only the prosperity but the actual security of the United States, as witness the humiliating dependence of our battle-ship fleet in its voyage around the world on foreign colliers that could not lawfully be employed in time of war; and

Whereas this country is now losing hundreds of millions of dollars yearly because of the lack of proper facilities to carry its own mail and express, passengers, and merchandise to points with which we have no adequate means of communication; and

Whereas the American people need a naval reserve of American ships and sailors and need to keep at home in the channels of American trade and industry these millions of money now being paid to the ships of foreign governments, our rivals in commerce and possible enemies in war; and

Whereas there are now pending in the House of Representatives several measures that would, if passed, help materially to give us facilities that would be of the greatest benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, benefiting both capital and labor without in any way being a burden upon the taxpayers of the country; and

Whereas every President of the United States, from Washington to Taft, has declared in more or less emphatic terms for government action in this direction; and

Whereas national and local organizations, representing practically every phase of our financial, commercial, and industrial life, have repeatedly adopted strong resolutions favoring immediate action; and

Whereas one of these—namely, the bill amending the ocean mail act of March 3, 1891—has passed the United States Senate without a dissenting vote and is now pending before the House Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads; and

Whereas American people, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, are constructing the Panama Canal to connect the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans; and

Whereas without American merchant ships to use this canal these vast expenditures for this construction will prove to have only been a subsidy to the ships and trade of foreign governments: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the great necessity of our country right now is direct, swift, and regular steamship communication under the American flag with the chief countries of South America, Australasia, and the Orient, and that to this end this ocean mail bill should be immediately taken up and passed by the House of Representatives; and be it

Resolved, That as another step toward the restoration of our shipping Congress should at once extend our coastwise laws to Panama and the Philippine Islands; and be it

Resolved, That this meeting warmly commends the loyal support given this cause upon all occasions by the President and Vice-President of the United States, the entire Cabinet and all Members of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House, the chairman and many members of the House Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and a large number of citizens prominent in public and private life throughout the entire country; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and the board of directors of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association be requested to immediately transmit these resolutions to our Representatives in Congress and urge upon them the necessity of giving the subject referred to their hearty support.

Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the commercial and industrial organizations of Indiana, at Indianapolis, February 5, 1909:

Resolved, That whereas the need of a merchant marine under the American flag to carry our mails, passengers, express, and commodities to foreign countries with which we now have no direct communication has been repeatedly urged for many years by scores of national, state, and local business men's associations; and

Whereas the American Navy needs and must have a strong contingent of American ships as an auxiliary, as without such ships our navy would be ineffective and absolutely useless in time of war; and

Whereas the pending ocean-mail bill, which has passed the Senate unanimously as a nonpartisan measure and is now pending before the House Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, of which committee our distinguished fellow-citizen, the Hon. Jesse Overstreet, is chairman, is an amendment to the act of March 3, 1891, which bill was advocated and signed by President Benjamin Harrison: Therefore be it

Resolved, That as a means of prosperity in peace and security in war we respectfully urge our Representatives in Congress to support the measure referred to.

The following resolution was adopted by the Kansas State Retail Merchants' Association, in convention assembled, at Hutchinson, Kans., January 20 and 21, 1909:

Whereas the enactment into law of the bill amending the act of March 3, 1908, recommended by President Roosevelt, passed unanimously by the United States Senate and now pending before the House Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, with reference to our ocean mail and known as S. 28 would, in the judgment of the members of this convention, redound to the advantage of all citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the people of Kansas are anxious to promote any legislation which either directly or indirectly will advance the mercantile interests of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we heartily indorse said bill and that the secretary of this association be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each Senator and Congressman in the United States, urging their support to same.

O. M. BABCOCK,
J. B. TAYLOR,
AUF. HOHN,
Committee.

Resolution adopted by New York Chamber of Commerce, January 2, 1908:

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, on December 6, 1906, expressed itself in favor of the payment of a liberal postal subsidy for the establishment of quick, frequent, and direct mail communication with the countries of South America as one of the elements of importance in the promotion of commercial intercourse with these countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the chamber approve of the bills S. 28, introduced by Mr. GALLINGER, and H. R. 4068, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, authorizing the Postmaster-General to pay for ocean mail service under the act of March 3, 1891, in vessels of the second class on routes across the Pacific Ocean, or to ports of the South Atlantic, 4,000 miles or more in length, outward voyage, at a rate per mile not exceeding the rate applicable to vessels of the first class, as provided in said act.

Resolutions adopted by Portland (Me.) Board of Trade, January 13, 1908:

Resolved, That the decadence of American shipping and shipbuilding, and the almost entire monopoly of the deep-sea carrying trade by vessels of foreign nations has become a serious menace to the welfare and prosperity of this country.

Our foreign commerce for the year 1907, amounting to over three and one-half billions of dollars in value, has all but a very small percentage been transacted by foreign carriers.

The amount paid for freight, carrying of mails, transportation of passengers, etc., is estimated at over \$250,000,000. To build the necessary tonnage to handle this immense volume of business would furnish employment to 100,000 skilled workmen, and require ten years' time for our shipyards to duplicate.

Resolved, That we believe it most desirable that Congress give this matter its early consideration to the end that in some way practical relief will be afforded this condition, both in the carrying trade and to shipbuilding; that this immense business may be turned over to our own ships, and once again infuse new life and energy into our almost silent shipyards.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the Merchant Marine League of Cleveland and also to our marine Congressmen, asking their earnest cooperation in forwarding this important measure.

Resolutions adopted by New York Board of Trade and Transportation, December 11, 1907:

Whereas the American merchant marine in the foreign trade has practically disappeared from the ocean, and the United States Government was compelled to charter vessels flying the flags of other nations to transport necessary supplies and coal for the use of the American fleet on its cruise to the Pacific: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That while we refrain from urging the adoption of any specific plan for restoring the American merchant marine, we believe that the necessity of depending upon the colliers and other auxiliaries of other nations in the cruise of the American fleet to the Pacific is not only humiliating to the American people, and invites disaster, and we most earnestly urge upon Congress the great importance of immediately adopting measures which will insure the sailing under the American flag, whether owned by the Government or citizens, of a sufficient number of transports and colliers, or vessels adapted to these uses, to make the American fleet independent of foreign vessels, both in peace and war.

Resolved, That the president be and is authorized to appoint delegates, in his discretion, to attend the convention called by the Merchant Marine League of the United States, to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, on December 21st instant, to urge the necessity of immediate legislation by the Congress of the United States for the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine in the foreign trade.

Resolution adopted by Spokane Chamber of Commerce, December 10, 1907:

Resolved by the board of trustees and members assembled of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, That we most heartily indorse the sentiments expressed by the Merchant Marine League of the United States relative to the vital need of national legislation to encourage the building of merchant ships by American capital and the manning of same by American seamen.

The lack of American owned and manned freight-carrying ocean vessels, if allowed to continue, would be a menace to our naval efficiency in time of war. We believe that government aid, properly safeguarded, is imperative if the commercial life of the nation is to reach its fullest development.

Resolutions adopted by Indianapolis Board of Trade, November 21, 1907:

Whereas the industrial interests of Indianapolis, as well as other localities, are largely affected by transportation and mail facilities with foreign countries, incident to the great extent of export manufacturers and otherwise; and

Whereas the feature of time and frequency in the transmission of communications upon which business interests are dependent is one of special importance, so that whatever may serve to lessen the period of time necessary to consummate such communications by mail facilities has a direct bearing upon the industrial interests of our locality and of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That to the end of securing facility for more frequent mail communication between the United States, South America, and oriental ports, the rate of pay for ocean-mail service now provided for ships of the first class, under the act of March 3, 1891, not to exceed \$4 a mile, shall be applicable to ships of the second class, now allowed a rate of \$2 per mile, which rate for ships of the second class has failed to induce the needful mail service for them: Therefore

Resolved by the Indianapolis Board of Trade, That Congress be urged to authorize the Postmaster-General, at his discretion, to apply to ships of the second class the same rate of mail pay provided for ships of the first class, when such allowance to second-class ships will secure extension of mail facilities with South America and oriental ports.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, the Postmaster-General, to the Secretary of State, and to each Congressman from Indiana, and that said Members of Congress be, and are hereby, earnestly requested to use their best endeavors to secure legislation suggested in these resolutions.

Resolution adopted by Commercial Club of Topeka, Kans., December 17, 1907:

Resolved, by the Commercial Club of Topeka, Kans., That we are in favor of national legislation for the upbuilding of our shipping communication with foreign countries, as advocated by the Merchant Marine League of the United States, and that we specially favor swift and regular American ocean-mail lines to South America and the Orient, and that the rates of compensation for ships of speed suitable for South American and Orient service be so increased that American merchants can ship American-made goods on vessels as good as those now run from Europe under the mail pay of European governments.

Resolutions adopted by Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, November 5, 1907:

Whereas the industrial interests of Cincinnati, as well as other localities, are largely affected by transportation and mail facilities with foreign countries, incident to the great extent of export business in lines of manufactures and otherwise; and

Whereas the feature of time and of frequency in the transmission of communications upon which business interests are dependent is one of especial importance, so that whatever may serve to lessen the period of time necessary to consummate such communication by mail facilities has a direct bearing upon the industrial interests of our locality and of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That to the end of securing facility for more frequent mail communication between the United States and South American ports, the rate of pay for ocean-mail service now provided for ships of the first-class, under the act of March 3, 1891, not to exceed \$4 a mile, shall be applicable to ships of the second-class, now allowed a rate of \$2 a mile, which rate for ships of the second-class has failed to induce the needful mail service from them: Therefore

Resolved by the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, That Congress be urged to authorize the Postmaster-General, at his discretion, to apply to ships of the second class the same rate of mail pay provided for ships of the first class when such allowance to second-class ships will secure extension of mail facilities with South America and oriental ports.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, to the Postmaster-General, to the Secretary of State, and to each Congressman from Ohio, and that said Members of Congress be, and are hereby, earnestly requested to use their best endeavors to secure the legislation suggested in these resolutions.

Resolution of the National Board of Trade, adopted January 18, 1905:

Whereas the American people are sprung from the greatest seafaring races of the world and have most notably exemplified, both by commerce and in war upon the sea, the skill and courage of their ancestry; and

Whereas the great States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois have been largely developed by the railroad systems which were built by the concentrated capital that grew out of the seagoing foreign commerce of the people earned in the first half of the nineteenth century; and

Whereas the far West depends for its communications on transcontinental railways, which were called into being by subsidies from the National Treasury; and

Whereas a congressional commission has, at large expense and with great patience and personal attention, spent months of time and thousands of miles of travel in examination of the causes of the disgraceful decay of American commerce, and as a product of their labor have proposed a remedy for this decay in Senate bill 6291, by which a threefold purpose may be obtained, which purpose is expressed, firstly, in the creation of a naval militia reserve; secondly, in the creation of a labor

equalization allowance, by which American labor on the ocean may compete, without degradation, with the seamen of Europe and Asia; thirdly, in the authority to the Post-Office Department to spend such sums as will be sufficient to provide direct postal service with the ports of South Africa, South America, and Asia without attempting competition with the extravagant sums paid by foreign governments for the service between British and north seaports and those on our Atlantic seaboard: Therefore

Resolved, That the National Board of Trade heartily commends the work of the Congressional Marine Commission, and urges upon Congress the enactment, at the earliest possible date, of Senate bill 6291.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MASTERS AND
PILOTS OF STEAM VESSELS,
January, 1905.

Whereas American ships now convey only 10 per cent of the imports and exports of the United States, while 90 per cent are conveyed in foreign ships, thus building up at the expense of the American people the naval reserve of foreign nations; and

Whereas this condition of affairs deprives American officers and seamen of employment in ocean trade, and thus prevents the development of an adequate naval reserve in our own country: Therefore

Resolved, That the American Association of Masters and Pilots of Steam Vessels, realizing the need of American deep-sea shipping and the value of a strong merchant fleet to the Nation in peace or war, heartily commends the work of the Merchant Marine Commission, authorized by Congress on the recommendation of the President, and urges the prompt enactment of Senate bill 6291, reported by the commission, "to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage."

PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE,
February 2, 1905.

To the honorable the Senate and House of
Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

This memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade respectfully represents:

That this board for many years, dating back to the time when American shipping in the foreign trade commenced showing a marked and rapid decline in tonnage, has persistently and earnestly petitioned your humble bodies to enact such legislation as might tend to again place upon the seas the flag of our country on vessels of American build and have it borne to the ports of the world.

That the board earnestly favored the appointment by Congress of the Merchant Marine Commission, and believes that this advocacy was wise and timely, as shown by the intelligent and exhaustive report of the majority of the said commission submitted to Congress.

That the recommendations as presented by the majority report mentioned above, it is believed, if promptly adopted, will aid materially in rehabilitating our merchant marine: Therefore

Your memorialist, the Philadelphia Board of Trade, earnestly petitions your honorable bodies to promptly enact at this session of Congress the bill presented for its consideration by direction of the Merchant Marine Commission (Senate bill 6291), "to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage."

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF SAN FRANCISCO,
February 3, 1905.

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco has ever advocated the interests of the merchant marine of the United States and steadfastly believes that all means should be adopted whereby it may ultimately flourish in consonance with our national greatness, and has heretofore memorialized Congress to this effect; and

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco also believes that the sea power of the United States should be maintained and strengthened, and particularly by making provision so that our merchant marine may be auxiliary to our navy should the emergency require: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to support and secure the enactment of legislation substantially as provided for in Senate bill 6291, Fifty-eighth Congress, third session, entitled "To promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean line mails to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage."

AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
May 11, 1905.

Resolved, That more American ships to deliver the products of American factories are indispensable to a full development of our export trade with foreign lands, and especially with South America and the Orient.

Resolved, That the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association heartily commends the frank and thorough report of President Roosevelt's merchant marine commission, and urges Congress at the next session to enact vigorous legislation for the upbuilding of American shipping in overseas trade, as a most effective method of commercial expansion. The American people must no longer be dependent upon the flags of England, France, and Germany, their mercantile competitors, for the means of reaching the neutral markets of the world.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
May 17, 1905.

Whereas this association has annually for several years plead for the restoration of the merchant marine, now imperative and indispensable for our present and future commerce, our exports having reached nearly a total of a billion and a half and our imports over a billion and still increasing; and

Whereas our flag has almost entirely disappeared from the high seas, 92 per cent of our entire foreign commerce having been transported in

foreign-built vessels in 1903 and over 95 per cent in 1904, including naturalized steamships under American registration; and

Whereas at the Fifty-eighth Congress a commission was created for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon the merchant-marine necessities of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Manufacturers commends the work of the Merchant Marine Commission, heartily approves the passage of a bill for the upbuilding of American shipping in the foreign trade for our passengers, mails, and war service, and requests Congress to promptly take action on such a bill, thereby making possible an American marine power for the present and future expansion of our great commerce and as an auxiliary to our navy.

BOARD OF TRADE OF THE STATE OF MAINE,
September 22, 1905.

Whereas for many years the State of Maine was famous for its shipbuilding, the products of its forests and the skill of its mechanics, being known the world over for the safety, speed, and beauty of its ships; and

Whereas a century ago and for a period of over thirty years American ships carried an average of 90 per cent of our entire foreign commerce; they were unrivaled in construction; they were commanded, officered, and manned by men who were unequalled for their ability, and whose courage and intrepidity have repeatedly shed imperishable renown upon the pages of our history, in all of which Maine ships and Maine men bore a conspicuous and glorious part; and

Whereas while during the past half century the growth of our land industries has been the marvel of mankind, while our domestic carrying has by national law been confined to American vessels, which have increased and prospered under freight rates that have been steadily reduced under the competition of our own people, our shipping in the foreign trade has shrunk to but one-third of its former proportions, being now of less tonnage than it was in 1810; and

Whereas despite the wonderful growth of our foreign commerce, now approaching in value \$3,000,000,000 annually and requiring a shipping of fully 6,000,000 of tons for its ocean transportation, shipbuilding in the United States for the foreign trade has practically ceased; our Maine shipyards are shut down and, in many places, dismantled; our enterprising builders are facing ruin; our owners of deep-sea shipping are laying up, selling, or facing constant losses in the operation of their vessels; our shipmasters, officers, and seamen are without employment in the foreign trade; our young men are no longer bred to the sea, and we are threatened with extinction in the world's carrying trade; and

Whereas our almost complete dependence upon foreign shipping for the transportation of our growing surplus products to distant markets is a grave menace to the stability and safety of our foreign trade, since war between any of the great European powers—always possible—upon whose ships we rely for our ocean carrying would suddenly and indefinitely deprive us of the means with which to market our exports and cause disaster and widespread losses in every avenue of trade; and

Whereas our foreign commerce at present affords employment for foreign vessels that are so constructed as to be available as auxiliaries to the navies of the nations whose flags they fly, their officers and seamen being trained and educated at our expense as a reserve in time of need for our rivals and our possible enemies, while our Government is lacking in similar resource that is essential to our national defense; and

Whereas upon President Roosevelt's urgent recommendation, the last Congress appointed a commission which thoroughly investigated the condition and needs of American shipping, their report and their bill to carry into effect their recommendations being now ready for presentation to the coming Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Maine State Board of Trade, That we keenly feel the loss to the Nation and to our State resulting from our humiliating decay and impotence; that we appreciate the thorough work of the congressional Merchant Marine Commission, which we commend to the earliest possible and most earnest consideration of Congress; that we are grateful of the splendid past services of Maine's Senators and Representatives in Congress and confidently rely upon them to take the lead in the coming Congress in presenting and urging the promptest possible enactment of adequate legislation for the upbuilding and prosperous and permanent development of our deep-sea shipping, and we especially depend upon the commanding influence, deep interest, and solicitous concern of President Roosevelt in the rehabilitation of our merchant marine to help place upon our national statutes provisions for an effective and enduring American maritime policy; and be it further

Resolved, That the president and secretary be requested to send attested copies of these resolutions to President Roosevelt, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to the press.

AMERICAN BANKERS' ASSOCIATION,
October 12, 1905.

Resolved by the American Bankers' Association, assembled:
1. That the members of this association are deeply interested in any measure which will promote the interest of the whole country commercially and industrially, and especially with reference to our foreign commerce.

2. That we favor and most respectfully urge the passage by Congress of some measure to foster and encourage the upbuilding of our merchant marine, and to give us back the prestige upon the high seas which we once enjoyed.

3. That we favor the ship-subsidy measure which has received consideration by Congress, which, we think, would tend to restore our flag upon the seas and build up our merchant marine to the extent that the necessities of our trade now and in the future may demand.

4. That we recommend that our Senators and Congressmen favor some just and equitable measure that will bring about the results and afford the relief above suggested.

5. That through our legislative committee we memorialize the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States with a copy of these resolutions.

NATIONAL FOUNDERS' ASSOCIATION,
November 15, 1905.

Resolved, That this convention of the National Founders' Association does most earnestly urge that our national legislators give their early attention to the deplorable condition of the American merchant marine.

Resolved, That we urge the immediate passage of the merchant marine bill proposed by the Merchant Marine Commission and submitted to the last Congress as a part of its report.

COMMERCIAL CLUB OF MOBILE,
November 17, 1905.

Whereas upon the recommendation of President Roosevelt a commission was appointed by the last Congress which thoroughly investigated the condition of American shipping, said commission presenting a report, together with a bill to carry into effect its recommendations; and

Whereas the commission found that but 9 per cent of our ocean carrying is done by American vessels, 91 per cent being carried by the subsidized and bountied shipping of other countries; that annually \$200,000,000 are being paid to foreign ships, and this condition the commission's bill would so remedy as to give to American ships a much larger and fairer share of our deep-sea carrying; and

Whereas the commission's bill conforms in its provisions to the practices of other nations in dealing with their merchant shipping, and is so designed as to not only give our shipowners a greater share of our foreign carrying, but to create a demand for American materials and American labor in shipbuilding, as well as afford employment afloat for American ship masters, officers, and seamen, the ships and men being essential to the national defense for auxiliary naval purposes in time of trouble: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Commercial Club of Mobile, Ala., recognizing the pressing importance of an American mercantile marine, warmly commends the work of the congressional merchant marine commission and expresses the earnest hope that its bill will receive the support of Alabama's Senators and Representatives in Congress to the end that we shall have an effective and enduring American mercantile marine measurably commensurate with our position as a great world power; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Members of the Alabama delegation to Congress.

TRANS-MISSISSIPPI COMMERCIAL CONGRESS,
August 19, 1905.

Representing all the States and Territories west of the Mississippi River, including Hawaii and the Philippines, in annual meeting at Portland, Oreg., August 19, 1905.

We unqualifiedly favor the progressive national policy on the part of the United States of fostering and building up an American merchant marine by every available means, and we respectfully urge upon the consideration of Congress the national importance of this question in the development of our foreign trade.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHOLESALE DRUGGISTS,
October 5, 1905.

Whereas over 95 per cent of our exports, imports, passengers, and freight are carried under every flag except the Stars and Stripes, the National Association of Wholesale Druggists and its allied interests in convention assembled in one of the largest world seaports:

Resolved, That for our commerce in times of peace and our army and navy in times of war, we ask Congress to restore to us an American merchant marine by passing an effective shipping bill.

GREENE COUNTY (GA.) COTTON GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
May, 1905.

We, the cotton growers' convention, citizens of Greene County, in mass meeting assembled:

Resolved, That it is for the interest of the cotton growers of the South that all necessary aid shall be given by the General Government to upbuild and encourage our merchant marine, with a view of opening up new markets for the consumption of our cotton and cotton products, and we hereby request our Congressman to work and vote all necessary aid toward this end.

COMMERCIAL CLUB OF BIRMINGHAM,
January 10, 1906.

Resolved by the Commercial Club of Birmingham:

1. That it is apparent to all that the merchant-marine service of these United States is far below what it ought to be, and that it has not been and is not increasing in proportion to our national prosperity in other pursuits.

2. That the interests of this country, and particularly the early and further and continued prosperity of the States bordering on the Gulf, will be greatly enhanced by the extension of the shipping interest, and that its substantial encouragement and adjustment on some permanent basis will tend greatly to our defense in war and welfare in peace.

3. That it is an urgent and pressing and imperative duty resting on the Congress to aid and foster and upbuild our shipping interests; and we urge and request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to assist in all constitutional ways.

4. That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Alabama.

PENSACOLA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
November 28, 1905.

Whereas upon the recommendation of President Roosevelt a commission was appointed by the last Congress which thoroughly investigated the condition of the American shipping, said commission presenting a report, together with a bill to carry into effect its recommendations; and

Whereas the commission found that but 9 per cent of our ocean carrying is done by American vessels, 91 per cent being carried by the subsidized and bountied shipping of other countries; that annually \$200,000,000 are being paid to foreign ships, and this condition the commission's bill would so remedy as to give to American ships a much larger and fairer share of our deep-sea carrying; and

Whereas the commission's bill conforms in its provisions to the practice of other nations in dealing with their merchant shipping and is so designed as to not only give our shipowners the greatest share of

our foreign carrying, but to create a demand for American materials and American labor in shipbuilding, as well as to afford employment for American ship officers and seamen, the ships and men being essential to the national defense for auxiliary naval purposes in the time of trouble: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Pensacola, Fla., recognizing the pressing importance of an American mercantile marine warmly commends the work of the Congressional Merchant Marine Commission and expresses the earnest hope that its bill will receive the support of Florida's Senators and Representatives in Congress to the end that we will have an effective and enduring American mercantile marine commensurate with our position as a great world power; and be it further

Resolved, That nothing in the foregoing resolution shall affect state control of pilotage matters in the several States of the Union.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Members of the Florida delegation in Congress.

NEW ORLEANS BOARD OF TRADE,
December 13, 1905.

Whereas upon the recommendation of President Roosevelt, a commission was appointed by the last Congress which thoroughly investigated the condition of American shipping, said commission presenting a report, together with a bill to carry into effect its recommendations; and

Whereas the commission found that 9 per cent of our ocean carrying is done by American vessels, 91 per cent being carried by the subsidized and bountied shipping of other countries, that annually \$200,000,000 are being paid to foreign ships, and this condition the commission's bill would so remedy as to give to American ships a much larger and fairer share of our deep-sea carrying; and

Whereas the commission's bill conforms in its provisions to the practices of other nations in dealing with their merchant shipping and is so designed not only to give our shipowners a greater share of our foreign carrying, but to create a demand for American materials and American labor in shipbuilding, as well as afford employment afloat for American shipmasters, officers, and seamen, the ships and men being essential to the national defense for auxiliary naval purposes in time of trouble: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Orleans Board of Trade, recognizing the pressing importance of an American mercantile marine, warmly commends the work of the congressional Merchant Marine Commission and expresses the earnest hope that its bill will receive the support of Louisiana's Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the end that we shall have an effective and enduring mercantile marine commensurate with our position as a great world power; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress.

BRUNSWICK (GA.) BOARD OF TRADE,
January 4, 1906.

Whereas upon the recommendation of the President a commission was appointed by the last Congress which thoroughly investigated the condition of American shipping, said commission presenting a report together with a bill to carry into effect its recommendations; and

Whereas the commission found that 9 per cent of our ocean carrying is done by American vessels, 91 per cent being carried by the subsidized and bountied shipping of other countries; that annually about \$200,000,000 are being paid to foreign ships, and this condition the commission's bill would so remedy as to give to American ships a much larger and fairer share of our deep-sea carrying; and

Whereas said commission has framed a bill, now pending before Congress, after full hearings in all parts of the country, the entire commission agreeing, it is understood, that some legislation is not only desirable, but necessary, for the revival of our merchant marine, differing only as to methods; and

Whereas the commerce of the United States with the West Indies, Central and South America is steadily increasing, is nearest the southern ports, increasing with Cuba in the past seven years from \$28,000,000 to \$134,000,000, with Porto Rico from less than \$4,000,000 to over \$28,000,000, destined, with reasonable aid to our merchant marine, to increase with South and Central America in equally wonderful proportions, and equally important to this port and other ports on the South Atlantic coast with Gulf ports:

Resolved, That this board earnestly appeals to Congress to amend Senate bill 529 (or any like measure which may be passed) in the sixth section thereof, in the first to eighth paragraphs, inclusive, so as to open the ocean mail service therein provided for to all Atlantic and all Gulf ports.

Resolved, That this board earnestly appreciates and commends the patriotic work of the commission, deems this a question above party, and appeals to the Congress to pass some wise measure for the revival of our merchant marine in American ships, built in American shipyards, of American material, thus paving the way for supremacy in this only field of effort in which the United States is exceeded by other nations, and earnestly hopes our Senators and Representatives in Congress will see their way to support such a measure, already appealed for by the legislature of Georgia, and of vital importance, as this board believes, to every citizen of the State, and wiping out the humiliation of the leading nation in commerce carrying 91 per cent of its trade in foreign ships under foreign flags.

Resolved, That a properly certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

CITIZENS' ASSOCIATION OF QUINCY,
January 8, 1906.

Whereas the Citizens' Association of Quincy, Mass., has learned that a bill has been introduced in Congress to promote and upbuild the American merchant marine and American commerce, which bill is of vital interest to the shipping and commercial interests of the State of Massachusetts, and especially to the city of Quincy; and

Whereas American ships now convey less than 10 per cent of the imports and exports of the United States; and

Whereas more American ships are indispensable to a full development of American export trade with foreign lands, and especially with South America; and

Whereas this condition of affairs deprives American officers and seamen of employment in ocean trade, and prevents the establishment of a suitable naval reserve; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Citizens' Association believes that the proposed encouragement to the maritime interests of this country is a measure which will advance the commercial interests of the Nation, and recommends the enactment by Congress of suitable measures "to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage;" And be it further

Resolved, That the president and secretary be requested to send attested copies of these resolutions to President Roosevelt, to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from Massachusetts, to Senator GALLINGER, of the Merchant Marine Commission, and to the press.

NATIONAL BOARD OF TRADE,
January 18, 1906.

Resolved, That the National Board of Trade approves of the Senate bill 529 as the best means now practicable before the country for the improvement of the merchant marine, and urges its approval by Congress; and further, the committee approves the postponement of the time of application for the present navigation laws as to the Philippines to July 1, 1909, as recommended in the Senate bill above referred to.

NEWPORT NEWS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
January 24, 1906.

Whereas the chamber of commerce of the seaport city of Newport News, Va., has observed with peculiar interest the rapidly increasing growth of the ocean commerce of the United States, but has noted with grave apprehension that coincident with this increasing trade the American merchant marine has diminished to the vanishing point; and

Whereas this lamentable decline in our deep-sea shipping has been caused, not only by a lower wage scale in foreign construction and operation, but by the lower freight rate following the large subsidies which every maritime nation except the United States has long granted its merchant marine, in direct consequence of which American ships now carry only 5 per cent of our sea commerce, and the people of the United States now pay \$200,000,000 annual freight tribute to those foreign nations who have embraced the advantage which our apathy presented; and

Whereas this chamber in 1902 expressed by resolution its conviction that the payment of such tremendous annual sum to foreign ships essentially constituted an enormous subsidy to foreign sea power, and was a reckless and dangerous dissipation of American wealth; and

Whereas this chamber recognized that sound business policy, as well as the graver considerations of self-defense, demanded that American ships should carry American commerce, for when our ships carry our commerce that commerce will reach peoples who will otherwise never see an American product; and

Whereas this chamber further recognized that the defense of the Nation, the preservation of its power, and the prosperity of its people were not to be regarded from the narrowness of a partisan standpoint, but in a broad and patriotic spirit; and

Whereas when Congress appointed a nonpartisan commission to inquire into and report the best means for providing for an efficient merchant marine this chamber felt that a step had been taken of inestimable importance to the entire Nation; and

Whereas after an inquiry extending over many months a report was presented to Congress by the commission recommending Senate bill 529, entitled "A bill to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage;" and

Whereas accompanying said report was a minority report, declaring an attachment to the system of discriminating duties, which minority report, however, further declared that that system would not bring relief unless the present tariff was increased in many cases and a new tariff imposed in many others to permit the discriminating duties to attach, but further declared the conviction that the tariff should not be disturbed, and no bill was reported by the minority and no specific method of relief suggested by it; and

Whereas, this chamber perceives that the sole difference between discriminating duties and subsidies is that the former is paid directly and the latter indirectly by the people, and that, so far as the individual is concerned, both have the same consequence; and

Whereas this chamber recognizes that the American people are offered the choice between the affirmative legislation recommended by the majority, and the negative policy of inaction which has already cost the Nation many billions of money; and this chamber further realizes that the question is one of business propriety and finance, as well as one of self-defense, and that it is the duty of commercial bodies under such circumstances to seek to arouse the public to a realization of its opportunity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, 1. That this chamber does hereby unhesitatingly indorse Senate bill 529, entitled "A bill to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage."

2. That this chamber earnestly requests the Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives to secure the passage of the said bill.

3. That a copy of the above preamble and these resolutions be transmitted to each Member of Congress from Virginia, with the request that they give this measure their active support.

4. That copies be transmitted to the various commercial bodies in the State of Virginia and in all the southern States, with the urgent desire that such bodies cooperate in securing the passage of similar resolutions.

NEWPORT NEWS MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION,
January 25, 1906.

Whereas the chamber of commerce of this city did, on the 24th instant, by resolution, indorse the bill now pending in the Congress of

the United States, entitled "A bill to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage;" and

Whereas the Merchants' Association of Newport News, Va., is in hearty accord with the tenor of said resolutions, believing that said bill, if enacted into law, will encourage our deep-sea shipping and bring greater prosperity to the entire Nation: Be it therefore

Resolved, 1. That this association hereby indorses the action of the chamber of commerce in approving said bill.

2. That copies of the foregoing preamble and these resolutions be transmitted to the Members of Congress from Virginia.

3. That copies also be furnished the various boards of trade and kindred organizations in Virginia and throughout the South, with the request that they cooperate with us in bringing about the passage of said bill.

Adopted at a regular meeting of the Merchants' Association of Newport News, Va., held on this 25th day of January, 1906.

NEWPORT NEWS CLEARING-HOUSE ASSOCIATION,
January, 1906.

Whereas on October 12, 1905, The American Bankers' Association passed the following resolutions:

1. That the members of this association are deeply interested in any measure which will promote the interest of the whole country commercially and industrially, and especially with reference to our foreign commerce.

2. That we favor and most respectfully urge the passage by Congress of some measure to foster and encourage the upbuilding of our merchant marine, and to give us back the prestige upon the high seas which we once enjoyed.

3. That we favor the ship subsidy measure which has received consideration by Congress, which, we think, would tend to restore our flag upon the seas and build up our merchant marine to the extent that the necessities of our trade now and in the future may demand.

4. That we recommend that our Senators and Congressmen favor some just and equitable measure that will bring about the results and afford the relief above suggested.

5. That through our legislative committee we memorialize the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States with a copy of these resolutions.

And whereas the Newport News Clearing House Association, representing the banks of the city of Newport News, observes that there is but one measure now before Congress for the relief of the American merchant marine, namely, Senate bill 529, entitled "A bill to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage;" and

Whereas it is known to this body that questions have been raised as to whether the said bill is the best that could be devised for the accomplishment of the above purpose, but no other bill has been presented, and it is admitted on all sides that the existing bill will accomplish the restoration of our shipping; and

Whereas for want of appropriate affirmative legislation the merchant marine of the United States has disappeared from the seas, with the result that American commerce now depends upon foreign ships of carriage, paying for this service the immense sum of \$200,000,000 annually, thus employing 500,000 foreign workmen and subsidizing a foreign shipping and building its sea power at the cost of our own; and

Whereas this body is convinced that the continued expenditure of such a vast annual sum is a subject of much more serious concern to the American people than the mere form of legislation, and this body is further convinced that it is the duty of every patriotic citizen to urge affirmative legislation in place of that policy of inaction which not only saps the national resources of defense, but creates a naval strength in foreign nations, who in the future may threaten the safety of the Republic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, 1. That this clearing-house association does hereby unhesitatingly indorse Senate bill 529, entitled "A bill to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage."

2. That this association earnestly requests the Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives to secure the passage of said bill.

3. That a copy of the above preamble and these resolutions be transmitted to each Member of Congress from Virginia, with the request that they give this measure their active support.

CLEVELAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
February 20, 1906.

Resolved, First. That due consideration for the broad development of our foreign commerce and for the better safety of the Nation demands the restoration of a foreign merchant marine under our flag;

Second. That this is being striven for and accomplished steadily by other nations in their own behalf;

Third. That we regard the work of the Congressional Marine Commission as having been done with ability, fairness, and discrimination; and therefore

Fourth. We recommend the prompt enactment and early trial of the plan evolved by the commission and embodied in the Gallinger bill, so called, which has recently passed the Senate; and

Fifth. That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives of Ohio in Congress.

BUFFALO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
March 8, 1906.

The development of the American merchant marine as a means for the further growth of our foreign commerce has been most thoroughly investigated by the Merchant Marine Commission, appointed under authority of an act of Congress.

The Merchant Marine Commission, after an exhaustive investigation and study of the subject, recommended the enactment of a bill known as the Gallinger bill, which recently passed the Senate.

Believing that the building up of an American merchant marine is essential to the further development of trade and commerce with foreign nations, and that the recommendations of the commission might safely be followed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo recommends the speedy enactment of the Gallinger bill and respectfully urges upon the Members of Congress from the city of Buffalo and the State of New York their hearty support of this measure; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of New York.

NATIONAL METAL TRADES ASSOCIATION,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 22, 1906.

Resolved, That the National Metal Trades Association, in annual convention assembled, hereby gives its most emphatic indorsement and approval of United States Senate bill 529, known as the Gallinger bill, for the aid of the American merchant marine; and this convention recommends and strongly urges upon the House of Representatives the passage of this bill; and further

Resolved, That the secretary of this convention is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House.

ILLINOIS MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
April 13, 1906.

Resolved, That the Illinois Manufacturers' Association most heartily favors the promptest possible passage through the House of Representatives of the merchant marine commission shipping bill (S. 529) that passed the United States Senate February 14, 1906, for the greater stability of our foreign trade, and also in order that merchant ships and their trained officers and seamen may be at the command of our Government in time of war: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the foregoing resolution be sent to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress from Illinois.

TRANS-MISSISSIPPI COMMERCIAL CONGRESS,
Kansas City, November 23, 1906.

Our trade relations with South America and the cultivation of a better understanding and acquaintance with the people of our sister republics have justly claimed the attention of this congress. To the Secretary of State of our own country and to the representatives of the other nations who honored us by their presence we extend assurances of our profound respect and earnest hope that their words of wisdom and counsel may bring about closer relations between all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere, and that the mutual regard and confidence now existing may increase as the years pass by. We realize the value of our friendly intercourse. The trans-Mississippi region is especially interested in encouraging all efforts to bring about the increase of commercial transactions as the surest and best way of establishing the intimate friendly relations that should exist between us. To promote such relations we indorse the propositions submitted by Secretary Root for encouraging our merchant marine and for increasing our intercourse with South Africa by adequate mail facilities.

We reaffirm our previous action favoring the upbuilding of an American merchant marine, especially in view of the necessity of fostering commerce and intercommunication with Central and South America. We advise the two parties in Congress to consider the creation of an American merchant marine as a nonpartisan issue.

NATIONAL BOARD OF TRADE,
January 17, 1907.

Resolved, That the National Board of Trade approves of any legislation which will promote the national defense, create a naval reserve, establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, especially to South American, Central American, and oriental countries, and foster and promote commerce generally, and to that end it recommends and earnestly urges upon Congress the speedy passage of the shipping bill now pending in Congress, being the modified bill which was reported to the House of Representatives January 15, 1907, by its Committee on Merchant Marine.

BOSTON MARINE SOCIETY,
November 13, 1906.

Voted, That we, the Boston Marine Society, a society of upward of 400 members, composed of shipmasters, merchants, and others directly interested in the commerce of our country, do here, at our annual meeting, heartily and unanimously indorse Senate bill 529, known as the shipping bill, as passed by the Senate, and we strongly urge the passage of the same by the House.

Voted, Unanimously, that a copy of the above vote be sent to each of the Massachusetts Congressmen, and also to the Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Merchant Marine Commission.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE BOARD OF TRADE,
January 22, 1907.

That the Massachusetts State Board of Trade indorses the substitute for Senate bill 529, to promote the national defense, to create a naval reserve, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, and to promote commerce, now pending before the House.

NOTE.—The Massachusetts State Board of Trade is a delegate body representing the chief cities and towns of the Commonwealth.

Mississippi Valley Latin-American Convention at New Orleans, April 5, 6, and 7, 1906.

Be it resolved, That, believing the development of the American merchant marine will result in the stimulation of American trade, we heartily approve the bill introduced in Congress by Senator GALLINGER for the rehabilitation of the American flag on the high seas, and trust our Representatives in Congress will do everything in their power to give us relief, since it seems but natural that the means of conveyance

for the shipment of the products of this country to the great markets of the world should be owned by ourselves; and be it

Resolved, That as the improvement of internal waterways is coincident with the development of foreign trade, the National Government, having assumed the improvement and control of rivers, harbors, and waterways of the country, and having unequivocally bound itself to discharge these obligations promptly by sound business methods, instead of appropriating for the purpose at uncertain intervals of two or three years, should put river and harbor bills on a par with other great appropriation bills by annual appropriation, and direct all such work economically and continuously without the waste incident to intermittent effort; and be it

Resolved, That this conference heartily indorses the efforts of all private enterprises that may tend to the development of internal trade. Names of different cities and associations which were represented at the Mississippi Valley Latin-American Convention at New Orleans on April 5, 6, and 7:

Frankfort, Ky.; Nashville Board of Trade; Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce; Wisconsin; Quincy (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce; Columbus, Miss.; Meridian (Miss.) Board of Trade; Belleville (Ill.) Commercial Club; St. Louis Merchants' Exchange; Latin-American Club and Foreign Trade Association of St. Louis; Kansas City Board of Trade; Kansas City Commercial Club; Dallas (Tex.) Commercial Club; Galveston, Tex.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Pittsburg (Pa.) Merchants and Manufacturers' Association; Atlanta, Ga.; Little Rock (Ark.) Board of Trade; Pine Bluff, Ark.; Clarksville, Tenn.; Washington, D. C.; St. Paul, Minn.; Beaumont (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce; Madisonville, Tex.; Southern Cotton Growers' Association; Marion (Ind.) Commercial Club; Birmingham, Ala.

National Convention for the Extension of the Foreign Commerce of the United States.

WASHINGTON, January 16, 1910.

We believe it imperative that the American merchant marine should be reestablished and that new steamship lines of direct and speedy communication should be opened, especially with South and Central American and Asiatic ports, for the proper extension of our commerce.

To this end we recommend liberal compensation from the Government to American-built and American-manned ships for all services rendered, including the carriage of mails and the right to use the ships in time of war.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, the bill now pending before the committee provides, among other things, for an appropriation of \$250,000 to be used in defraying the salaries and expense of a commission appointed by the President to investigate and report on the cost of articles affected by tariff duties. A few Republicans who are satisfied with past methods of framing revenue laws will, I understand, become insurgents on this provision. I am also informed that the minority of the House, preferring to make the coming campaign on its usual grounds of denunciation, and disliking to be embarrassed with facts, will oppose the appropriation.

I am pleased to know that the President has sufficiently impressed the Appropriations Committee with the wisdom of this proposition as to induce it to give the membership of the House an opportunity to express itself upon this most important matter.

Tariff revision, in the very nature of things, becomes from time to time necessary, and not only the party in power at the time of such revision suffers from misrepresentations by its opponents, but the business of the country is disturbed, and for a year before and as long after the revision industrial and commercial prosperity and progress are checked.

The discussion, pro and con, now going on here is but a repetition of the arguments and tactics employed by partisans for political advantage after all general tariff legislation in the past. I am firmly convinced that the highest general welfare of our country depends directly and substantially upon a tariff law imposing upon articles of foreign production competing with similar articles which can and ought to be produced at home duties which measure the difference between cost of production in the foreign country and in this.

For years the Democratic party has openly and boldly proclaimed its hostility to such a tariff, but, with the benign effects of protection on exhibition, even in Democracy's stronghold in the South that party has gradually abandoned its old-time doctrine. At the time of the passage of the Payne bill, when under the provisions of the new rule adopted at the beginning of the Sixty-first Congress, the minority had an opportunity to present a substitute in the form of a new bill expressing its views, it did not suggest a distinctly revenue measure, but rather a bill which recognized, as much as anything else, the doctrine of protection.

So, I repeat, the policy of protection is established and the people will not long tolerate in power any party which assaults it.

No prominent man in this House will arise here or elsewhere and oppose the doctrine of placing American producers—capitalists and laborers—on a par with foreign producers who seek

our markets. Therefore, conceding, as I believe it must be conceded, that a duty on foreign products equal to the difference between their cost and the cost of similar articles in the United States should be imposed, we are prepared to discuss the merits of the provision before us.

The questions before the House and country are: What is the difference in cost? How shall it be determined? Heretofore, throughout our entire history, the tariff has been a partisan question, and revisions have been made by parties in Congress after a more or less acrimonious campaign, in which both virtues and defects have been magnified. Business has been disturbed, if not destroyed, by the fear and doubt which anticipated tariff revision engendered; not particular kinds of business, but business in general. After an election when tariff revision was promised, the Congress meets. Three hundred and ninety-one Representatives, from as many districts and from all parts of the United States, and 92 Senators, from 46 States, undertake the revision—the majority according to its party platform and the minority according to what, in its notion, will be most embarrassing to its opponents; or, if not that, then according to the principles of its party platform.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate proceed to have hearings. Interested parties appear. These parties are usually represented by special pleaders skilled in the intricacies of the expert methods of production. Volumes of testimony from producers are taken, which the ordinary Congressman not on the committee can not properly weigh, not having seen the witnesses and not knowing their bias. Representatives of importers, equally skilled, also appear and give evidence contradicting the evidence of the producer.

The committee tries to be fair and impartial, but it does not require unusual powers of discernment and perception to discover that when the testimony is being weighed the committeeman, as does the Member not on the committee, throws his prejudice for home interests, or what he supposes are home interests, into the scale, and the beam tips as he wants it and not as the evidence might otherwise determine. I submit that almost any proposition in reference to a tariff can be proven by some evidence submitted to the committees. The ordinary Member is confused by a multitude of conflicting witnesses and finds too frequently that he is voting for policy rather than principle.

Most Congressmen treat the tariff as a "local issue," and I have yet to discover an insurgent or regular who even hesitated to maintain or raise a duty on an article which competed with a prominent product of his district and State. The votes of Members in the two branches of Congress during the consideration of the Payne bill will be both entertaining and instructive to the student investigating the Record on this subject. As a general rule the downward revisionist begins and continues in districts and States other than his own, and always a tariff law is the result of a compromise which too frequently has omitted the principle of sound protection. Insurgents on a tariff bill are always those who either do not receive enough duty on home products or who think the other fellow is getting too much. I submit that tariff revision is, and always has been, unscientific, and the principle of difference in cost of production is but approximately observed in the schedules. Upon some articles the duty from the very nature of things may be too high, upon others the rate may be too low. The question therefore which confronts the thoughtful, conscientious legislator is, How can the proper rate of duty be best determined?

Evidently there is a difference in cost between competing articles of foreign and domestic production. Surely it must be possible to determine that difference. For years it has occurred to me that the industrial, and therefore the financial, policy of this Government ought not to be the football of party politics. There are certain fundamental principles which are firmly established, and whatever may be the personal ambitions of gentlemen who proclaim in jealous rage against the establishment of sound governmental policies which would rob them of some little power to render special favors to interested constituents, yet I am satisfied that the sincere believer in a proper protective tariff is willing to test this theory by facts, and he asks only for a duty which will place American capital and American labor on an equality with their foreign competitors. He asks for nothing more; he will be content with nothing less.

If I am correct in my belief that the greatest difficulties to be met in revising a tariff are the unreliability of evidence as to cost and the partisan zeal for unreasonable advantage to local or special interests by Congressmen, then whatever tends to overcome these difficulties will, in that respect at least, be an improvement on existing conditions. I am in favor of creat-

ing an expert nonpartisan board of big men and intrust them with full power to investigate industrial conditions here and abroad and to report results to the President. Such a board would not be embarrassed either by personal pecuniary interests in a rate of duty nor by local interests upon which their political life depends. This board would undoubtedly proceed to determine the conditions as to the articles in some particular schedule; and upon making its report to the President, he could, if the facts warranted, call the attention of Congress to the matter in hand, and a revision of that particular schedule could be had. No other schedule need be reviewed at that time and nothing else would be disturbed. Legitimate business involved in the particular schedule would not be greatly affected, for the American producer would know that he would always be protected against ruinous foreign competition due to a smaller cost of production. Rates thus established would continue for years, except such minor changes as might be found necessary from changed conditions. The changes would be gradual, and no general destructive assault upon American business would periodically be made. I know of no great nonpartisan commission ever created by the Government that has not commanded almost universal confidence and respect. A tariff commission would be no exception to the rule. Its report would be the basis of revision by Congress, and, in my judgment, this would be much better than a system which makes it possible for a few men to pick out some arbitrary keystone about which certain special interests commanding a sufficient number of votes can be arranged to form a protective-tariff arch. I believe that the commission provided by existing law, if given sufficient money, can do what the President would have it do; but some gentlemen seem to doubt this, and therefore I shall take advantage of every opportunity to make clear the construction of the President and create and equip with funds a tariff commission to carry out the principles for which the Republican party has stood throughout its existence.

I am not especially complaining of the Payne tariff law. It is subject to no criticism that was not applicable to any other in our history. To its preparation was given more conscientious and intelligent consideration than was given to any of its predecessors. I believe it is the best tariff law ever written into our statutes. It was the best that could have been passed at the time of its enactment under the old methods. It is infinitely better than any measure which the disintegrated, incoherent, and inconsistent Democracy could frame, as witness of which fact I call the country's attention to the puerile substitute offered by its representatives for the House bill last June. I am not satisfied that it fully meets our party demands for a tariff which measures the difference in cost between productions here and abroad, and I want to be satisfied.

Let us create this commission, and, without disturbing business, we will obtain information upon which the President and the Congress may proceed to correct any imperfections which may exist in the present law and establish for all time, by scientific methods which will command the respect of all, the Republican doctrine of true protection, which simply means maintaining the higher wage of American workmen against the lower wage of their foreign competitors.

If the minority party votes against the provision, it will be because they realize that its enactment into law will largely disarm them in their proposed campaign of misrepresentation and abuse. It is difficult for me to understand how any sincere believer in a tariff which measures the difference between the cost of production here and abroad can vote against a proposition to disclose facts, and for the continuation of a guessing and trading contest in which the shrewdest and most influential have great advantage over the rest.

Gentlemen of the majority, I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I am strongly convinced that we can do nothing of greater value to the cause of true protection, of our party, and of our country than to adopt this provision.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT].

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I feel like I ought to apologize to the House of Representatives and to the country for paying any further attention to the bilious gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH], whose liver is evidently not performing its proper functions. He would be pitiable if he had not brought upon himself his own discomfiture. He is an adept at having put into the Record so-called speeches that are never delivered, but are inserted under "leave to print." If he displays little of the characteristic of a "real soldier" as defined by Sir Walter Scott, he shows much of the cunning of the little animal which knows how to "tack" before the hounds while he is robbing a henroost. This applies, however, only to his efforts to get into the Record, and not to his aptitude for argumentation or skill in

dodging a real issue. In these respects he is as woefully wanting as a 6-year-old schoolboy who recites for the first time "The boy stood on the burning deck." [Laughter.]

Last Saturday, the 14th, the gentleman from Ohio, after having "nursed his wrath" and "brooded over" the reflections upon his imaginary dignity since the 26th of March, only a little less than two months ago, again "breaks" into the RECORD with what I have no doubt he proudly regarded as a piece of consummate ridicule upon me. I have always been of a charitable disposition and take pleasure in contributing to the enjoyment of the unfortunate. I would not for any consideration deprive the gentleman from Ohio of the sweet consolation which he is hugging to his innocent bosom that he has "wiped" me out by his superlative ridicule and unexampled witticisms. To take from him this delicious satisfaction would be indictable under the law to punish cruelty to animals. [Laughter.]

Paradoxical as it may seem, I am really sorry for him. He is evidently a pessimist, and is, perhaps, doing the best he can. He ought to be indulged in his outbreaks, because they are harmless to every one else and are amusing to himself. I am glad that I am charitably inclined and that this feeling is broad enough to cover even the idiosyncrasies of the gentleman from Ohio.

One of the gentleman's troubles is that when he essays to discuss questions of real importance he takes himself too seriously. This is too great a tax upon his powers of elucidation, and in all kindness I earnestly advise him to refrain from such laborious efforts in the future. It might endanger his mental equilibrium. This was forcibly illustrated about 4 o'clock one morning not long ago, during the fight on "Cannonism," when an unfeeling deputy sergeant-at-arms hustled him out of his bed in the Willard Hotel and compelled his attendance in the House.

The Herculean efforts of the gentleman to find out "who ordered it," together with the cruel jibes of his fellow-sufferers in the "congressional bull pen," seriously disturbed the equanimity of the gentleman from Ohio.

For the pleasure which it gives him, I can bear complacently the tender and affectionate encomiums which he passes upon me. It so happens that he did not wake up to his importance as a critic of Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee until after their mighty spirits had passed into a brighter land into which poisoned shafts can never enter. [Applause.] If the gentleman knew how impotent is his rage against our dead heroes and how little heeded is his slander of our people, he might curb his "unruly member" and learn a little of the spirit of the deathless declaration, "The greatest of these is charity." The gentleman charges me with "muck-raking," which I understand means stirring up filth. I am not conscious of having stirred up anything but the gentleman from Ohio. [Laughter.] Surely he would not call this "muck-raking."

In my speech of the 26th of March, to which the gentleman is supposed by himself to have replied last Saturday, I stated some historical facts which I was not vain enough to suppose could penetrate the vast desert between truth and justice and the beclouded mentality of those who preach the gospel of hate. I am somewhat surprised that my defense of the southern people against his wholesale arraignments should have pricked the conscience of the gentleman from Ohio to the extent of inducing an effort to deny the purport of his slanderous charge. His answer is in the nature of a "plea of confession and avoidance," and does no credit to either his sincerity or his intelligence. In his quotation of two paragraphs of his former speech, instead of the one cited by me, he only emphasizes the truth and force of my construction. He demonstrates that he is either insincere or surprisingly ignorant of the meaning of ordinary words. He impales himself upon one horn of the dilemma or upon the other. He may make his choice. It is a matter of supreme indifference which he selects.

The hypercritical objection which the gentleman offers to some slight immaterial mistakes in dates which appeared in my speech as published in the RECORD of the next morning is puerile. If he had taken the pains to examine, he would have found that these mistakes were corrected in the permanent RECORD. But this may be an unkind suggestion, because it would have deprived the gentleman of a large part of his thunder.

The gentleman undertakes to defend the brutality of the treatment of Jefferson Davis at Fortress Monroe in time of peace, after the last confederate soldier had laid down his gun, by comparing it with conditions in southern prisons during the latter days of the war, when the confederate soldiers themselves were compelled to live upon very scant rations. There are two sides to this question. There were confederate prisons and federal prisons, and men are living to-day who know something of the horrors of both. I have no desire to enter into a discussion

of these matters. I thank God this nightmare has passed, and I do not care to conjure it up again. In conclusion, I want to say that the gentleman from Ohio is mistaken in assuming that I have any unkind feeling toward him. I do not expect to ever see the day when he and I will agree politically or upon some other important matters of difference, because we are not so constituted. Some men can get away from passion and prejudice and others can not. Personally, however, I have no malice toward him, and the only harm I wish him is that some man, Democrat or Republican, may succeed him who knows that the war is over. [Applause.]

The gentleman says I "exploited my own bravery" in my speech. It might be unparliamentary for me to say that this statement is without any foundation in fact, but I may be permitted to remark that no real soldier ever indulges in such self-laudation, nor charges another with doing so without some foundation for its truth. Not a word in my speech can be distorted into making such a boast. But the gentleman has so abundantly demonstrated that he is incapable of and unwilling to understand the meaning of language that he ought not to be held responsible for any mental or moral lapse. Now, I am going to bid the gentleman from Ohio an affectionate good-by. I regret that his peevishness has made it necessary to add this short chapter to a controversy which ought never to have been started, and would not have been but for the fact that his position as a Representative in Congress gave undue dignity to his uncharitable and unwarranted charges. I have the highest opinion of the conservative and generous spirit of the northern people, and am glad to know that a large majority of them entertain none of the bitter feeling engendered during the civil war. They and we of the South recognize that we are brethren, and that every dictate of patriotism leads us to the accomplishment of those things which will add to the prosperity, happiness, and glory of the greatest nation on earth. [Applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, those of us who are unwilling to carry out every wish of the Speaker and the House organization are derided as insurgents. Insurgents against whom? Against what Republican policy? No; not that, but against the tyrannical rules of the House.

The Good Book tells us that "he that is without sin let him cast the first stone."

I have taken some pains to look up the record of those who bore the principal part in defending the rules, and I find that many of them, if not all, have been insurgents at one time or the other—not against the rules, but against Republican Presidents or Republican policies—and that almost without exception every one who came to the rescue of the Speaker and the rules voted on January 8, 1909, to rebuke President Roosevelt.

A careful scrutiny of that vote is worthy of perusal.

Few will question the statement that the most consistent, insistent, and persistent insurgents against the Roosevelt administration were the gentlemen from the first district of Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] and the eighth district of Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], and that in spite of the tremendous Roosevelt sentiment in their respective States, and notwithstanding the fact that President Taft, at the urgent request of the gentleman from Minnesota, who wished to bolster up his political fences, changed his line of travel to make a speech in his district, we find that gentleman only a few weeks since vigorously opposing one of the administration measures, namely, the provision for the construction of two battle ships; and in the very early days of President Taft's administration the gentleman from Massachusetts spoke and voted against the passage of the joint resolution for a constitutional amendment to provide for the levying of an income tax, and, with the courage of Ulysses of old, stood alone on the Republican side against the granting of the franking privilege to Theodore Roosevelt. [Applause.]

The poet laureate of the House, on February 22, quoting from Washington's Farewell Address—

Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effect of the spirit of party generally—

Inveighed against and depicted the evils of party tyranny. I quote further from his speech:

Evidently they—the fathers of our country—did not anticipate the power and perhaps the necessary tyranny of party government.

"We have in a great measure realized the evils of the party spirit which Washington predicted," and yet within but a few short weeks—less than a month—in his denunciation of those who sought to put an end to the tyranny of the House organization, he referred to the Roman holiday and the impending butchery. [Applause.] I call to his mind another Roman holiday in this very Hall of Representatives on January 8, 1909—the intended

victim was none other than Theodore Roosevelt, then President of the United States—when the chief inquisitors were the gentlemen from the first district of Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] and the ninth district of Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and when a combination of a minority of the Republicans elected to the House and a majority of the Democrats passed a resolution reflecting on and rebuking the man who is to-day the idol of the American people. [Applause.] Well may those who bore a conspicuous part in that tragedy, and who are now appealing to their constituencies for a reelection, exclaim, "Out, damned spot; out, I say!" for the supposedly dead lion of that day is the live lion of to-day. The gentleman from the thirty-third district of New York [Mr. FASSETT] glories in the fact of his blind adulation of the Speaker and of the rules of this House as they existed prior to March 19 and anathematizes the so-called insurgents, and yet, with but little consistency, in conjunction with the eminent whip of the House, he sought to bring about in the month of March the election as president pro tempore of the New York state senate of a gentleman (of admittedly high personal character) who only two months before had refused to support the caucus nominee of the Republican state senators. [Applause.] Is there not a broad enough field for the political activities of these gentlemen in their home neighborhood, in view of the fact that within two or three months even the state senator from the district of one of these gentlemen and the state senator from a county represented on this floor by the other gentleman have, for the sake of the good name of our State, been compelled to resign?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Did I understand the gentleman from New York to say that one of the gentlemen who criticized the insurgents himself advocated a bolter from the Republican caucus of the state senate of New York?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Who was it?

Mr. FISH. The gentlemen from New York [Mr. FASSETT and Mr. DWIGHT].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Advocated the election of a man who refused to support the caucus nominee. Who was the man?

Mr. FISH. Senator Hinman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is one of the saddest things I have ever heard. [Laughter.]

Mr. FISH. My colleague from the thirty-third district owns, and I believe edits, a newspaper which, while perhaps limited in circulation is by no means limited in fulsome praise of its owner; its columns are bubbling over with his great deeds. In fact, he needs no press agent; he fills it himself. That is a mere matter of taste and I have no comment to make, but I had supposed that one was rather ethically restrained from attacking a colleague, as it were, in the dark.

The issue of his paper of March 21, in which his own speech is described as "one of the best, most eloquent, and patriotic of the many addresses made during the memorable struggle," states that "Mr. MALBY called attention to the fact that when Mr. FISH was speaker of the New York assembly he created a committee on rules and made himself the chairman of the committee on rules," and then it goes on to say that "it illustrates the sweet simplicity or the hypocrisy of the Hon. HAMILTON FISH," and so forth. The article in question shows only the crass ignorance of the owner or editor of the paper, one or both. As the rules of the New York assembly specifically provide for a committee on rules of which the speaker shall be not only a member, but chairman, how then could I have appointed myself?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What editor was that?

Mr. FISH. The editor of a paper owned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FASSETT].

Mr. MALBY has since acknowledged that he was mistaken in his statement. I do not expect any such frank acknowledgment from the editor-owner. It is a matter of indifference to me, as well as to the people of the Twenty-first Congressional District what the gentleman from the thirty-third may think. The only time the people of the four counties composing the twenty-first district had of expressing their views of him was when in 1891 he ran for governor and was defeated by upward of 47,000 majority by his Democratic opponent, and by 820 in the counties composing the present Twenty-first Congressional District. In fact, he is the single and significant instance of the only Republican candidate for governor of our State who in twenty years has been defeated. The gentleman does not always correctly reflect public sentiment. For a long time he vigorously opposed Governor Hughes in his efforts to secure legislation to stop betting on the race tracks. He urged his state senator to oppose it, and it was only at the very end of that memorable struggle that he sent the famous "John and I" telegram,

which apparently was found to be capable of two interpretations.

Two years ago, I remember him, at the state convention (where we were both delegates) protesting against the renomination of that fearless executive Charles E. Hughes, and only lately he is credited with the following statement. I quote from the Troy Observer of April 3, 1910:

Referring to the proclaimed intention of Governor Hughes to retire from politics, at least for the time being, Mr. FASSETT says:

"A possible defeat for the governorship race, in addition to the record of the last election wherein he fell 130,000 votes behind the Republican ticket, would seriously cripple his activity as a presidential possibility."

This is certainly a very unpleasant remark, and it is not surprising that some of Governor Hughes's admirers resent it with considerable show of heat.

By analogous reasoning, as the gentleman's majority for Congress in 1904 was 8,221, in 1906, 5,252, and in 1908—I quote from the New York World Almanac of 1909, page 646:

Thirty-third District of New York—James A. Parsons, Democrat, 20,319; Jacob S. Fassett, Republican, 24,580.

That is a majority of 4,261, compared with 8,221 in 1904. We might inquire, in view of his vote in the House of Representatives on January 8, 1909, to rebuke Theodore Roosevelt, and his unremitting efforts to save the House rules and the House organization, what the gentleman's majority is likely to be this fall?

From the result of the recent special election in the thirty-second district of our State, one would infer from the extracts from the gentleman's paper that his hindsight is better than his foresight. [Laughter.]

Quoting:

The Hon. George W. Aldridge will undoubtedly be the successor to Hon. James Breck Perkins from Rochester. Mr. Aldridge is a strong man; one of the best-balanced and level-headed members of the Republican state committee. He is a power in council. In Rochester he has the full and complete confidence of the people. They have known him since boyhood. They trust him; they have tried him out.

The Advertiser predicts that the results from the Rochester district will not be so gratifying to our friends, the enemy, as the results from the Massachusetts district. (Elmira Advertiser, Mar. 28, 1910.)

With all his profession of loyalty to President Roosevelt when seeking favors, well may the latter have exclaimed, "How sharper than a serpent's tongue," when he learned that the gentleman from the thirty-third district had voted to rebuke him; and yet the same gentleman, in the recent debate on the rules, in his fruitless effort to save the House organization, quoted from a letter of four years ago of the late President. Was that the latest expression which has emanated from that source?

Is it not possible, aye, probable, that in view of subsequent events there had come a change of mind on his part?

However that may be, one may well exclaim, considering the purpose for which the letter was made use of, "He was a man who stole the livery of the court of heaven to serve the devil in."

Possibly the quotation would also apply to that part of the speech which my colleague [Mr. BENNET] delivered Tuesday. It is the first time that he has come out in the open as the champion of Cannonism. True it is that at a meeting of the New York delegation in January he offered an inspired resolution stating that the rules of the House, as then existing, were adequate. Suffice to say that this proposal to commit the delegation and thus to forestall the question met with so much opposition on the part of the members of the delegation that he was obliged to withdraw it.

Thus ended the movement to commit the delegations of the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio to the "adequacy of the rules;" the child died "a bornin'."

Mr. PARSONS. If the gentleman will yield, I think the statement in the resolution was that we were in favor of certain legislation and rules as these were advocating to secure that legislation. The explanation was made that the Republican party could call a caucus and that undoubtedly the Rules Committee would obey the party caucus and bring in a special rule.

Mr. FISH. I do not agree with the gentleman's explanation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] was one of those who wanted to cut that part out.

Mr. PARSONS. I did; I thought that the explanation was all right, and the resolution would be all right if it had the explanation in it, but it did not.

Mr. FISH. My colleague [Mr. BENNET] in his new-born zeal—and I admit that he has cause to be grateful to the House organization; he has been singularly favored—drags in the name of Theodore Roosevelt with intent to lead people to believe that the ex-President stands for Cannonism. Has the gentleman any reason for believing that Theodore Roosevelt was opposed to the elimination of the Speaker from the Rules Committee? Has he any reason for believing that he stands

for Cannonism? Does he not know that on the contrary Theodore Roosevelt resented the manner in which he was treated by the Speaker and the House organization the latter part of his administration?

Exuberance of spirits and intemperance of speech are often concomitants of banquets. The day that it was feared the comet might strike the earth was no exception to this rule. An assertion that there is not a Republican majority in this House for all measures that are for the good of the country and the party is a willful misstatement of facts.

To-day in another capital, the city of London, royalty, nobles, are paying their last tribute to one of the wisest rulers. Among others in attendance is the Right Hon. James William Lowther, Speaker of the House of Commons, a body second only to this, a man of dignity, of breeding, who has the respect of his colleagues and who respects them, a man who honors the place to which he has been called.

Republicanism does not mean the stifling of legislation which is in the interest of the people and of labor at the behest of corporations, nor does it stand for the writing of tariff schedules either by those who have special interests to subserve, nor for the benefit of and at the behest of certain former legislative cronies.

The Republican party from the earliest days has recognized the broadest and most liberal views and differences of opinion among its members. It was founded upon the doctrine of freedom of speech; unlike its political adversary, it chafed at the lash of either political or human bondage. Never in the history of the country has there been a time when the ties of party rested more lightly than to-day. The spirit of deep thinking and independent voting is rife.

The recent special elections in Massachusetts and New York attest it. It is no time to attempt to drive men out of the party, but rather to admit honest differences of opinion and recognize the conditions and adjust ourselves thereto by pursuing a broad and liberal policy, and the man, be he public official or private citizen, who fails to recognize it does his party a lasting injury. A few months ago there appeared a manifesto from some of the officials of the Republican congressional committee, of which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] is chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] is vice-chairman, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOUD-ENSLAGER] is secretary. It attempted to read out of the party some gentlemen who did not agree in all things with those who issued the manifesto; it may be dismissed as merely a fine touch of kindergarten politics. It reminded one of the three tailors of Tooley street. Compare that manifesto with the broad-minded views on the very same question propounded in a speech in this House a few weeks ago, on March 17, by the distinguished leader of the Republican side, the Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE:

I have no criticism to make of any gentleman on this side of the House for any vote he has given, for any position he has taken in all the debates in this Congress. I have no criticism to make of any Members on this side of the House who failed to vote for the conference report on the tariff bill last summer.

Now listen to the highest Republican authority in the land. President Taft, who within three weeks of the memorable struggle which resulted in the election of the new Rules Committee and the elimination of the Speaker therefrom used the following language in a speech at the Arlington Hotel in this city on April 9 last:

The Republican party is not rigid in its demands; it is so broad and liberal that it permits differences of opinion. To-night we are reading nobody out of the party. We want them all within the ranks.

After these expressions, what small soul will attempt to read men out of the party?

The Republican national convention two years ago decided by an overwhelming vote, by almost three-fourths of the convention, in favor of the exponent of progressive policies as opposed to the reactionary element. The Speaker of this House was a candidate for the Presidency and received 58 votes out of 1,000 for other candidates. The Republican delegates to that convention represented correctly the wishes of their constituencies. They desired that the Roosevelt policies should be carried out to their legitimate conclusion, and President Taft, faithful to his trust, is attempting to fulfill the principles enunciated in the platform, and in that he has been sustained at this session by an almost solid support of the progressives in this House.

While the Republicans, Representatives from fifteen great Commonwealths and numbering one-fifth of the Republicans voting upon the question, who voted to enlarge the composition of the committee and to eliminate the Speaker, are blind followers of no man, yet as a whole they favor the progressive Roosevelt-

Taft policies rather than those of the reactionary element of the party.

The long delay in reporting from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads the bill for postal savings bank can not be charged to the progressives, for there is but one of its representatives on the committee, and he has for weeks strenuously, in and out of season, urged having a bill reported.

The delay in reporting the anti-injunction bill from the Committee on the Judiciary can not be charged to the progressives, and yet each of these measures was part of our national platform and have been asked for by President Taft.

A party, like a man, which lives merely on its past stagnates and is but of little benefit to its or future generations. The Republican party, while justly proud of its glorious past, must turn its eyes to the future and keep step with that great onward uplift movement which, within the past eight years, has made such great strides under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt.

The Republicans of my State have two great molders of public opinion, men who are in the advance guard of all that makes for the benefit of morality and the good of their fellow-man. The first, that great private citizen to whom the whole civilized world has lately paid unexampled homage and who upon his return to our shores will receive from his countrymen such a welcome as has never been extended to living man. The other is our chief executive, Charles E. Hughes, whose administration has been the exponent of the highest citizenship and loftiest purposes.

In a speech delivered at New Rochelle, N. Y., on March 29 of the present year, he said:

I want to see the illicit efforts of privilege frustrated, bribery and corrupt arrangements destroyed, and the market places, where governmental favor has been bought and sold, converted into true assemblies of honest representatives of the people.

These words strike a sympathetic chord in the hearts of the progressives of this House. To those principles they give their cordial support, and all that they stand for they will maintain in their legislation. Is it not significant that a large share of responsibility of the administration measures in this House falls on so-called insurgents or near-insurgents? The able gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] introduced the President's chief conservation bill; in fact, as it passed the House it was almost a literal copy of the bill as introduced; and the railway rate bill was largely the handiwork of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], who bore a conspicuous part in securing its passage, and yet both of these gentlemen voted for an enlargement of the Rules Committee and the elimination of the Speaker therefrom.

A new brand of insurgents was developed in the consideration of the rate bill. Whether we call them New England or New Haven Republicans it is immaterial. Suffice it to say among them was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], who was so incensed at insurgency against the rules, and also that devoted follower of the Speaker, Mr. TILSON.

Let us be frank with one another. The definition of insurgency depends largely upon who construes it. It is a case of the old familiar definition of orthodoxy. Orthodoxy is my doxy. Heterodoxy is another man's doxy.

The progressive element of the House heartily support not only the principles of the national Republican platform, but also the President's measures. While they favor a protective tariff, they are not in favor of raising a Chinese wall to exclude all imports. Nor will they, unlike the ultra stand-pat element, oppose the laudable desire of the President for an appropriation of \$250,000 for the employment of experts and securing information as to the tariff rates so that the inequalities found to exist may be corrected, and in this attitude they are sustained by the great mass of the Republican party.

To the independent course of the progressives of this House is due the fact that the House membership of the Ballinger-Pinchot investigating committee was elected by the House rather than appointed by the Speaker. To this same element is due the fact that the Democratic membership of that committee was selected by the minority Members of the House rather than by a Republican caucus as was desired by the Speaker and the House organization. To them also is due the fact of the election by the House of an enlarged Rules Committee and the elimination of the Speaker therefrom; in fact, the whole atmosphere of the House has changed of late and many public questions are given the utmost consideration and the fullest debate on the floor of the House.

Such have been the fruits of the contest waged for greater freedom of action and the rights of the Representatives, and yet more remains to be done, and that it will be done within

the next few weeks admits of no doubt; that is, giving to this body an opportunity such as exists in every other legislative body in the civilized world—to vote on the question of having committees discharged from measures that have been too long stifled by them. Preferably it should come in the regular course of procedure by a rule reported from the Committee on Rules; if not, it shall come before the House in the same way as the resolution of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Norris]. Does anyone question its adoption by a still larger majority than his received on March 19?

The two great measures of the President's which have passed this House—the conservation bill and the railway rate bill—have received the support of the so-called insurgents or progressives, and I challenge contradiction of this statement. We can, fellow-Republicans, best carry to a successful issue in this House the remainder of the progressive measures of President Taft by recognizing that broad spirit of liberality which is so well and tersely expressed in the following words:

In essentials, unity;
In nonessentials, liberty;
In all things, charity.

Before the conclusion of the remarks by Mr. FISH the following occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House the time is controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota promised me twenty minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. BURLESON. I hope the gentleman will not take the gentleman from New York off his feet.

Mr. TAWNEY. I am not taking the gentleman off his feet; his time has expired.

Mr. FISH. Have I the right, Mr. Chairman, to print the remainder of my remarks in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right under the order of the House.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman from New York was yielded twenty minutes.

Mr. FISH. I was, and I want it to so appear in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division there were 20 ayes and 42 noes.

So the motion was lost.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House the committee will now rise and report to the House.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MANN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 25552) and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, under the order of the House agreed to yesterday we were to adjourn at 4 o'clock, with the understanding that the international Sunday-school parade would take place at that time, and that we were to go to the steps on the east side of the Capitol. I understand that the parade will not start until 5.45. If the time between now and then can be consumed in general debate, we will be able to close general debate to-morrow, and I ask unanimous consent to vacate the order of yesterday and agree to adjourn at 5.45 p. m.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I object.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] objects.

Mr. TAWNEY. We will close general debate to-morrow, anyway. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House passed yesterday, the hour of 4 o'clock p. m. having arrived, the House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules of audited claims (H. Doc. No. 926) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PEARRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3890) to amend an act entitled "An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or of his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances," approved March 23, 1906, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1374), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4503) to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, savings banks, trust companies, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1375), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17560) granting to Savanna Coal Company right to acquire additional acreage to its existing coal lease in the Choctaw Nation, Pittsburg County, Okla., and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1376), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 26130) to regulate the establishment of markets in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: A bill (H. R. 26131) granting to the State of Illinois all claims of the United States in the Illinois and Michigan Canal—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 26132) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended by an act approved February 5, 1903, and as further amended by an act approved June 15, 1906—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 26133) to authorize the Stockton and Eastern Railroad Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, to construct a bridge across the Stockton diverting canal, connecting Mormon Channel with the Calaveras River, in the county of San Joaquin, State of California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 26134) granting to the State of California public lands, and the proceeds thereof to be used for the construction and improvement of public highways—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 26135) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit the relinquishment of lands in certain Choctaw and Chickasaw coal leases, and the substitution of other lands therefor, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 26136) to provide for the creation and maintenance of an emergency station for the treatment of indigent invalids at Hot Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 26137) permitting suits against the United States for damages caused by vessels owned or operated by the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Resolution (H. Res. 708) of inquiry to the Secretary of War—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILL of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 26138) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26139) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANT: A bill (H. R. 26140) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Crane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 26141) granting an increase of pension to James Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 26142) granting a pension to Emily Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 26143) granting an increase of pension to John Taft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 26144) for the relief of Lydia A. Newby—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 26145) granting an increase of pension to Frances Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 26146) granting a pension to Ulysess S. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 26147) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Gilbert—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. BARNHART: Petition of independent telephone and telegraph companies, asking interstate-commerce regulation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURLESON: Petition of Colorado Springs and Pueblo (Colo.) Stereotypers' Union, No. 67; Batavia (N. Y.) Central Labor Union; Galveston (Tex.) International Association of Longshoremen; Dubuque (Iowa) United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Gas Fitters, etc.; Cleveland (Ohio) Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Union; Federacion Libre de Los Trabajadores of Porto Rico; East Liverpool (Ohio) Trades and Labor Council; Zanesville (Ohio) Central Trades and Labor Council; Sandusky (Ohio) Trades and Labor Assembly; Washington (D. C.) International Association of Machinists; Topeka (Kans.) United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Gas Fitters, etc.; Chicago (Ill.) Brotherhood of Freight Handlers; Kansas City (Mo.) International Association of Machinists; Bloomington (Ill.) Trades and Labor Assembly; Washington (D. C.) Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners; Buffalo (N. Y.) International Longshoremen's Association; Niagara Falls (N. Y.) Federal Union, No. 7479, United Garment Workers of America; Cleveland (Ohio) Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America; Portland (Oreg.) Musicians' Mutual Association; and Springfield (Ohio) International Association of Machinists, favoring repeal of 10-cent tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, of San Marcos, Tex., for amendment of House bill 21321, in the interest of fraternal periodicals as second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DIEKEMA: Petition of Union No. 1369 and Union No. 1352, of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, favoring the eight-hour law on government works—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., for increase of postage rates on second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of National Lodge, No. 556, International Association of Machinists, of New York, against federal control of the water supply of San Francisco—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Young Women's Christian Association, of Chicago, Ill., relative to proposed legislation concerning the water supply for the city of San Francisco—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of John H. Denbigh, superintendent Norris High School, New York City, favoring House bill 15798, for issuance of arms and ammunition to high schools for improvement of military efficiency of the country—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Commercial Union Assurance Company, New York, for the Panama exposition at New Orleans—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., indorsing recommendations of the President rela-

tive to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of Minnesota Valley Medical Association, for Senate bill 6049, to create a department of public health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Dr. F. M. Manson and twelve other physicians of Nobles County, Minn., favoring the establishment of the proposed department of public health, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, of Fargo, N. Dak., praying for certain amendments to House bill 21321—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Farmington (Conn.) Grange, No. 49, Patrons of Husbandry, for Senate bill 6931, for an appropriation of \$500,000 for extension of work of the Office of Public Roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of G. C. Noble and other citizens of Crete, Nebr., for retention of the present oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Arthur Turner and others, in support of Senate bill 6931, providing an appropriation of \$500,000 to extend the work of improving the public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition of Medical Society of Henderson County, Ill., asking that Senate bill 6049 be enacted into law, and favoring a national health bureau—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLAUGHLAN of Michigan: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Emily Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Jefferson Van Horne—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Dr. L. J. Harvey and other citizens of Griggsville, Ill., for a national bureau of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Columbia Historical Society, for a suitable monument to the memory of Commodore Joshua Barney—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. STURGISS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George M. Lamont—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Bass, Ratcliff & Gretton (Limited), against Senate bill 8168, providing for labeling all packages with weight, measure, etc., of contents—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of president of the New York Produce Exchange Bank, indorsing House bill 25333, relating to bills of lading—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Commercial Union Assurance Company (Limited), of New York, favoring New Orleans as site of the World's Panama Exposition—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of Herman Ridder, for the Mann bill (House bill 12314) to promote commerce with the Dominion of Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of Progressive Club, of Golden, Colo.; Fortnightly Club, of Pueblo, Colo.; and Woman's Club, of La Junta, Colo., for the establishment of a national health bureau by the United States Government—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, of Rico, Colo., for amendment to House bill 21321, relative to rate of postage on fraternal periodicals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, for amendment of House bill 21321, in the interest of fraternal periodicals as second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of John Lucas & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., for Senate bill 1614 and House bill 3075—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petition of Lacktown (N. J.) Grange, No. 88, Patrons of Husbandry, for Senate bill 6931, making appropriation of \$500,000 for extension of the work of the Office of Public Roads of the United States Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Lacktown (N. J.) Grange, No. 88, and Raritan Valley Grange, No. 153, Patrons of Husbandry, of South Branch, N. J., for Senate bill 5842—oleomargarine regulation—to the Committee on Agriculture.