

him as a shock. The manner and incidents of his death were unspcakably sad. Whether in his case the words were true—

Thou steal'st away my breath, Life's purpose unfulfilled—
This is thy sting, O Death!

I know not. I only know that he was devoted to his country, faithful to his trusts, sincere in all his relations with his fellow-men, and suddenly taken from us in the prime of his faculties and the plenitude of his usefulness. Death has bereft us of his presence. Death can not bereave his family, friends, or country of the high service he rendered nor of the tender memories which his manly personality inspired.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to state that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], who had intimate knowledge of and held affectionate relations with Judge DE ARMOND during his service here at the Capitol, had intended to be present and pay his tribute to the deceased, but he sends me word that the illness with which he is afflicted makes it physically impossible for him to be present to-day.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it had not been my purpose to make any remarks upon this occasion, but I do not feel like permitting these exercises to close without paying a tribute to the memory of one of the most distinguished citizens of my State. I am here to bear witness that DAVID A. DE ARMOND was true to every demand of good citizenship. As a lawyer he was loyal to his clients, as a judge he was just and fearless, and as a statesman he was intellectually honest. In debate he was a master, neither asking for nor giving quarter.

His success came to him by reason of his untiring industry and incorruptible integrity. His life was a struggle; his death was a tragedy. In the full power of his manhood and in the zenith of his usefulness he passed away. I am constrained to believe that when called upon to cross the invisible and shadowy line separating time from eternity, pressing his little grandson to his bosom amid the flames, he passed over, "seeing nothing here to regret or there to fear." In life the grandfather and the grandson were companions; in death they were not parted.

Mr. President, skeptical as we may be, when we stand in the presence of our dead there comes to our aching hearts an affirmative answer to the question of the ages, "If a man die, shall he live again?"

Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask for its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Secretary will read the resolution submitted by the Senator from Missouri.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved. That as a further mark of respect to the memory of FRANCIS W. CUSHMAN and DAVID A. DE ARMOND, the distinguished deceased Representatives, the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Missouri.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 23, 1910, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, May 21, 1910.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

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

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, 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 (H. R. 25552).

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 sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 25552), with Mr. MANN in the chair.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, some time ago I made application for an hour to discuss the first section of the sundry civil appropriation bill, but time seems to be so much in demand that I very cheerfully have withdrawn that request, and I ask in lieu of it that I may be permitted to extend very briefly, with one or two short quotations, my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right under the order of the House.

Mr. HILL. I will state that I am most thoroughly and heartily in favor of the tariff-board proposition as presented by the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. YOUNG of New York. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak primarily on the provision in the sundry civil appropriation bill providing \$250,000 to enable the tariff board to perform the work for which it was created. I do not think any Member on either side of this House should hesitate a moment to vote for it.

We are all certainly desirous of getting at the facts upon which we can base any amendments to the tariff bill which may be deemed wise and in the interest of all the people. We are here for that very purpose.

I do not share the fear of many of those on the Democratic side of the House that the President would conceal or withhold information furnished him by the tariff board, and certainly this House has the power to demand that he furnish Congress with the information.

It seems to me, if we should ever have the misfortune to have a Democratic President, and the facts sustain the contention of the Republicans that the difference in cost of production proved to be such as to justify the Payne tariff schedules, a Democratic House might not want to have such wide publicity of it.

I, personally, am so confident that the tariff bill is based on the difference in cost of production that I would consider very seriously an amendment providing that the data secured should be laid before the House by the President.

We have heard a great deal of talk about the tariff bill being responsible for the high cost of living, and I am going to take a different position from my colleagues in this respect and state frankly that I think the bill measurably responsible for the advance in many articles in daily use. You all remember that owing to the financial panic of 1907-8, brought on by the most reckless band of financial pirates this country has ever seen, men who for their own enrichment ruined banks, destroyed confidence throughout the country, impoverished thousands, and destroyed values of all commodities. Factories, furnaces, mills, and workshops curtailed production or work ceased, and all business was crippled.

The country was just recovering from this disaster when the discussion of the tariff revision began, and this created distrust and unrest. Manufacturers feared to continue their work, bankruptcies were very numerous. Importers were afraid to bring merchandise from abroad, not knowing what rate of duty they would be compelled to pay, and stagnation prevailed throughout the land.

The President's signature was not yet dry on the Payne bill when all trade revived. The workshops were open, and the hum of industry was heard throughout the land.

Goods came forward from abroad in shiploads, and workers were everywhere employed at good wages, and they had money with which to buy.

Then it was found that the stocks of merchandise had been so depleted that there was not enough to meet the growing demand, and prices began to advance, and as prosperity increased prices advanced still more, until the high level of to-day was reached.

Mr. Chairman, to this extent the Payne bill is responsible for the high prices, and no further. This is what caused articles from which the duty was removed or reduced to advance in price.

Placing hides on the free list opened the markets of the world to us, and still, there being an insufficient supply, hides advanced 20 per cent.

The duties on various grades of leather were reduced from 20 per cent to 50 per cent, and leather advanced. The duty on shoes was cut 66 per cent, and still they advanced, and if the duty had been entirely removed they would have advanced.

It is simply a question of supply and demand which regulates prices, but I want to say to this House, in view of the remarks made on the Democratic side, that the duty on shoes was reduced too much, and already the shoe manufacturers of this country find themselves in competition with shoes from Europe and Asia, made on American lasts and patterns by American machines, with labor from 50 per cent to 75 per cent cheaper than the wages paid to American labor, which should not and would not live as the European and oriental laborer.

As I have said, the duty on shoes, you will remember, was reduced about 66 per cent, and to these remarks I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I proclaimed from the beginning, and I proclaim now, that the reduction of the duty on shoes was too drastic. Labor on the other side of the water is from 50 to 75 per cent less than it is here. I stated in this House repeatedly that without a fair, reasonable protection on shoes the American manufacturer

would very speedily be confronted with a condition of which he never dreamed, and I want to say to this House now that I hold in my hand two shoes, one of them made in Europe, the other made in this country, and one is landed, duty paid, at about 98 cents; the other shoe costs to make in this country \$1.30. It is sold at \$1.35—5 cents profit to the manufacturer. I want to say further to the gentleman from Missouri that not only in this country at large will a demand come before long for an increase of duty, but especially from his own imperial city of St. Louis, where they say they are making forty, fifty, and sixty thousand pairs of shoes to-day in a single factory, and 250,000 pairs are made in the city of St. Louis every working day.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman two questions in one. Was it not testified to before the Committee on Ways and Means that we can make shoes cheaper than any of the nations of the earth, and was not the claim for this tariff on shoes the fact that there was some kind of a trust on shoe-making machinery, and the American manufacturers were afraid that that would get to Europe?

Mr. YOUNG of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask if I am charged with the time that the gentleman from Missouri has taken from me? I am very sorry, because I want to say to the gentleman the man who gave the Ways and Means Committee that information did not know of the error in his statement, and he never knew it, until he went home and consulted other manufacturers in the East and learned what the true conditions were, and he returned to the Ways and Means Committee and withdrew the statement, saying he was in error. I have known the conditions from the beginning, and protested against the reduction of the duty on shoes, and your people in Missouri will not send back to this House any man who in any effort to destroy their business by reducing duty on their goods will stand for a reduction, or will not, when the time comes, stand for an increase on shoes.

Much has been said on this floor about the prices of meat. Meat has advanced in almost every country on the globe. A few days ago I read a comprehensive report showing that meat in Hamburg and Hanover, Germany, was dearer than in New York.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard much of the cheaper cost of living in Canada compared with this country. I hold in my hand Senate Document No. 437, showing prices in Windsor, Canada, and Detroit, Mich., on the same day, February 25, indicating that nearly all articles of food were cheaper in Detroit than on the Canadian side. I propose inserting this in the Record as part of my remarks.

In England the cost of living has advanced 10 per cent, and, indeed, in all lands on which I have information the cost of living has materially increased, and in no other country have wages advanced as much as in this country. Nowhere on earth are men as well paid for their labor, nowhere on earth do men live as well as here.

Mr. Chairman, I boldly declare that I do not think there is a man in this House who would declare himself in favor of free trade. The constituency of every Member on both sides of the House want free trade on the things they do not make or raise and a protective tariff on everything they have for sale. I remember very well the remarks of Mr. CLARK of Florida, who said, in substance, that he wanted protection on long staple cotton and the products of his State. I can see this will be found the case with every section of the country, and no man should hold his place in this House who would favor reducing American wages to the level paid in either Europe or the Orient.

When in England some time ago I visited an old and prominent manufacturing establishment, and talked with the proprietor regarding wages paid to the various employees in his business.

He informed me that he was paying porters from \$5 to \$7 per week, while at the same time in this country we were paying from \$12 to \$16 per week, and head porters as high as \$25 per week. Ordinary workmen in his establishment were being paid from \$5 to \$8 per week, while similar workmen were being paid from \$9 to \$15 per week here; and for skilled labor he was paying from \$8 to \$12, while for similar work we were paying from \$12 to \$18 per week.

During my conversation a few days ago with an English manufacturer in the same line of business he informed me he was paying practically the same wages, while the wage scale in America in the meantime has advanced.

It is undoubtedly true that the ordinary class of workmen in England are able to live on a considerably smaller outlay than in this country, but this is largely due to inferiority of living. They do not consume such expensive food, do not wear as expensive clothing, and do not occupy as comfortable abodes as American workmen.

In Belgium at the time of my last visit a manufacturer called on me, suggesting that I contribute capital so that he might increase his business to full capacity of his factory, and as an inducement stated that he could make goods much cheaper than we could make them in this country—so much cheaper, in fact, that he could ship his product to America, pay 20 per cent duty, and undersell the American manufacturer.

The suggestion seemed such an attractive one that I took the matter up with him seriously, and he informed me the reason why he could produce his goods so much cheaper than we could in this country was that he employed 50 per cent female labor, which averaged 38 cents per day, and the 50 per cent of male labor averaged about 85 cents per day.

Upon going into the proposition very carefully, he demonstrated to my entire satisfaction his ability to produce goods conformedly with his statements.

After careful consideration I realized that, while it might be a money-making business and perfectly feasible, if I joined him, selling the product of his factory in this country, I should be compelled to discharge those in the same line and turn them in idleness in the streets, and I informed him that this I could not do.

Mr. Chairman, I make the broad statement that any man who would by any act deprive the American workmen of labor by voting for a tariff which would close workshops and reduce the wages of the American workmen to the level of the European or oriental is unworthy to be classed as an American.

Do our friends on the other side of the House think that Mr. Gompers, the great apostle of organized labor, would support a Member of this House who was willing to go on record as opposed to the prevailing scale of wages or that would reduce wages to a lower level than at present?

Mr. Gompers has recently said that nowhere on earth were men better paid, better fed, better clothed, or better housed than in this country. Would you change this condition by reducing the power of manufacturers to pay present high wages?

I say to you that this condition can not continue if the American manufacturer is placed on a parity with those carrying on similar work in Europe or Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of New York. Can I have a little more time? The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman in charge of the time for the majority does not seem to be on the floor.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the time has been apportioned for the entire day, and if I should yield time to the gentleman other gentlemen who have already been reduced will have to suffer. I can not part with more time.

Mr. YOUNG of New York. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask the privilege of extending my remarks in the Record and inserting some matter which I think is of a public nature.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that privilege under the general order.

The matter referred to is as follows:

APPENDIX A.

Relative cost of food, weighted according to family consumption in the United States, 1899 to 1907.

COST IN 1899=100.0.

(Computed from data in Bulletin 77, Bureau of Labor.)

	Per cent.
1899.....	100.0
1900.....	101.6
1901.....	105.7
1902.....	111.5
1903.....	110.9
1904.....	112.3
1905.....	113.0
1906.....	116.3
1907.....	121.2

Relative wages per hour and relative full-time weekly earnings per employee in the principal manufacturing and mechanical industries of the United States, 1899 to 1907.

WAGES FOR 1899=100.0.

[These figures do not cover wages in agriculture, mining, transportation, domestic service, or any line of work not classed as manufacturing or mechanical.]

(Computed from data in Bulletin 77, Bureau of Labor.)

Year.	Relative wages per hour.	Relative full-time weekly earnings per employee.
1899.....	100.0	100.0
1900.....	103.4	102.9
1901.....	105.9	104.6
1902.....	110.9	107.9
1903.....	114.0	111.0
1904.....	114.7	110.9
1905.....	116.6	112.6
1906.....	121.8	117.1
1907.....	126.3	120.9

APPENDIX B.
Summary of prices in Windsor and Detroit.

Articles.	Windsor.	Detroit.
	Cents.	Cents.
Homemade headcheese.....	10	10-15
Selected corned beef..... per pound.....	10	7-8-10
Finest hamburger steak..... do.....	10	9-10
Prime rib roast of beef..... do.....	12½-13	11-12
Porterhouse steak..... do.....	16-17	14-15
Sirloin steak..... do.....	15	12½-14
Round steak..... do.....	12	13
Leg of lamb..... do.....	16	15-16
Roast fillet of veal..... do.....	12½-16	12½-15
Outlets of veal..... do.....	15	16-18
Stewing veal..... do.....	8-10	10
Roast pork..... do.....	15	16
Pork chops..... do.....	16-18	17
Forequarter pork..... do.....	13	13
Leaf lard..... do.....	14-15	12-15
Front quarter lamb..... do.....	12½	13½
Hind quarter lamb..... do.....	15	15
Bacon..... do.....	20	18-20
Ham..... do.....	17	15½-17
Bologna..... do.....	10	15
Pork sausage..... do.....	12½	12-17
Liver..... do.....	10	6
Oysters..... per quart.....	50	40
Cranberries.....	12½	(b)
Hinkel's buckwheat flour..... per package.....	25	(c)
Fresh eggs..... per dozen.....	35	27-28
Fancy white potatoes..... per bushel.....	60	45-49
Grape fruit..... (d)	4	4 10
Extra fancy butter..... per pound.....	30	32
Seeded raisins..... per package.....	12½	7½
Flour..... per sack.....	75	68
Sauer kraut..... per quart.....	10	7
Granulated sugar..... per pound.....	(e)	(f)

^a Three pounds for 25 cents. ^d Three for 25 cents.
^b Two quarts for 15 cents. ^e Eighteen pounds for \$1.
^c Three packages for 25 cents. ^f Ten pounds for 47 cents.

APPENDIX C.

BRITISH LABOR CONDITIONS AND COST OF LIVING—WAGE SCALES SECURED FROM UNION ORGANIZATIONS.

Special Agent Henry Studniczka, who has been making an investigation of wages, cost of living, and the general condition of the laboring population in the London district, submits the following report:

The scales of wages given herein have been recognized since October 1, 1909, by the different trade unions and agreed to by the employers' associations. In a few exceptional cases the scale has been determined by the local conciliation boards or by umpires and arbitrators accepted by the unions. The wages named are for time work of male adults. Wages in the interior of England for the same trades, it is stated, are on a lower level, owing to the fact that living expenses there are proportionately lower.

The figures were secured from the secretaries of the labor organizations in London or, if the principal offices of the unions were in Manchester or other cities, from subordinate unions in the metropolis. Among the prominent labor organizations visited were the Workingmen's Club and Institute Union, the National Antisweating League, the Women's Trade Union League, and various unions of the building trades. The Workingmen's Club and Institute Union is a union of some 1,300 workingmen's clubs, with a membership of over 400,000. The National Antisweating League, authorized by the board of trade in 1909, embraces those employed in the following trades: Wholesale ready-made clothing, paper-box manufactures, machine-made lace and net work, and certain kinds of chains manufactured by women and children. The league, directly and through its branches, makes inquiries into existing conditions. The law authorizing its work affects between 30,000 and 40,000 employees, many of them women and girls, who are kept acquainted with their rights under the various labor laws.

All the secretaries of the building trade unions stated that building in London has been dull for the past three years. At all of the offices visited there was a general complaint of short time and proportionately poor earnings for the various classes of workmen during the past two to five years. The secretaries that were willing to commit themselves said that their men during this period have not had employment more than 65 to 75 per cent of the full time they were willing and able to work.

WAGES PAID TO VARIOUS TRADES.

Following are scales of the wages paid the various trades and classes of labor in the London district, the number of working hours per week without overtime also being given:

Building trades.—Working hours per week, 50 in summer and 44 in winter. Wages per hour: Stone masons, 21 cents; bricklayers, 21 cents; plasterers, 22 cents; bricklayers' and plasterers' assistants, 14 cents; carpenters, 21 cents; plumbers, 22 cents; painters, 18 cents.

Furniture trades.—Working hours per week, 52. Wages per hour: Cabinetmakers, 21 cents; polishers, 18 cents; upholsterers, 20 to 24 cents; machinists, 20 to 28 cents; carvers, 19 to 22 cents; chair makers, 20 cents.

Boiler makers and steel-ship building trades.—Working hours per week in shop, 54; for repair work outside, 45. Wages per week in shop: Boiler makers, sheet-iron workers, and angle-iron smiths, \$10.94; riveters, \$6.32; calkers, \$8.49; holders-up, \$6.56. For outside work wages are about \$1.21 more per week.

Lithographers.—Working hours per week, 54. Wages per week: Lithographers, \$9.73 (minimum); lithographers, tin printing, \$10.94; lithographers, rotary machine, \$13.38.

Bookbinders and rulers.—Working hours per week, 48. Wages per week for bookbinders and rulers, \$8.50.

Compositors.—Working hours per week, 52½. Wages per week in jobbing trade and on weekly newspapers, \$9.49.

Electrical workers.—Working hours per week, 54. Wages per hour: Fitters and wiremen, 19 cents; armature winders, 18 cents; cable joiners, 19 cents.

Shoe trade.—Working hours per week, 52½. Wages per week: Clickers (foremen), lasters, and finishers, \$7.29; pressmen, \$4.86.

Bakers.—Working hours per week, 55. Wages per week: Foremen, \$8.51; first-class hands, \$7.29; second-class hands, \$6.81; helpers, \$6.56.

Engineering trades.—Working hours per week, 54. Wages per week: Turners, fitters, copper-smiths, brass finishers, borers, slotters, millers, die sinkers, and press tool makers, \$7.73; smiths, \$9.73 to \$11.92; millwrights, \$10.33; iron foundry, \$9.73 to \$10.46; pattern makers, \$10.70.

Ship service.—Wages per month with board: Chief steamship engineer, \$68 to \$83; second engineer, \$48 to \$58; third engineer, \$36.49 to \$43.79; fourth engineer, \$30.40 to \$36.49; firemen, \$21.89 to \$24.33; trimmers, \$19.46 to \$21.89; able seamen, \$19.46 to \$21.89; able seamen (sailing vessels), \$14.60. Dock stevedores receive 10 to 24 cents per hour for loading and unloading vessels.

POLICE, MOTORMEN, CONDUCTORS, CABMEN, ETC.

London city police.—These policemen work in the heart of the city on exacting duty, and their pay is \$6.56 (minimum) to \$10.33 (maximum) per week. The London Metropolitan police, taking in all the duties in greater London, receive \$6.19 (minimum) to \$8.51 (maximum) per week, and the reserve class receive \$9.34 per week. Twelve cents additional is paid for each five years' service with good conduct. These men receive an extra allowance for coal in winter, and their uniforms are furnished.

Motor omnibus drivers and conductors.—There are about 2,000 motor omnibuses in London, and the motormen receive from \$1.70 to \$1.94 per day of fifteen to sixteen hours, according to the trips they have to make, the length of service for the company also being considered. The conductors who collect the fares receive from \$1.46 to \$1.70 per day.

Horse omnibus drivers and conductors.—The drivers and conductors of the 2,500 horse omnibuses receive from \$1.46 to \$1.70 per day of fifteen hours. Length of service for the company is a factor in determining the wages.

Taxicab motormen.—In London there are approximately 4,000 taxicabs. The men that operate them receive 25 per cent of the money they actually collect. Out of this they furnish their own gasoline and do the minor repairing themselves. As an average the men interviewed stated that they can make \$15 to \$20 per week, according to how fortunate they are in securing passengers. This is unquestionably the best paid class of workmen I found in London.

London cabmen.—London has over 9,000 four-wheeled and two-wheeled one-horse cabs. The cab drivers rent these cabs and horses from different companies. They pay the owners in winter season \$1.94 and in the summer season, when London is full of tourists and their business is very active, \$2.92 rent per day for cab and horse. Their compensation for driving is the difference between the rental they pay and the fares they collect. The men interviewed stated that only in the busy season can they make from \$10 to \$12 per week, and in winter months they can not realize more than \$7 weekly.

Coal porters.—Almost all houses in London are heated by grate fires. The daily coal delivery therefore takes a large force of men. Coal is delivered in 112 and 56 pound sacks, each wagon having a driver and a helper. They receive 14 to 16 cents per ton for loading the coal on the wagons, delivering, and unloading at the houses. On exceptionally thickly settled routes they can make about \$7 per week each. In poor neighborhoods the coal porters pay for the coal as they take it out and collect whatever price they may be able to get for the coal. This difference in price is their compensation for their work.

City street cleaners.—Each street-cleaning wagon has one driver and one loader, each of whom receives \$1.13 per day, fifty-six hours constituting a week.

Delivery-wagon drivers.—The drivers of delivery wagons of wholesale and retail houses work from twelve to fourteen hours per day. Many of them collect for the goods, and they receive \$7.25 to \$8.50 per week. Those that deliver only and make no collections receive \$6 to \$7.25 per week.

London letter carriers.—This is part of the government civil service. The apprentice letter carrier starts at \$5.10 per week. When old soldiers are employed they start at \$5.83 and are gradually advanced to \$8.51 per week, according to time of service and record. This is the maximum pay. Their uniforms are supplied by the Government, and a pension is paid when they reach the old-age limit.

Common laborers.—Common day laborers receive for various work from 10 to 14 cents an hour. Gas-work stokers get \$1.39 to \$1.46 for eight hours' work, double time being given for Sunday labor.

LABOR IN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS.

A trip was made to Godalming, in the county of Surrey, Swanley, county of Kent, and Haslemier, in the county of Surrey. The wages paid in these counties are almost the same, and have been averaged in one general figure for each class of workmen. None of these places is over 30 miles distant from London.

Common laborers receive \$4.38 weekly, or, estimating the value of supplies furnished by the landowner, \$4.98 per week.

Hostlers and cattlemen receive \$4.50 cash, weekly, or, with the addition of cash value supplies, \$5.46.

Shepherds receive \$4.86 cash, or, with the addition of cash value for supplies, \$5.34 weekly. The married men are supplied with cottages, and receive in many cases ground for gardens or potatoes, straw for pigs, and free cartage of fuel, and other minor benefits which the landowner wishes to grant them.

All single hired men on farms in these counties receive lodging and board in farmhouses and \$4.38 cash compensation, weekly. It is generally understood that these men work longer hours.

From all my interviews I am constrained to arrive at one conclusion, that the unskilled laborer in this district can not make over 20s. (\$4.86) per week at steady employment, and that even some of the mechanical workers, such as those in the building trades, are not earning over 25s. (\$6.07) weekly on a general average the year round.

COST OF LIVING.

The prices of living supplies furnished in this statement were obtained in the three most prominent laboring districts in the city: Islington, Hackney, and Whitechapel. From ten to fifteen stores in each district were visited, and from two to three of the articles were priced in each store; and the figures given below are the average obtained in the three districts on each article named.

No effort was made to obtain the prices in the higher resident districts or around the habitations of the middle classes, as 25 to 50 per cent more is charged in these districts for the articles sold by the same name, the quality, however, being superior. My aim was to get at the cheapest possible way of living for the men who do not earn over 25s. (\$6.07) per week and less, this amount representing the greatest army of laborers in the city of London.

Special attention has been given to the cost of bread. Over 20 large retail bakeries were visited, and the same class of bread that can be purchased in Chicago, St. Louis, and New Orleans at 5 cents per pound costs here 4 cents per pound in all the retail stores. In the laboring districts, however, a 4-pound loaf is sold for 12 cents. This bread compares well with the second day's stale bread which wholesale bakers in American cities sell for 2½ cents per pound. It is a good substantial food, but not the best obtainable.

Following is a list of prices asked for various articles in the three districts visited:

Articles.	Price.	
	Pence.	Cents.
Apples, second and third quality.....	2 to 3	4 to 6
Bread.....	4	12
Butter, dairy.....	12 to 16	24 to 32
Cheese, Canadian.....	7 to 8	14 to 16
Cocoa.....	8 to 18	16 to 36
Coffee.....	8 to 18	16 to 36
Currants.....	2 to 4	4 to 8
Eggs.....	12 to 16	24
Fish:		
Cod.....	4 to 6	8 to 12
Salmon.....	3 to 4	6 to 8
Various kinds.....	2 to 6	4 to 12
Flour, second quality.....	4½ to 5	9 to 10
Jam.....	3 to 4	6 to 8
Marmalade.....	4 to 5	8 to 10
Meat:		
Bacon.....	8 to 12	16 to 24
Beef—		
Frozen.....	5 to 7	10 to 14
Fresh.....	8 to 10	16 to 20
Pork, steak and ribs.....	6 to 8	12 to 16
Milk, fresh.....	2	4
Oatmeal.....	2 to 3	4 to 3
Onions.....	1	2
Oranges.....	2 to 3	2
Potatoes.....	1 to 1	1 to 2
Do.....	30 to 48	72 to 96
Prunes.....	4 to 6	8 to 12
Raisins.....	3 to 5	6 to 10
Rice, lowest quality.....	2	4
Sirup.....	3	6
Sugar:		
White.....	2½	5
Yellow.....	2	4
Tapioea.....	4	8
Tea.....	10 to 30	20 to 60
Tomatoes.....	4	8
Vegetables, general.....	1½ to 2	3 to 4

Not less than 75 families were visited, and from all the information gathered from these interviews a family of man and wife, with possibly two small children, may subsist on the following food per week:

Articles.	Quantity.	Cost.	
		Pence.	Cents.
Bacon.....	2	24	\$0.48
Bread.....	30	45	.90
Butter.....	1	12	.24
Cheese.....	1	7	.14
Coffee.....	¾	3	.06
Currants.....	1	3	.06
Meat, frozen.....	6	30	.60
Milk.....	10	20	.40
Potatoes.....	12	14	.24
Rice, or equivalent.....	3	6	.12
Sugar.....	5	10	.20
Tea.....	¾	6	.12
Vegetables.....	5	5	.10
Total.....		183	3.63

¾ Pints.

The pence have been converted on the basis of 2 cents, but the slight difference between this and the actual value would make the total cost \$3.68.

To this must be added the cost of rental, which amounts in the poorest districts for one room to not less than 2s. (48 cents) per week, and for a three-room flat from 8s. to 10s. (\$1.94 to \$2.43) per week. The coal in these laboring districts is sold at the rate of 32 to 36 cents per 112 pounds. To this must also be added the possibility of a car fare, which amounts to 2 cents to 8 cents per trip. The men seldom use the cars, unless exceptional distance from work necessitates this. Some of the better-paid workmen, such as engineers and others, who earn from \$7.25 to \$9.75 per week, are living better in proportion. The only real cheap article I found is the workman's clothing. One of the union secretaries stated, "No workman with wife and two children in London, in my opinion, can subsist and be housed for less than 22s. (\$5.34) per week."

The Board of Trade Labor Gazette states that employment in January was, on the whole, not quite so good as in December. Shipbuilding and engineering continued to improve, but nearly all the textile trades showed some falling off, especially cotton. There was also a seasonal decline in the building and printing trades.

The winter months are everywhere the poorest times of the year for the working classes, and there are thousands of unemployed men able and ready to work around the London docks. Charitable institutions are doing their utmost to take care of the indigent classes.

LABOR IN NOVA SCOTIA—RATES OF WAGES AND COST OF LIVING IN YARMOUTH.

Consul Alfred J. Fleming furnishes the following statistics covering the rates of wages and the cost of the necessaries of life in Yarmouth: Labor is unorganized in this consular district and, outside of Halifax and the iron-mining and iron-working districts, the same applies to all

Nova Scotia. Wages are fixed by the employers, and, as will be seen in the annexed table, they are low as compared with wages in the United States. Living in Yarmouth is little, if any, cheaper than in cities of like size in the United States, with the exception of house rent. Farmers and gardeners generally send their produce to Boston, with which there is almost daily steamship communication, and that market generally fixes the prices of foodstuffs here.

Clothing is no cheaper here than in the United States. Woolens are a trifle cheaper, but cottons are dearer. Many persons go from here to Boston to buy their winter and spring goods, and frankly say that for an outlay of \$50 in that city, including the cost of the trip, they can get more than for the same amount expended in Yarmouth.

The following statement shows the rates of wages, prices of food, and cost of other necessaries of life in Yarmouth:

Description.	Wages, prices, etc.
Wages:	
Cotton mill—	
Females.....	per week..... \$3.50 to \$6.50
Males.....	do..... 5.00 to 9.00
Iron works—	
Boys.....	do..... 3.50
Men.....	do..... 7.00 to 9.00
Skilled workers.....	do..... 12.00 to 15.00
Printers.....	do..... 7.00 to 9.00
Plumbers.....	do..... 10.00 to 12.00
Bakers.....	do..... 7.00 to 8.00
Tailors.....	do..... 8.00 to 9.00
Tailoresses.....	do..... 5.00 to 6.00
Barbers.....	do..... 9.00 to 12.00
Cigar makers, males.....	do..... 9.00 to 10.00
Cigar makers, females.....	do..... 3.00 to 5.00
Typewriters and stenographers, males.....	do..... 7.00 to 9.00
Typewriters and stenographers, females.....	do..... 6.00 to 7.00
Blacksmiths.....	per day..... 1.50 to 1.75
Carpenters.....	do..... 1.75 to 2.00
Masons and plasterers.....	do..... 1.50 to 2.00
Foodstuffs:	
Potatoes.....	per bushel..... .50 to .75
Coffee.....	per pound..... .20 to .40
Tea.....	do..... .30 to .60
Cheese.....	do..... .18 to .22
Butter.....	do..... .30 to .35
Milk.....	per quart..... .06 to .08
Flour.....	per 28 pounds..... .80 to .90
Eggs.....	per dozen..... .30 to .45
Lard.....	per pound..... .18 to .22
Bacon, hams, and shoulders, and fresh meats.....	do..... .18 to .22
Crackers.....	do..... .10 to .12
Fish, dried.....	do..... .05 to .06
Fish, salted.....	do..... .10 to .15
Cabbage.....	per dozen..... .50 to .75
Corn meal.....	per pound..... .03
Oatmeal.....	do..... .05 to .06
Kerosene.....	per gallon..... .20
Other necessaries:	
House rent—	
A cottage.....	per month..... 5.00 to 7.00
House, 6 to 9 rooms.....	do..... 10.00 to 15.00
Gas.....	per M..... 2.00
Anthracite coal.....	per ton..... 6.50 to 7.25
Bituminous coal.....	do..... 4.50 to 5.00
Board for working girls.....	per week..... 2.00 to 2.50
Board for workmen.....	do..... 3.00 to 4.00
Cottons—	
Bleached.....	per yard..... .18 to .23
Unbleached.....	do..... .12 to .15
Prints (calicoes).....	do..... .12 to .15
Ginghams.....	do..... .12 to .25

APPENDIX D.

[Senate Document No. 477, part 2, Sixty-first Congress, second session.]
WAGES AND PRICES ABROAD—REPORTS FROM CONSULAR OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES AT HAMBURG, GERMANY; MANCHESTER, ENGLAND; GLASGOW, SCOTLAND; AND WARSAW, RUSSIA, GIVING THE PRESENT RETAIL AND WHOLESALE PRICES OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES AND THE PRICES OBTAINING IN 1900, TOGETHER WITH SALARIES PAID VARIOUS CLASSES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

[Presented by Mr. LODGE.]

[Inclosures: Hamburg, Germany, March 14, 1910; Manchester, England, March 17, 1910; Glasgow, Scotland, March 15, 1910; Warsaw, Russia, March 10 and 19, 1910.]

MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.

Rents.—Rents have not increased during the past ten years. It is difficult to give rentals, because a six-room house in one district of the city would be \$1.22 to \$1.46 per week, while in another it would be \$1.75 to \$2.43 per week; larger houses in proportion.

The city rates have increased from \$1.58 in 1900 to \$1.86 at the present time.

The rates fluctuate each year, but they do not affect a weekly rented house, the landlord paying the rates out of the rental received.

A tenant of a quarterly or yearly rented house pays, in addition, the amount of rates levied in that particular year.

Wholesale prices in Manchester.

Articles.	1910.	1900.
Wheat (per 100 pounds):		
No. 1 Northern Manitoba.....	\$2.06 - \$2.07	\$1.47 - \$1.49
Choice White Karachi.....	2.05 - 2.06
Red Karachi.....	2.02 - 2.03
Russian, Northern River Plate.....	2.03 - 2.04	1.34 - 1.52
Maize:		
Cinquantina.....	1.55 - 1.56	1.18 - 1.19
Servian.....	1.39 - 1.40
Mixed American.....	1.38 - 1.44	.80½ - .90
River Plate.....	1.44 - 1.45	.81 - .92

Wholesale prices in Manchester—Continued.

Articles.	1910.	1900.
Barley, Russian (per 60 pounds)	\$0.76 - \$0.77	\$0.70 - \$0.71
Butter (per 112 pounds):		
Danish, finest	30.66 - 31.63	27.01 - 27.49
Swedish, finest	30.42 - 31.15	27.01 - 27.49
Finnish, finest	29.69 - 30.42	25.79 - 26.76
Australian	28.71 - 29.44	24.33 - 25.30
New Zealand	29.20 - 30.17	
Argentine	28.71 - 29.44	
Eggs (per 120):		
Irish (extra selected)	2.47 - 2.51	3.31 - 2.43
Irish (ordinary)	2.39 - 2.43	
Danish	2.43 - 2.55	2.19 - 2.68
Austrian (originals)	2.01 - 2.07	1.95 - 2.19
Egyptian	1.34 - 1.38	1.46 - 1.52
Cheshire cheese (per 120 pounds):		
Finest	18.86 - 20.07	18.25 - 20.68
Medium	17.03 - 18.25	15.82 - 18.01
Lower grades	14.60	12.16 - 14.59
Canadian and American cheese (per 112 pounds):		
Finest white	15.09 - 15.33	14.83 - 15.32
Finest colored	14.84 - 15.09	
Bacon (per 112 pounds):		
Cumberland cut	16.90 - 16.79	9.00 - 9.73
Hams, long cut	16.18 - 16.79	
Hams, short cut	16.42 - 16.79	11.92 - 13.14
Shoulders, New York cut	13.14 - 13.74	8.29 - 8.53
Bacon (per 112 pounds):		
Canadian, best sizable	16.06 - 16.30	10.95 - 11.19
Canadian, medium	16.06 - 16.30	
Canadian, outside	15.82 - 16.06	
Irish, light	17.28 - 17.40	13.02 - 14.11
Irish, medium	17.04 - 17.28	
Irish, heavy	16.79 - 17.04	
Danish, stout sizable	16.55 - 16.79	
Danish, medium	16.30 - 16.55	
Danish, heavy	16.06 - 16.30	
Lard (per 112 pounds):		
American, refined	16.18 - 16.42	8.14 - 8.26
Prime, western	16.12	7.54 - 7.60
Foreign meat (per pound):		
American (refrigerated beef)—		
Choice cuts, rumps, and loins	.15	.14 - .15
Ribs	.12	.11 - .12
Hind quarters	.12	.11 - .12
Fore quarters	.09	.08
South American chilled beef—		
Hind quarters	.12	
Fore quarters	.09	
Plate and Australian beef (frozen)—		
Hind quarters	.09	.07 - .07
Fore quarters	.09	.06
Mutton and lamb (frozen)—		
Canterbury sheep	.09	.06 - .06
New Zealand sheep	.09	.06 - .06
Australian sheep	.07	.06 - .06
Plate sheep	.07	.06 - .06
Australian lamb	.09	.07 - .07
Dead meat—		
Beef—		
First class	.11	.11
Second class	.09	.10
Third class	.07	.08 - .09
Mutton—		
First class	.16	.15
Second class	.14	.13 - .14
Third class	.12	.08 - .10
Veal—		
First class	.16	.15
Second class	.14	.12 - .14
Third class	.12	.08 - .10
Bacon pigs—		
First class	.13	.10
Second class	.11 - .12	.08 - .09
Third class	.09 - .10	.06 - .07
Porker pigs—		
First class	.15	.12
Second class	.14 - .14	.10 - .11
Third class	.13 - .13	.08 - .09
Potatoes, per load (252 pounds):		
Yorkshire	1.95 - 2.19	2.19 - 2.55
Sands (Yorkshire)	1.82 - 1.95	1.95 - 2.10
Cheshire	1.34 - 1.58	1.70 - 1.95
Lincoln	1.95 - 2.19	2.19 - 2.55
Lincoln (Sands)	1.70 - 1.95	
Turnips	per ton	21.89 - 24.33
Swedes	do.	7.29 - 9.73
Carrots, washed	do.	14.59 - 18.24
Onions:		
Valencian	per case	1.95 - 2.07
Dutch, white	per bag	.85 - .89
Petroleum (per gallon):		
Russian and Roumanian	.12	.14 - .15
American	.13 - .15	.15 - .18
Hides, dehorned (per pound):		
First class—		
90 pounds and upward	.12	
88 pounds and upward		.08
Second class—		
90 pounds and upward	.12	
88 pounds and upward		.08
First class—		
80 to 89 pounds	.12	
83 to 92 pounds		.09
Second class—		
80 to 89 pounds	.11	
83 to 92 pounds		.08

Wholesale prices in Manchester—Continued.

Articles.	1910.	1900.
Hides, dehorned (per pound)—Continued.		
First class—		
70 to 79 pounds	\$0.11	
73 to 82 pounds		\$0.09
Second class—		
70 to 79 pounds	.11	
73 to 82 pounds		.08
First class—		
60 to 69 pounds	.11	
63 to 72 pounds		.09
Second class—		
60 to 69 pounds	.11	
63 to 72 pounds		.08
First class—		
50 to 59 pounds	.11	
54 to 63 pounds		.08
Second class—		
50 to 59 pounds	.11	
54 to 62 pounds		.08
First class—		
49 pounds and under	.12	
53 pounds and under		.09
Second class—		
49 pounds and under	.12	
53 pounds and under		.08
Cows—		
First class—		
60 pounds and above	.11	
63 pounds and above		.08
Second class—		
60 pounds and above	.10	
63 pounds and above		.07
First class—		
50 to 59 pounds	.11	
54 to 62 pounds		.08
Second class—		
50 to 59 pounds	.10	
54 to 62 pounds		.08
First class—		
49 pounds and under	.11	
53 pounds and under		.09
Second class—		
49 pounds and under	.11	
53 pounds and under		.08
Bulls—		
First class	.10	.06
Second class	.10	.06
Calves—		
Above 16 pounds	.13	.11
9 to 16 pounds	.13	.13
Under 9 pounds	.18	.11
Kips	.10	.08
Horsehides	2.43 - 5.10	1.88 - 4.56
Cotton, American (per pound)—		
Good ordinary	.1526	.09
Low middling	.1578	.10
Middling	.1568	.10
Good middling	.1630	.10
Fair good middling	.164	.10
Middling fair	.1660	.10
Egyptian cotton (per pound):		
Egyptian brown—		
Fair	.23	.14
Good fair	.29	.15
Fair good fair	.30	.16
Good	.31	.16
Fine	.33	.16
Egyptian, upper—		
Fair	.27	.14
Good fair	.28	.15
Fair good fair	.29	.15
Good	.30	.15
Fine	.31	.15
Coal (per ton):		
Best Lancashire (for domestic purposes)	3.65 - 3.97	3.53 - 3.77
Seconds	3.16 - 3.41	3.16 - 3.41
Round furnace coal	2.80	2.31 - 2.55
Coal for bunkering purposes, screened	2.80	2.80 - 2.92
Coal for bunkering purposes, unscreened	2.55	2.55
Cattle, etc. (per pound):		
Choice small cattle	.14	.14
Good bullocks and heifers	.13 - .13	.13 - .13
Middling cattle	.12 - .13	.12 - .12
Rough	.10	.10 - .11
Choice small north country sheep	.20	.17 - .17
Heavy north country sheep	.18 - .19	.16
Irish sheep	.17 - .19	
Ewes	.13 - .15	.13
Calves	.13 - .17	.10 - .17
Currants (per hundredweight):		
Provincial	5.10 - 5.35	3.65 - 3.77
Amalias	5.22 - 5.50	3.89 - 4.74
Patras	5.47 - 6.08	3.89 - 4.74
Zante	5.35 - 6.20	4.26 - 4.98
Gulf	5.47 - 6.52	4.62 - 5.47
Vostizza, etc.	6.32 - 8.02	5.22 - 6.68
Boots, men's rough wear: *		
Northampton prices	2.19	1.86
	1.22	1.09
	1.05	.93
	1.38	1.22
	1.88	1.62

* The prices for boots, as above, are only obtainable for men's rough wear, as this is the only class of boot that has remained the same standard during the past ten years.

Wholesale prices in Manchester—Continued.

Articles.	1910.	1900.
Boots, men's rough wear—Continued.		
Leeds prices.....	\$1.88	\$1.70
	1.88	1.62
	1.95	1.68
Bristol prices.....	1.66	1.52
	1.52	1.26
	1.58	1.34
Bricks (per 1,000):		
Ordinary red house brick.....	\$3.65- 4.38	\$4.86- 5.10
Cement (per ton) ^a	6.69	9.24

^a The reason for the remarkable decrease in the price of cement is that the supply is greater than the demand; also that more modern machinery enables manufacturers to produce cheaper.

Prices of agricultural implements as sold in Manchester.

Articles.	1910.	1900.
Small digging plow (2 wheels, for market gardener's use).....	\$13.38	\$13.38
Light horse plow.....	18.85	18.85
Steel chlll digging plows.....	24.33	24.33
Light double Farrow plow (weight 308 pounds).....	25.55	25.55
Light double Farrow plow (weight 280 pounds).....	23.11	23.11
Horse hoe and scarifier (light handle).....	15.81	15.81
Horse hoe and scarifier (heavy handle).....	17.63	17.63
Steel cultivators.....	\$45.01- 51.09	\$45.01- 51.09
Chain and brush harrows.....	7.29- 20.68	7.29- 20.68
Hard steel harrows.....	9.48- 22.87	9.48- 22.87
Corn drill.....	107.06-114.36	107.06-114.36
Lumber:		
From British America—		
Yellow-pine timber, Quebec, square wood, per cubic foot.....	.40- .70	.30- .67
Yellow-pine Waney board, square wood, per cubic foot.....	.61- 1.03	.53- .69
Yellow-pine, St. John (18-inch average), per cubic foot.....	.61- .79	.36- .53
Yellow-pine, Dalhousie, etc. per cubic foot.....	.30- .40	.30- .40
Red pine.....do.....	.49- .61	.34- .45
Oak, first quality.....do.....	.73- .89	.67- .73
Oak, second quality.....do.....	.49- .71	.36- .49
Elm.....do.....	.73- 1.03	.67- .73
Ash.....do.....	.36- .61	.40- .55
Birch, St. John.....do.....	.32- .49	.32- .40
Birch, Quebec.....do.....	.32- .53	.32- .49
Birch, Nova Scotia, etc.....do.....	.26- .36	.28- .36
Birch planks.....do.....	.21- .24	.22- .24
Deals, Quebec, yellow—		
First quality.....per standard.....	111.92-182.49	107.06-136.26
Second quality.....do.....	82.73-121.66	87.59-102.19
Third quality.....do.....	70.56- 85.16	58.39- 65.69
Deals, spruce—		
St. John, etc.....do.....	37.31- 39.54	35.28- 36.49
Nova Scotia, etc.....do.....	36.10- 38.93	35.28- 36.49
Boards, spruce, etc.....do.....	32.84- 35.28	32.84- 34.06
Oars, ash.....per running foot.....	.06- .08	.06- .08
From United States, etc.—		
Pitch pine—		
Hewn.....per cubic foot.....	.32- .47	.32- .40
Sawn.....do.....	.24- .36	.24- .36
Planks, stowage.....do.....	.18- .22	.24- .28
Prime deals and boards.....per standard.....	72.99- 92.46	65.69- 74.21
Oak logs.....per cubic foot.....	.42- .67	.39- .53
Oak planks.....do.....	.32- .67	.36- .49
Whitewood, logs and planks.....do.....	.40- .97	.32- .44
Teak wood, East India.....per load caliper.....	48.66-104.62	55.96- 65.69
Green heart.....do.....	34.06- 36.49	32.84- 35.23
Staves, New Orleans—		
Canada butts, 66 inches long.....per mille.....	437.98-583.98	364.98-462.31
Double extra heavy.....do.....	340.65-364.98	267.65-316.32
Wine pipe, extra heavy.....do.....	240.32-267.65	206.82-243.32
Hogshead, extra heavy.....do.....	145.99-170.32	145.99-170.32
Barrel, extra heavy.....do.....	87.59-116.79	85.16-116.79
Staves, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia—		
Extra heavy pipe.....per mille.....	170.32-204.39	121.66-172.75
Light pipe.....do.....	111.92-136.26	97.33-121.66
W. O. W. I. hogshead.....do.....	107.06-121.66	97.33-102.10
Second quality.....do.....	72.99- 82.73	72.99- 82.73
Culls.....do.....	58.39- 65.13	48.66- 58.39
Barrel.....do.....	48.66- 58.39	38.93- 68.13
Staves, Baltimore, Norfolk, etc.—		
Wine pipe.....do.....	92.46-102.19	92.46-102.19
Hogshead.....do.....	68.13- 87.59	53.53- 72.99
Barrel.....do.....	34.06- 38.93	34.06- 38.93
Timber:		
Riga, red.....per cubic foot.....	.44- .55	.42- .55
Danzig, crown.....do.....	.55- .61	.53- .59
Danzig, middling and common.....do.....	.44- .49	.42- .47
Memel, crown.....do.....	.55- .61	.53- .59
Memel, middling and common.....do.....	.44- .49	.42- .47
Stettin.....do.....	.38- .44	.42- .47
Swedish.....do.....	.32- .36	.34- .38
Danzig and Riga whitewood.....do.....	.34- .38	.36- .40
Norway mining timber.....do.....	.24- .28	.28- .32
Oak, Stettin, Danzig, etc.....do.....	.67- .91	.49- .67
Wainscot logs:		
Riga and Memel crown.....do.....	1.06- 1.34	1.09- 1.22
Riga and Memel black.....do.....	.79- .91	.69- .81
Austrian.....do.....	1.22- 1.40	.97- 1.09
Spars, Norway, etc.....do.....	.28- .42	.24- .32

Retail prices in Manchester.

Articles.	Weight.	1910.	1900.
Bacon:			
Plain.....	1	\$0.18- \$0.24	\$0.14- \$0.20
Smoked, best cut.....	1	.28- .32	.20- .24
Butter, best.....	1	.24- .32	.24- .32
Tea.....	1	.14- .20	.12- .20
Cheese.....	1	.14- .20	.12- .20
Lard.....	1	.17	.09
Hams:			
Whole.....	1	.17	.17
Rashers.....	1	.12	.12
Currants.....	1	.06- .12	.05- .12
Salmon, tinned, talls.....	1	.14	.11
Lobster, tinned.....	1	.40	.26
Fruits, tinned:			
Apricots.....	2½	.13- .32	.13- .32
Pears.....	2½	.15- .32	.12- .28
Peaches.....	2½	.17- .32	.17- .32
Pineapple, chunks.....	1½	.09- .11	.09- .11
Tongues, tinned:			
Lunch.....	1	.30	.24
Ox.....	1½	.61	.55
Do.....	2	.73	.67
Do.....	2½	.85	.79
Corned beef.....	1	.15	.11
Do.....	2	.24	.20
Jams.....	1	.07- .16	.07- .16
Coffee.....	1	.24- .57	.24- .57
Cocoa:			
Finest bulk.....	1	.36	.26
Advertised brands.....	1	.65	.65
Eggs, finest Irish (dozen).....	1	.18- .20	.17- .24
Sausage.....	1	.38	.32
Flour, household.....	12	.04	.04
Oatmeal.....	1	.04	.04
Barley.....	1	.04	.04
Candied peel, lemon.....	1	.00- .12	.00- .12
Candles, wax.....	3	.20	.27
Rice.....	1	.03- .12	.03- .12
Quaker oats.....	2	.11	.11
Matches, wood (dozen).....	1	.04	.04
Pepper.....	1	.20- .36	.24- .40
Pickles (ounce jar).....	10	.05- .12	.05- .12
Sago.....	1	.07	.05
Raisins, Valencia.....	1	.08- .12	.08- .12
Salt (bars).....	1	.06	.07
Soaps.....	1	.06- .08	.06- .06
Starch.....	1	.04- .06	.06- .05
Sugar.....	1	.24- .40	.24- .40
Vinegar (gallon).....	1	.24- .40	.24- .40
Beef, best meats:			
Rump steak.....	1	.24	.24
Round.....	1	.20	.20
Sirloin.....	1	.20- .21	.20- .21
Ribs, best cut.....	1	.20	.20
Ribs.....	1	.17	.17
Brisket.....	1	.08- .12	.08- .12
Shoulder steak.....	1	.16- .18	.16- .18
Mutton:			
Shoulders.....	1	.20	.20
Legs.....	1	.21	.21
Loin (piece).....	1	.21	.21
Loin (chops).....	1	.24	.24
Breast.....	1	.09	.09
Neck.....	1	.15	.15
Liver.....	1	.14- .16	.14- .16
Hearts (each).....	1	.04- .06	.04- .06
Pork:			
Loin.....	1	.21	.21
Leg.....	1	.21	.21
Shoulder.....	1	.14	.14
Coal:			
Best drawing room, delivered, per hundredweight.....		.27½	.26
Good drawing room, delivered, per hundredweight.....		.26	.23
Best house coal, per hundredweight.....		.26	.23
Seconds, house coal, per hundredweight.....		.25	.22
Good kitchen coal, per hundredweight.....		.24	.21
Kitchen nut (free from slack), per hundredweight.....		.21	.18
Clothing: ^d			
Men's suits made to order.....		11.55-30.66	11.55-30.66
Men's overcoats made to order.....		10.95-20.43	10.95-20.43
Men's raincoats made to order.....		10.22-20.43	10.22-20.43
Youths' and juveniles' in proportion.			
Boots and shoes: ^e			
Men's (kip and split kip) rough wear.....		2.17- 2.83	1.93- 2.55

^a According to maker.
^b Average.
^c 20 to 25 per cent cheaper.
^d It will be noticed that prices for suits, etc., have neither increased nor decreased, but as a prominent tailor here informed me, the prices of all materials have gone up considerably since 1900, anything from 10 to 20 per cent; tailors have customers who will not pay any more than their regular prices for suits, so the tailor gives inferior linings and trimmings, also a slightly inferior quality of cloth; hence the price being at the same figure. It must also be borne in mind that certain qualities and styles of cloth used ten years ago would not sell at any price at the present time, but taking everything into consideration, a 10 per cent increase would be a fair average.
^e This is the only quality of boot that has remained at the same standard during the past ten years. It is impossible to give specified prices for other qualities of boots and shoes, because since 1900 there has been great advancement in styles and shapes. As an example, a \$2.55 boot to-day looks equal to one of the same price ten years ago, but the wearing quality is less by at least 10 per cent. As a general average, boots and shoes to-day are 10 per cent dearer than ten years ago.

Salaries paid to teachers in the Manchester public schools.

	1910.	1900.
Masters who have had charge of schools for a less period than 5 years.....	\$583.98	\$525.58
Over 5 but less than 10.....	656.97	583.98
Over 10 but less than 15.....	759.17	700.77
Over 15.....	851.63	778.64
Mistresses, less than 5 years.....	389.32	321.18
Over 5 but less than 10.....	487.98	379.53
Over 10 but less than 15.....	486.65	437.98
15 years and upward.....	535.31	467.18

Also head teachers receive as follows: Head masters, for the first 300 scholars, 97 cents per unit; for the next 100 scholars, 73 cents per unit; for each unit over 400 scholars, 49 cents per unit. Head mistresses, for the first 300 scholars, 49 cents per unit; for the next 100 scholars, 36 cents per unit; for each unit over 400 scholars, 24 cents per unit; \$48.66 per annum if the school obtain the full grant and \$24.33 per annum if the school obtain a lower grant; \$9.73 per annum for each pupil teacher. An extra payment to be fixed by the education committee where there is a school of science. All the above extra payments were the same in 1900.

Assistant teachers.

	Class.	Salary.	Yearly increase.	Maximum salary.
Men, 1910.....	A.	(a)	\$24.33	\$778.64
Men, 1900.....	A.	(a)	24.33	729.97
Women, 1910.....	A.	(a)	24.33	583.98
Women, 1900.....	A.	(a)	24.33	486.65
Men, 1910.....	B.	\$364.98	24.33	729.97
Men, 1900.....	B.	364.98	24.33	632.64
Women, 1910.....	B.	267.65	24.33	535.31
Women, 1900.....	B.	267.65	24.33	437.98
Men, 1910.....	C.	340.65	24.33	535.31
Men, 1900.....	C.	340.65	24.33	437.98
Women, 1910.....	C.	243.32	24.33	413.65
Women, 1900.....	C.	243.32	24.33	340.65
Men, 1910.....	D.	267.65	24.33	389.32
Men, 1900.....	D.	267.65	24.33	340.65
Women, 1910.....	D.	194.66	24.33	316.32
Women, 1900.....	D.	194.66	24.33	267.65

* The commencing salary of teachers appointed to class A is \$24.33 in excess of the amount which they would receive according to service in class B. This rule was also in force in the year 1900.

Pupil teachers, 1910.—Boys, first year, \$121.66; second year, \$133.82. Girls, first year, \$87.59; second year, \$102.19.

Pupil teachers and candidates, 1900.—Probationers, boys, under 14, \$58.39; over 14 years, \$72.99. Girls, under 14, \$29.19; over 14 years, \$29.19. Candidates, boys, \$97.33; girls, \$48.66. Pupil teachers, boys, first year, \$109.49; second year, \$121.66; third year, \$133.82. Pupil teachers, girls, first year, \$58.39; second year, \$72.99; third year, \$87.59.

Salaries paid to officials, etc., in the Manchester post-office.

Rank of officer.	1910.	1900.
Chief superintendents (per annum).....	\$1,995.26-\$2,433.25	\$1,946.60-\$2,433.25
Superintendents (per annum).....	1,557.28-1,946.60	1,508.61-1,946.60
Assistant superintendents, class 1 (per annum).....	1,313.95-1,508.61	1,265.29-1,508.61
Assistant superintendents, class 2 (per annum).....	973.30-1,265.29	973.30-1,265.29
Overseers (per annum).....	778.64-924.63	729.97-924.63
Supervisors telegraph (female) (per annum).....	681.31-851.63	608.31-778.64
Assistant supervisors telegraph (female) (per annum).....	535.31-656.97	462.31-608.31
Telephone supervisor (female) (per annum).....	535.31-729.97	510.98-681.31
Assistant telephone supervisor (female) (per annum).....	364.98-510.98	340.65-486.65
Inspectors of postmen (per annum).....	924.63-1,167.96	924.63-1,119.29
Chief inspectors of postmen (per annum).....	1,216.65-1,459.95
Assistant inspectors (per annum).....	583.98-875.97	535.31-827.30
Inspectors of telegraph messengers (per annum).....	583.98-875.97	535.31-827.30
Telegraphists (female) (per week).....	3.16-8.75	2.43-8.51
Typists (female) (per week).....	3.41-6.32
Telephonists (female) (per week).....	2.43-6.32	2.43-5.83
Postmen (per week).....	4.38-7.29	4.38-7.29
Assistant postmen (6 hours) (per week).....	3.83	3.65
Assistant postmen (5 hours) (per week).....	3.83	3.04
Unestablished cleaners (per week).....	5.35	4.86
Doorkeepers (per week).....	5.35	5.35
Telegraph messengers (per week).....	1.46-2.92	1.46-2.92

Salaries paid to other government officials resident in the city of Manchester.

	1910.	1900.
<i>Factory department (home office).</i>		
Superintending inspector.....	\$2,919.90-\$3,649.87	\$2,676.57-\$3,406.55
Inspectors.....	1,459.95-2,189.92	1,459.95-1,946.60
Inspectors.....	2,189.92-2,676.57	1,995.26-2,676.57
Assistant inspectors.....	729.97-1,216.62	729.97-1,216.62
		973.30-1,459.95

Salaries paid to other government officials, etc.—Continued.

	1910.	1900.
<i>Factory department (home office)—Cont'd.</i>		
Senior lady inspector.....	\$1,459.95-\$1,946.60
Lady inspector.....	973.30-1,459.95	\$973.30-\$1,459.95
Assistant lady inspector.....	535.31-973.30
<i>Inspectors of explosives, coal and metalliferous mines.</i>		
Inspectors.....	4,379.85	2,919.90-3,893.20
Assistant inspectors.....	1,459.95-1,946.60	1,459.95-1,946.60
<i>Patent office.</i>		
Keeper of cotton marks.....	2,798.23	\$3,163.22
Assistant keeper of cotton marks.....	1,605.94

In conclusion, I made application to the following departments of the Government in Manchester, and they all respectfully informed me that they were unable to give me the information, and referred me to the respective head offices in London—Inland-revenue department, customs department, mercantile marine department.

CHURCH HOWE,
American Consul.

AMERICAN CONSULATE,
Glasgow, Scotland, March 15, 1910.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to report, in accordance with instructions from the consul-general at London, on the subject of wholesale and retail prices of commodities in this consular district in the year 1900 and at the present time; also on the salaries of government employees and teachers for some periods.

After careful inquiry from reliable sources of information, the following data, I believe, amply answer the requirements as far as applies to Glasgow consular district.

In some instances wholesale prices only are given, the nature of the commodity being such as to be seldom or never required in the retail market.

[One ton=2,240 pounds; one hundredweight=124 pounds.]

	1900.		Present time.	
	Wholesale.	Retail.	Wholesale.	Retail.
<i>Vegetables:</i>				
Potatoes, per hundred-weight.....	\$1.02	\$1.34	\$0.58	\$0.90
Potatoes, per ton.....	20.08	10.56
Cabbages.....2330
Rhubarb, forced, per hundredweight.....	4.62	5.60	5.04	5.68
Rhubarb, field.....	.98	1.68	.69	1.12
Turnips, per hundred-weight.....	.42	.54	.43	.54
Onions, Valencia, per case.....	1.70	2.16	2.36	3.12
<i>Live stock:</i>				
Beef, per hundred-weight.....	\$9.60-14.64	\$9.12-9.60
Sheep, per pound.....	\$0.12-.18	\$0.22-.30
<i>Grain:</i>				
Wheat, per 240 pounds.....	3.36	4.56
Oats, per 264 pounds.....	4.29	5.04	4.38	5.18
Barley, per 320 pounds.....	4.32	5.04	5.18	5.98
Maize, per 280 pounds.....	3.26	3.84	4.14	4.86
Corn, per 280 pounds.....	2.92	3.60	4.44	5.28
Pease, per 280 pounds.....	13.34	16.00	12.20	14.40
Pease (feeding), per 280 pounds.....	5.44	6.30	5.74	6.60
<i>Raw material:</i>				
Cotton (middlings), per pound.....1015
Wool (washed), per pound.....18-.2228-.42
Hides (93 pounds upward), per pound.....10
<i>Wearing apparel:</i>				
Men's suits, tailor-made.....	12.00-20.00	12.00-20.00
Men's suits, ready-made.....	6.00-10.00	6.00-10.00
Boots and shoes.....	2.50	3.00
<i>Underwear:</i>				
Wool suits.....	2.00-5.00	2.00-5.00
Shirts.....50-1.5050-1.50
Coal, per ton.....	4.08	4.43	3.00	5.00
Iron (columns), per hundredweight.....	1.80	1.32
<i>Groceries and provisions:</i>				
Oatmeal, per 280 pounds.....	8.22	9.60	8.56	10.40
Flour (patents), per 280 pounds.....	6.36	7.20	8.07	9.60
Barley, 280 pounds.....	5.06	9.60	6.25	9.60
Sugar, per hundred-weight.....	3.30	3.82	3.91	4.48
Corn flour, per hundredweight.....	2.58	3.09
Tea, per pound.....	.44	.56	.40	.48

	1900.		Present time.	
	Wholesale.	Retail.	Wholesale.	Retail.
Groceries and provisions—Continued.				
Butter (Danish), per hundredweight.....	\$27.68	* \$0.28	\$28.56	\$0.30
Margarine, hundredweight.....	15.00	* .19	15.60	* .19
Cheese (Canadian), per hundredweight.....	14.65	17.92	15.16	17.92
Ham (American), per hundredweight.....	15.30	19.04	17.34	21.20
Bacon (American), per hundredweight.....	11.64	15.68	15.54	17.92
Coffee, per pound.....	.32	.40	.29	.36
Eggs, per 150 pounds.....	1.97	2.19	2.54	2.74
Sago, per hundredweight.....	3.66	4.48	3.78	4.48
Lard (pure), per hundredweight.....	8.64	13.44	13.74	15.68
Salt, per hundredweight.....	.42	.60	.48	.60
Pepper (white), per pound.....	.24	.32	.21½	.32
Mustard (D. S. F.).....	.25	.32	.25	.32
Rice (Bengal), per hundredweight.....	3.94	4.80	4.84	5.86
Rice (Siam), per hundredweight.....	2.42	4.48	2.52	4.48
Petroleum oil, per gallon.....		.15½		.13
Steel, beams, hundredweight.....	2.08		1.44	
Brick (clay), per 1,000.....	8.10		6.90	
Timber, varying largely according to quality and the immediate need of the market (see below).				
Cement, per ton.....	8.04		4.72	
Timber:				
Red pine (Baltic), per cubic foot.....	.42		.35	
Pitch pine, per cubic foot.....	.60		.60	
Yellow pine (American), per cubic foot.....	.60		.76	
House rent:				
Tenements for laborers of 1 or 2 apartments, per annum.....	\$34.00-50.00		(c)	
More modern houses with 2 rooms, kitchen, and bath, per annum.....	45.00-68.00		(c)	
Larger town houses with 7 or 8 rooms and completely equipped with servants' rooms, etc., per annum.....	* 200.00-300.00		(d)	

* Per pound. ° And higher.
 ° About the same. ° Approximately 10 per cent cheaper.

Salaries of government employees.

	1910.	1900.
Collector of customs, Glasgow, per annum.....	\$5,000.00	\$4,500.00
Typists in customs department, per week.....	\$4.32- 6.00	\$3.85- 6.00
Messengers in customs department, yearly.....	350.00- 450.00	400.00- 450.00
Examining officers, customs department, annual salary:		
First class.....	1,150.00- 1,700.00	1,150.00- 1,700.00
Second class.....	550.00- 1,100.00	550.00- 1,100.00
Principal clerks, customs department, annual salary.....	2,100.00- 3,500.00	2,100.00- 3,500.00
Inland-revenue department, tellers and stampers, annual salary.....	800.00- 725.00	200.00- 475.00
Post-office clerks:		
First class.....	1,800.00- 2,150.00	1,800.00- 2,150.00
Second division.....	1,250.00- 1,750.00	1,250.00- 1,750.00
Post-office department:		
Accountants.....	3,000.00- 3,750.00	2,750.00- 3,750.00
Boy clerks, weekly.....	3.60- 3.84	3.36- 4.32
Superintendents.....	1,600.00- 2,000.00	1,500.00- 1,960.00
Postmen, weekly.....	4.92- 8.40	4.32- 8.40

Glasgow public schools—Salaries of head masters.

The head masters of Glasgow public schools are classified with reference to the importance of their posts into divisions, the salary of each head master being an amount specifically provided as compensation for work in that division.

The board, however, may exercise discretionary powers regarding the maximum salary to be paid, or may otherwise specially deal with particular cases and particular schools.

There are four of these groups of schools in Glasgow, and the following summary shows the number of schools in each group and the salaries paid per annum:

	1910.	1900.
Head masters:		
Group 1, 44 schools, maximum salary.....	\$1,946.60	(a)
Group 2, 10 schools, maximum salary.....	1,703.27	(a)
Group 3, 13 schools, maximum salary.....	1,459.95	(a)
Group 4, 3 schools, maximum salary.....	1,216.62	(a)
Second masters.....	\$729.97- 973.30	(b)
Assistant masters with training college course, minimum salary.....	413.65	\$389.32
Same as above when university graduates.....	437.98	413.65
Mistresses, with training college course, minimum salary.....	316.32	(b)
Same when university graduates.....	340.65	(b)

* Salaries for same services in 1900 practically the same as in 1910.
 ° Practically the same.

The maximum salaries of the above-named teachers are as follows: Masters (assistant), \$729.97; mistresses, \$583.08. The annual increase of salaries paid to teachers is brought about by a system of increments. The salaries of these assistants are considered after one year's service, and if the report is satisfactory an increase of \$10 or \$20 per annum is granted, at the discretion of the board, and thereafter a similar increase, biennially, on a favorable report until the maximum is reached.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
 J. N. McCUNN, Consul.

AMERICAN CONSULATE,
 Warsaw, Russia, March 10, 1910.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
 Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to forward herewith a list of prices of articles in Poland in 1900 and 1910, under the instructions given by Consul-General Mason to the American consul at St. Petersburg. This report is not quite complete, but it was the best that could be obtained in the time. Cotton does not figure in the Warsaw market, and then there are no cotton mills here. I have written to Lodz for prices and will forward the answer when received. The salaries and wages which were asked for came as a second telegram, and these will be sent at the earliest date possible.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
 THOS. C. HEENAN, Consul.

Comparative prices at Warsaw, Russia.

Commodities.	1910.		1900.	
	Wholesale.	Retail.	Wholesale.	Retail.
Beef, per pound.....		\$0.09		\$0.08
Hogs, per pound.....	\$0.09		\$0.07	
Cattle:				
Bullocks, per pound.....	.06			
Sheep, per pound.....	.05			
Meats:				
Veal, per pound.....		.08		.07
Pork, per pound.....		.09		.08
Mutton, per pound.....		.08		.08
Bacon (salted), per pound.....		.11		.10
Grains:				
Wheat (choice), per bushel.....	1.07		.80	
Wheat (medium), per bushel.....	.97		.77	
Wheat (ordinary), per bushel.....	.88		.70	
Rye (choice), per bushel.....	.68		.60	
Rye (medium), per bushel.....	.65		.56	
Barley, per bushel.....	.60		.51	
Oats, per bushel.....	.40		.31	
Provisions:				
Butter (fresh), per pound.....		.23		.20
Butter (salt), per pound.....	.20		.17	
Milk, per quart.....	.04	.05	.04	.05
Eggs, per 100.....	1.54		1.14	
Bread:				
Coarseblack, per hundredweight.....	1.65	* .01½	1.65	* .01½
Rye, per pound.....		.02		.02
Wheat, per pound.....		.03½		.03
Wheat, very choice, per pound.....		.04½		.04
Lard, per hundredweight.....	13.44		10.30	
Rents:				
Wool, per pound.....	.35		.35	
Hides:				
Ox, per pound.....	.10			
Cow, per pound.....	.08			
Calf, each.....	1.00			
Leather:				
Box calf, per foot.....	1.40		.80	
Boots, per pair.....	6.50	9.00		
Shoes, per pair.....		.65		3.35
Clothing, per suit.....		9.00		
Lumber:				
Beams—				
Pine, per 35 cubic feet.....	12.10			
Oak, per 35 cubic feet.....	16.75			
Boards—				
Pine, per 35 cubic feet.....	12.25			
Oak, ash, elm, lime, and beech, per 35 cubic feet.....	20.00			
Birch, per 35 cubic feet.....	14.25			
Coal, per hundredweight.....	.25	.34	.25	.34
Iron, per hundredweight.....	2.64		2.50	
Steel, per hundredweight.....	18.48		18.48	
Oil, per pound.....	.02		.02	
Bricks, per 1,000.....	7.22		6.18	
Cement, per barrel of 875 pounds.....	2.32		2.44	

* Per pound. ° Have increased from 30 per cent to 40 per cent since 1900.

The prices of farming implements have not varied at all during the last ten years, and the following gives the particulars of prices prevailing in Poland, Russia:

6-foot binder	\$165.00
5-foot binder	160.00
5-foot reaper	85.00
Combined reaper and mower, 5-foot	112.50
5-foot mower	65.00
4½-foot mower	62.50
Reaping attachments for mowers	15.00
8-foot self-dump rake (steel)	25.00
Sickle grinder:	
1 stone	6.50
2 stones	7.00
Hay tedders, 6 forks, 4 tines	42.50
Spring-tooth harrows:	
7-tooth	8.25
9-tooth	9.25
12-tooth	15.00
15-tooth	17.50
17-tooth	20.00
60-tooth peg-tooth harrows	19.00
Disk harrows:	
8 by 16, solid	32.50
12 by 16, solid	37.50
8 by 20, solid	37.50
12 by 20, solid	40.00
8 by 16, cutaway	33.50
12 by 16, cutaway	38.50
8 by 20, cutaway	38.50
12 by 20, cutaway	41.00
Feed grinders:	
8-inch	57.50
10-inch	62.50
Portable engines, English make:	
6 horsepower	1,275.00
8 horsepower	1,475.00
10 horsepower	1,700.00
Thrashers of English make:	
6 horsepower	1,125.00
8 horsepower	1,025.00
10 horsepower	1,090.00
Thrashing machines (horsepower)	97.85-412.00
Horsepowers	38.00-154.00

LIST OF SALARIES RELATING TO OFFICE OF GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF WARSAW. [For 1900 and 1910.]

The salary of the governor-general is \$12,000 per annum. Besides this salary he has the various palaces to reside in and has an allowance of \$50,000 a year for sundry expenses. The governor receives a salary of \$5,000 as well as free living quarters. The vice-governor's salary is \$2,250, with lodgings. The chief of the governor's chancery receives \$750 and free lodgings. The various clerks receive from \$500 to \$600, without lodgings. Writers receive \$200 to \$300.

The chancery of the governor-general.

Director of chancery (and lodgings free)	\$3,500
Vice-director (and lodgings free)	2,500
First officers for special orders (including rent and keep) each	1,500
Second officers for special orders (including rent and keep) do	1,200
Chief of chancery	1,500
First-grade clerks	900
Second-grade clerks	750
Third-grade clerks	600
Secretary (besides extras)	600
Typewriter	200
Copying clerk	180
Porter (with lodging and uniform)	150

List of salaries paid in connection with the office of the chief of police. [For 1900 and 1910.]

Chief of police (and free quarters)	\$4,250
His assistant	2,500
Chief of the police reserves (and free quarters)	900
Commissary of police, 15 in all (and free quarters)	1,000
Assistant commissary of police (and free quarters)	850
Chief of mounted police	600
First assistant to commissary (and free quarters)	600
Second assistant to commissary (and free quarters)	500
Clerk in the police reserve (and free quarters)	450
Noncommissioned officer of the police	360
Noncommissioned officer of the mounted police (and free quarters)	300
Police sergeant-major (and uniform and free quarters)	150
Mounted policeman (and free quarters)	180
Policeman, first grade (and uniform and free quarters)	108
Policeman of second grade (and uniform and free quarters)	90

List of salaries paid in connection with the office of the president of Warsaw.

[For 1900 and 1910.]

The president (and free residence)	\$3,000
The vice-president (and free residence)	2,500
Chief of chancery	300
Senior clerk	400
Translator	500
Bookkeeper	225
Other clerks	250

Salaries of letter carriers in Warsaw.

	1900.	1910.
First class	\$120	\$150
Second class	150	180
Third class	180	210

In addition to the above salaries each carrier receives the sum of \$2 per month toward his rent.

Salaries of teachers in the public schools.

[For 1900 and 1910.]

For giving fifteen hours a week lessons a salary of \$375 is paid per annum. After five years this sum is increased to \$900, where it practically remains. A teacher may give more than fifteen hours a week lessons, and in such cases he is paid at the rate of \$35 for one hour per week per year.

Conditions according to which government officials in Poland can receive pensions.

All officials except the following have a claim to a government pension in Poland: Military officers, custom-house officials, clergy (except Protestants), officials of Russian origin, and others coming from Russia proper, even when they are Poles.

Civilian officials receive increases of salary by 15 per cent. Teachers in public schools receive an increase of 25 per cent. Besides the above-mentioned increases a separate amount is allowed to both the above classes for the education of their children.

Administrative officials receive full pension after twenty-five years' service, and teachers after twenty years.

Administrative officials of local origin are entitled to the following scale of pension:

After twenty years one-fifth of highest salary received in a single year. After twenty-five years one-fourth of highest salary received in a single year. After thirty years one-half of highest salary received in a single year. After thirty-five years three-fourths of highest salary received in a single year. After forty years highest salary received in a single year.

Educational branch.—After twenty years one-fourth of highest salary received in a single year. After twenty-five years one-half of highest salary received in a single year. After thirty years three-fourths of highest salary received in a single year. After thirty-five years highest salary received in a single year.

Pensions are all calculated according to salary actually received, all additions not being taken into account, and only those on the permanent staff are entitled to a pension.

Sickness.—If an official is dismissed on account of an incurable disease or illness after having served a whole year or not more than twenty years, he receives a pension on the twenty years' service scale.

After twenty years' service the rate of pension is calculated normally.

Families of government employees who have not served twenty years receive a settled amount down at once, to the amount of the highest salary received in any one year. The widow receives one-third of this amount and the children two-thirds, which latter is placed in a bank, where it remains till each girl arrives at the age of 18 years and the boys 20 years.

If the employee served for less than eleven years, then only half the foregoing amounts are paid.

Orphans.—These receive one-fourth of the father's pension. If there are one or two children left they receive one-fourth each; if there are three then they get three-fourths; if there are four then the whole pension is divided amongst them. If there should be more than four children left, in that case the whole of the father's pension is divided equally amongst them all.

With the coming of age of each of the four minor children (when there have been five or more orphans left), the pension is reduced accordingly by one-fourth in each case.

THOS. E. HEENAN, Consul.

INCREASE IN THE COST OF LIVING IN GERMANY.

[In reply to a cabled instruction from the Department of State via Paris.]

HAMBURG, GERMANY, March 14, 1910.

Germany has long since ceased to be an inexpensive country, popular opinion to the contrary notwithstanding. The subjoined tables show conclusively the steady advance of the cost of living all along the line, an advance which is explained not only by the phenomena which accompany the enormous increase in the world's production of gold, but by profound changes which are taking place, which have already taken place, in the social fabric of the German people. Rapidly accumulated fortunes and increasing national wealth have created new standards and new requirements. Shorter hours of labor, higher wages, old-age and accident insurance, abundant tables, better homes—these are among the contributing causes of the higher cost of living, not merely as respects commodities, but as respects total per capita expenditures.

Six large German cities of a total population of over 3,000,000 show, between 1905 and 1908, an increase in wages of 7 per cent in certain building trades, 8 per cent in mechanical construction, 11 per cent in printing, and 7 per cent to 8 per cent in municipal wages. In three of these cities there were decreases of 2 per cent to 7 per cent in the mechanical building trades. In these same places and during the same interval the cost of bread increased 23 per cent, beef changed very little, and pork actually decreased 15 per cent. I pick out this fact in regard to pork as one of unusual interest, as it was precisely between the years 1905 and 1908 that American pork meats were rigidly excluded from Germany and the present high tariff became operative, so that wholesale and retail prices were entitled, apparently, to advance. It is explained that when American porks were excluded the German agrarians were appealed to to justify this measure by not advancing prices and by increasing the supply of domestic pork. The domestic supply was, in fact, stimulated, as the number of German hogs increased from 18,920,666 in 1904 to 22,146,532 in 1907, and the number of hogs increased from 19,331,568 in 1904 to 20,630,644 in 1907. However, after 1908 the cost of pork resumed its advance and submitted to the general law, so that the comparison of prices between 1900 and 1910 demonstrates a large increase.

The abundant population of Germany no longer emigrates to any great extent, but those who once emigrated and have returned, and those whose relatives have written home in regard to their prosperity and comfort abroad, especially in the United States, have become insistent upon an amelioration in living conditions here. Old and crowded quarters in ancient cities have been destroyed and in some cities large real-estate speculations have been undertaken at municipal expense to provide new suburbs embodying the most admirable hygienic principles. Against 97,103 Germans who emigrated in 1890 only 19,833 departed in 1908; thus the rapidly swelling population tends to force up the average rentals everywhere and compels the erection of new houses in all centers of population. In November, 1899, 40.23 per cent of the population of Hamburg resided in dwellings the rental of which did not exceed 300 marks (\$71.40), but in November, 1907, only 23.30 per cent of the population lived in such apartments. That is, in

eight years 12.93 per cent of the total population moved into homes which cost on an average at least 35 per cent more than formerly.

Another very remarkable fact observable in Germany, a fact noticeable, apparently, wherever national wealth increases, is the growing unwillingness of the native population to perform hard manual labor, and that too, frequently, in the face of an overstocked domestic labor market. The Germans who formerly emigrated to the United States, many of them to perform day labor and execute arduous tasks, not only refrain nowadays from emigrating, but in their own homes employ other European labor. The Italian consul-general in this port states to me that in and about Hamburg and Altona there are, in summer, from five to six thousand Italian workmen and in winter about 1,500, and that in summer in Germany there are upward of 100,000 Italian laborers, against 69,738 in 1900. In addition to this floating population there were, according to official statistics for 1908, 582 permanently domiciled Italians in Hamburg, 686 Russians, 862 Swiss, 7,571 Austro-Hungarians, and 1,934 Danes, practically all laborers, builders, or waiters.

Doctor Trefz, of this city, who has made economic conditions a life-long study, supplies the following general statement which confirms the foregoing in showing that the increased cost of living is largely attributable to altered standards:

"The increase in Hamburg and elsewhere in the price of commodities and of rents is due to many circumstances, of which one of the

most important is that men of small and moderate means demand more in the way of clothing, food, living apartments, amusements, hygiene, etc., than formerly. Enormous speculation in real estate in the larger cities has increased the value of houses and, in consequence, the scale of rents. The revenue and tax policy of the government also plays an important rôle. Articles which have been raised in price one pfennig or less per unit by increased taxation are sold to-day at retail at four or five pfennigs more than before. Wages have increased in consequence of the higher demands of the people, and, as regards farm laborers, there is also a great tendency to emigrate into the large cities. Thus, a scarcity of labor has been created in the rural districts and farmers are compelled to employ foreigners, chiefly Poles and Galicians, as farm hands. Also in the mining districts the labor available is not in proportion to the production, and foreign labor must be employed. Adjacent countries which formerly supplied large quantities of agricultural products to the German population on the frontiers, now need these supplies themselves, due to their own development, and the prices of such commodities, naturally, have gone up in Germany. In the meanwhile, numerous agricultural products consumed in this country are now being imported from foreign countries for less than they can be raised in this country (eggs, fruits, cereals), and therefore the revenue of the farmer has become smaller."

The following tables set forth, in detail, the results of my investigation:

Salaries paid to various classes of public officers in the State of Hamburg.
[Salaries stated in marks—1 mark=\$0.238.]

	1900.					1910.					
	Minimum salary.	Maximum salary.	Number of advances applicable.	Amount of each advance.	Number of years' service required for advance.	Minimum salary.	Maximum salary.	Number of advances applicable.	Amount of each advance.	Number of years' service required for advance.	
POLICE OFFICERS.											
<i>Street and criminal police.</i>											
Patrolmen.....	1,500	1,900	5	80	3	1,850	2,300	5	90	3	
Sergeants.....	1,900	2,500	5	120	3	2,100	2,700	5	120	3	
Sergeants in charge of beat.....	1,900	2,500	5	120	3	2,400	3,000	3	200	3	
Chief sergeants.....	2,300	3,300	5	200	3	2,800	3,800	4	250	3	
Lieutenants.....	4,000	6,000	5	400	3	4,400	6,400	4	500	3	
Captains.....	7,800	9,000	2	600	4	8,000	10,000	2	1,000	4	
<i>Harbor police.</i>											
Patrolmen.....	1,600	2,000	5	80	3	1,950	2,400	5	90	3	
Sergeants.....	1,900	2,500	5	120	3	2,100	2,700	5	120	3	
Sergeants in charge of station.....	1,900	2,500	5	120	3	2,400	3,000	3	200	3	
Chief sergeants, second class.....	2,300	3,300	5	200	3	2,800	3,800	4	250	3	
Chief sergeants, first class.....	3,400	5,200	5	360	3	3,700	5,500	5	360	3	
Captains.....	5,200	7,000	3	600	4	5,600	8,600	5	600	3	
<i>Administrative service.</i>											
Messengers and office men.....	1,300	1,700	5	80	3	1,500	1,900	5	80	3	
Clerks.....	1,700	2,500	5	160	3	1,900	2,700	5	160	3	
Assistants.....	2,300	3,300	5	200	3	2,400	3,600	4	300	3	
Registrars, cashiers, and commissaries.....	3,100	4,400	5	260	3	3,400	4,600	4	300	3	
District commissaries.....	4,000	6,000	5	400	3	4,400	6,400	4	500	3	
Inspectors.....	5,200	6,500	1	500	3	5,200	7,000	3	600	3	
Chief inspectors.....			2	400	3	5,600	8,600	5	600	3	
Director.....	12,000										
OFFICERS OF FIRE BRIGADE.											
Firemen.....	1,500	1,900	5	80	3	1,850	2,300	5	90	3	
Engineers.....	1,700	2,500	5	160	3	2,000	2,700	5	140	3	
Chief firemen.....	1,900	2,500	5	120	3	2,100	2,700	5	120	3	
Sergeants.....	2,200	2,800	3	200	3	2,400	3,000	3	200	3	
Warden's assistant.....	2,300	3,300	5	200	3	2,800	3,800	4	250	3	
Fire Warden.....	4,000	6,000	5	400	3	4,000	7,800	5	600	3	
Fire inspectors.....	5,000	7,500	5	500	4	5,600	8,600		5		600
Director.....	10,000										
CUSTOM-HOUSE OFFICERS.											
Messengers, etc.....	1,300	1,700	5	80	3	1,500	1,900	5	80	3	
Boatswains.....	1,400	1,800	5	80	3	1,700	2,100	5	80	3	
Overseers.....	1,600	2,000	5	80	3	1,950	2,400	5	90	3	
Assistants.....	2,100	3,000	5	180	3	2,200	3,600	4	200	3	
Engineers.....	1,700	2,500	5	160	3	2,000	2,700		4		250
Secretaries.....	2,200	4,000	5	360	3	2,200	4,600	6	400	3	
Controllers.....							3,200	4,800	4	400	3
Controllers, chief.....	3,400	5,200	5	360	3	3,700	5,500	3	400	3	
Chief supervisors.....	4,500	5,600	1	300	3	4,400	6,400		2		300
Chief inspectors.....	7,200	7,800	1	600	5	7,600	8,800	2	600	3	
COURT OFFICIALS AND JUDGES.											
Summoners.....	\$1,500	\$1,900	5	\$80	3	\$1,700	\$2,100	5	\$80	3	
Messengers.....							1,850	2,300	5	90	3
Copying clerks.....	1,700	2,500	5	160	3	1,900	2,700	5	160	3	
Bailliffs.....	2,300	3,300	5	200	3	2,200	3,800	4	200	3	
Assistant clerks.....	2,300	3,300	5	200	3	2,400	3,600		4		250
Secretaries.....	3,100	4,400	1	300	3	3,400	4,600	4	300	3	
Chief secretary.....	4,000	6,000		4		250	4,400		6,400		4
Judges and state's attorneys.....	5,000	10,000	5	1,000	4	5,000	10,000	5	1,000	4	
Directors.....	12,000										

Salaries paid to various classes of public officers in the State of Hamburg—Continued.

	1900.					1910.				
	Minimum salary.	Maximum salary.	Number of advances applicable.	Amount of each advance.	Number of years' service required for advance.	Minimum salary.	Maximum salary.	Number of advances applicable.	Amount of each advance.	Number of years' service required for advance.
OFFICE EMPLOYEES AND JURISTS IN GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT.										
Messengers.....	1,600	2,000	5	80	3	1,850	2,300	5	90	3
Copying clerks.....	1,700	2,500	5	160	3	1,900	2,700	5	160	3
Assistants.....	2,300	3,300	5	200	3	2,400	3,600	5	240	3
Registrars, cashiers, and bookkeepers.....	3,100	4,400	5	260	3	3,400	4,600	4	300	3
Officers in charge of small bureaus.....	3,400	5,200	5	360	3	3,700	5,500	5	360	3
Chiefs of bureaus.....	4,000	6,000	5	400	3	4,400	6,400	4	500	3
Chiefs of larger bureaus.....	5,200	6,500	2	400	3	5,200	7,000	3	600	3
Councillors, third class.....	8,000	10,000	5	1,000	4	5,000	10,000	5	1,000	4
Councillors, second class.....	8,000	12,000	4	1,000	4	8,000	12,000	4	1,000	4
Councillors, first class.....		12,000					12,000			
OFFICERS AND TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS.										
<i>Low public schools.</i>										
Assistant teachers, female.....		1,000				1,200	1,400	1	200	2
Assistant teachers, male.....		1,400								
Teachers, female.....	1,400	2,600	6	200	3	1,600	3,000	7	200	3
Teachers, male.....	2,000	4,400	8	300	3	2,400	4,600	6	300	3
Rectors.....	4,100	6,000	3	400	3	4,500	6,400	4	475	3
Inspectors.....	6,000	7,500	3	500	3	6,400	8,200	3	600	3
<i>Higher public schools.</i>										
Servants.....	1,300	1,700	5	80	3	1,500	1,900	5	80	3
Janitors.....	1,300	2,000	5	80	3	1,850	2,300	5	90	3
Teachers in elementary classes.....	2,000	4,400	8	300	3	2,400	4,600	6	300	3
Technical teachers and teachers in middle classes.....	3,600	5,600	5	400	3	4,000	5,800	2	400	3
Head teachers.....	3,600	9,000	9	600	3	4,000	9,000	2	600	3
Directors in schools of less than 9 classes.....	8,600	10,400	3	600	4	9,000	11,000	1	1,000	4
Directors in schools of less than 9 classes, other schools.....		10,000					12,000	2	1,000	
OFFICERS IN BUILDING DEPARTMENT.										
Sewer men.....	1,500	1,900	5	80	3	1,500	1,900	5	80	3
Road keepers.....	1,300	1,700	5	80	3	1,500	1,900	5	80	3
Assistants to bridge and lock keepers.....	1,500	1,900	5	80	3	1,700	2,100	5	80	3
Bridge and lock keepers.....	1,700	2,500	5	160	3	2,000	2,700	5	140	3
Canal, bridge, river, and street-cleaning overseers, storemen.....	1,900	2,500	5	120	3	2,100	2,700	5	120	3
Skippers, engineers, and draftsmen.....	2,200	2,800	3	200	2	2,400	3,000	3	200	3
Captains, chief storemen, building draftsmen.....	2,300	3,300	5	200	3	2,400	3,600	5	240	3
Building overseers.....	2,300	3,300	5	200	3	2,800	3,800	4	250	3
Building managers, technical assistants.....	3,000	4,000	5	200	3	3,300	4,300	4	250	3
Geometers.....	3,200	5,000	3	600	4	3,400	5,800	4	600	3
Supervisors.....	3,600	7,200	6	600	3	4,000	7,800	5	800	3
Inspectors.....	7,800	9,000	2	600	4	8,000	10,000	2	1,000	4
Directors.....		13,000					13,000			

* Besides free residence or 1,600 marks extra for rent.

PRICES IN HAMBURG.

Cotton, wholesale, 1900:	Mark.	All prices per 50 kilos (110 pounds) for German wool from tanneries located in vicinity of Hamburg.	
September 1, 1899.....	0.31½	Petroleum:	
September 30, 1899.....	.35	Wholesale—	
October 31, 1899.....	.37½	1900..... 0.1625	
November 30, 1899.....	.39	1910..... .1175	
December 29, 1899.....	.40½	Retail—	
January 3, 1900.....	.42	1900..... 0.1920-.2240	
February 28, 1900.....	.48	1910..... .13-.16	
March 29, 1900.....	.52	Prices per liter (1.057 quarts) for standard white oil.	
May 31, 1900.....	.47	<i>Coal.</i>	
July 10, 1900.....	.54½		
August 8, 1900.....	.51		
August 31, 1900.....	.54		
Cotton, wholesale, 1910:			
September 3, 1909.....	.65½		
September 25, 1909.....	.68½		
October 9, 1909.....	.67½		
October 23, 1909.....	.69		
November 6, 1909.....	.72½		
December 11, 1909.....	.76		
December 24, 1909.....	.77½		
December 31, 1909.....	.79½		
January 15, 1910.....	.73½		
February 6, 1910.....	.77½		
February 25, 1910.....	.73½		
March 1, 1910.....	.76		
All prices per one-half kilo, equal to 1.1 pounds.			
Wool, wholesale, 1900:	Marks.		
Gray.....	30.00		
Black.....	35.00		
White.....	35.00-40.00		
Wool, wholesale, 1910:			
Gray.....	57.50		
Black.....	62.50		
White.....	70.00		

* Prices are per double hectoliter, weighing 150 kilos (330 pounds).
 † Prices are per 100 kilos, equal to 220 pounds.
 ‡ Wholesale prices are per 3 tons of nuts, equal to 40 hectoliters.
 Bricks, wholesale, 1900, 22; 1910, 25-26; retail, 1900, 30; 1910, 33-35. Prices (in marks) per 1,000 bricks, ordinary size, delivered at store or building.

Portland cement, wholesale, 1900, 3.30, 1910, 2.28, excluding cost of barrel, delivered in Hamburg; retail, 1900, 3.90, 1910, 2.70, per bag of 85 kilos (187 pounds); 1900, 8.50, 1910, 6.50, per bag of 170 kilos (374 pounds).

Shoes, most popular styles.

	Wholesale.		Retail.	
	1900.	1910.	1900.	1910.
Marks.....	6.50	6.50	8.00-10.00	8.00-10.00
Do.....	9.50	9.50	12.50	12.50
Do.....	11.50-12.00	11.50-12.00	16.50	16.50

There have been ups and downs in prices between 1900 and 1910, particularly in the price of leather, but the market is at present on approximately the same level as ten years ago. Manufacturers and retailers claim to have cut their own margins in order to maintain retail prices unchanged.

Clothing, most current styles, ordinary and better ones.

	Wholesale.		Retail.	
	1900.	1910.	1900.	1910.
Marks.....	27.00-36.00	30.00-40.00	40.00-53.00	45.00-59.00
Do.....	16.00-25.00	18.00-28.00	23.00-35.00	25.00-39.00

Meat, retail prices only; for wholesale prices see special table.

	Marks.
Beef:	
Breast, rib, shoulder.....	0.70
Steak.....	1.40
Sheep:	
Leg of mutton.....	.80
Shoulder.....	.80
Ribs, chops.....	1.00
Pork:	
Ham.....	.85
Belly and shoulder.....	.80
Ribs, chops.....	1.00
Head.....	.40

Present prices all per 1/2 kilo, equal to 1.1 pound. They are approximately 10 to 12 per cent higher than ten years ago, in 1900.

Agricultural implements.

	Wholesale.		Retail.	
	1900.	1910.	1900.	1910.
Binders.....	650	610	925	830
Reapers.....	350	325	525	475
Mowers.....	220	200	320	280
Rakes.....	90	90	130	130
Plows.....	22-24	22-24	28-32	28-32

In 1900 the machines used in Germany were largely of foreign make, and competition was not keen. The result was high prices and large profits. With the increased demand came keener competition, especially on the part of German manufacturers, resulting in lower prices and smaller profits, so that, although prices of raw materials have increased largely in the last ten years, the wholesale and retail prices of machinery has decreased slightly during that time.

Prices of grain and provisions, hides, skins, and leather, wool, steel, and iron, and rents, see special tables.

Rents (absolute) have increased from 5 to 10 per cent since 1900, and the movement of the population from houses of one class to more expensive apartments is shown in the table.

As to hides, skins, and leather, prices are to-day from 20 to 30 per cent higher than in 1900. A fall in prices set in of late, and it is expected that they will drop to a point 25 to 30 per cent below the maximum.

Table showing number of occupied dwellings in Hamburg and amounts of rent paid.

Amount of rent paid annually.	November, 1907.		December, 1899.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
100 marks and less.....	1,361	0.70	1,372	0.93
Over 100 marks to 150 marks.....	1,652	.85	2,900	1.95
Over 150 marks to 200 marks.....	6,053	3.12	11,542	7.78
Over 200 marks to 240 marks.....	12,437	6.41	21,670	14.61
Over 240 marks to 280 marks.....	3,923	2.03		
Over 280 marks to 300 marks.....	27,528	14.19	22,193	14.96
Over 300 marks to 350 marks.....	24,722	12.73	15,147	10.21
Over 350 marks to 400 marks.....	22,381	11.53	13,065	8.88
Over 400 marks to 500 marks.....	29,296	15.10	17,116	11.54
Over 500 marks to 600 marks.....	17,142	8.84	10,265	6.92
Over 600 marks to 800 marks.....	19,002	9.80	11,949	8.06
Over 800 marks to 1,000 marks.....	8,820	4.55	6,008	4.05
Over 1,000 marks to 1,500 marks.....	9,123	4.72	6,804	4.52
Over 1,500 marks to 2,000 marks.....	4,402	2.27	3,380	2.28
Over 2,000 marks.....	6,142	3.16	4,916	3.31
Total.....	193,993	100.00	143,327	100.00

Market prices for cattle in Hamburg.

	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.
Oxen:										
First quality.....	75	79	77	71	70	70	66	64	64	63
Second quality.....	70	74	71	65	65	65	61	60	60	59
Cows:										
Young fat.....	67	70	67	63	63	62.5	60	58	58	57
Older fat.....	62	65	62	57	58	57	53.5	52	52	52
Inferior.....	55	57	55	51	51	51	47	46	46	46
Bulls:										
Heavy, best, 20 per cent tare.....	65	71	69	63	62	61	53.5	52	53	53
Heavy, medium, 22 per cent tare.....	59	56	68	65	50	51	60	57	49	47
Good light medium, 22 per cent tare.....	59	56	69	65	50	51	60	57	49	48
Inferior medium, 24 per cent tare.....	60	56	69	64	50	51	60	57.5	49	49
Sows, different tare.....	56	53	67	62	48	50	59	56	48	48
	53	50	62	60	44.5	46	55	52	43	42

All above prices (average prices for years given) are in marks per 50 kilograms. Oxen, cows, and bulls, meat weight.

Hogs and sows, weight of living animal less tare.

Mark equals \$0.238; 50 kilograms equal 220 pounds.

Average prices for slaughtered cattle in Germany.

	Oxen, cows, etc.						Calves.					
	January 26, 1900.	January 30, 1910.	February 2, 1900.	February 6, 1910.	February 16, 1900.	February 23, 1910.	January 26, 1900.	January 30, 1910.	February 2, 1900.	February 6, 1910.	February 16, 1900.	February 23, 1910.
Aix la Chapelle..	60	59	60	59	60	60	80	90	80	90	77	89
Barmen.....	55	64	55	64	55	59	72	90	71	82	70	81
Berlin.....	55	62	55	62	55	63	59	92	57	94	59	85
Bremen.....	55	65	57	65	58	64	74	85	72	85	72	85
Breslau.....	49	61	49	62	47	63						
Chemnitz.....	53	59	54	57	54	58						
Dortmund.....	56	61	54	63	54	63						
Dresden.....	57	66	57	66	57	66	62	75	60	76	60	76
Elberfeld.....	57	70	60	69	60	69	72	80	72	80	70	84
Essen.....	57	66	57	66	56	66	71	80				
Frankfort-on-the-Main.....	50	62	48	61	48	58	71	79	70	79	70	82
Hamburg.....	56	59	55	60	54	61	69	116	68	110	73	115
Hanover.....	57	61	57	60	58	67	70	82	70	82	70	82
Husum.....	59	69	62	69	60	68						
Cologne.....	56	65	58	65	57	66	62	87	69	82	69	83
Leipzig.....	60	61	58	61	58	60						
Mayence.....	56	74	58	74	58	61	72	82	72	87		
Zwickau.....	56	58	58	59	55	60						
Average ...	56	63	56	64	56	63	70	88	70	85	68	85

	Hogs.						Sheep.					
	January 26, 1900.	January 30, 1910.	February 2, 1900.	February 6, 1910.	February 16, 1900.	February 23, 1910.	January 26, 1900.	January 30, 1910.	February 2, 1900.	February 6, 1910.	February 16, 1900.	February 23, 1910.
Aix la Chapelle..	50	71	50	72	51	70	62	72	62	72	62	75
Barmen.....	47	70	47	69	47	67	60	76	61	77	61	80
Berlin.....	43	68	44	67	44	68	55	68	54	67	57	66
Bremen.....	46	67	46	68	48	63	58	70	60	70	63	73
Breslau.....	40	66	43	65	43	65	57	70	52	72	50	72
Chemnitz.....			47	47	46	69						
Dortmund.....	46	66	48	66	47	64	60	72	59	67	59	47
Dresden.....	50	70	50	69	47	70	62	72	62	77	60	80
Elberfeld.....	48	65	48	65	47	66	59	65	58	67	60	76
Essen.....	48	67	48	68	48	65	58	73	58	72	59	82
Frankfort-on-the-Main.....	53	73	53	71	52	70	63	73	54	76	50	79
Hamburg.....	44	67	44	63	44	62	53	75	54	81	59	75
Hanover.....	46	70	47	68	47	66	64	75	58	76	64	74
Cologne.....	45	65	47	66	46	65	62	79	63	74	63	83
Leipzig.....	46	69	47	69	46	67						
Mayence.....	50	70	50	72	50	71						
Zwickau.....	49	72	51	72	48	70						
Average...	47	69	48	68	47	67	57	71	57	72	57	73

SUMMARY—AVERAGE PRICES.

	January, 1900.	January, 1910.	February, 1900.	February, 1910.	Advance.
Cattle.....	56	63	56	63 1/2	13 1/2
Calves.....	70	88	70	85	16 1/2
Hogs.....	47	69	47 1/2	67 1/2	21
Sheep.....	57	71	57	72 1/2	15

Prices are quoted in marks per 50 kilograms. (Mark=\$0.238; 50 kilograms=110 pounds.) All for slaughtered animals, less ordinary tare. Hogs, 22 per cent; cattle, 40 to 48 per cent, according to quality; sheep, 50 to 52 per cent.

MARKET PRICES OF PROVISIONS IN GERMANY.

POTATOES.

[Price for 100 kilos (220 pounds) in marks (1 mark=\$0.238).]

Year.	Danzig.	Breslau.	Stettin.	Berlin.	Magdeburg.	Dresden.	Hanover.	Kiel.	Aachen.	Munich.	Mannheim.	Karlsruhe.	Stuttgart.	Strassburg.
1899	5.22	4.64	4.47	4.51	5.18	5.37	4.91	5.26	5.73	6.52	8.38	5.72	7.90	5.69
1900	5.34	4.79	5.12	4.94	5.04	5.81	4.77	5.50	5.77	6.06	6.98	4.43	6.66	4.55
1901	4.78	4.42	4.64	5.14	5.60	5.32	5.00	5.40	5.58	5.62	7.13	4.43	7.02	4.85
1902	4.49	3.43	4.66	4.50	5.72	4.79	4.70	5.16	6.24	5.44	7.00	4.81	7.16	6.22
1903	4.81	4.49	4.76	4.93	5.75	5.98	5.63	5.68	8.10	6.04	7.79	5.30	7.22	7.32
1904	5.63	5.64	6.19	6.44	7.01	7.26	5.97	5.77	7.75	6.60	8.19	5.80	8.23	6.98
1905	5.07	6.09	5.52	6.05	7.04	7.33	6.20	5.43	8.30	6.44	8.67	6.24	7.63	6.74
1906	4.42	4.45	4.06	4.29	5.30	5.83	5.20	5.44	8.92	5.10	8.16	6.54	7.74	6.12
1907	7.02	4.80	6.35	5.88	6.20	6.61	6.65	7.55	9.44	6.36	8.69	6.46	8.46	6.65
1908	6.41	4.84	5.94	6.16	6.49	6.75	6.14	7.69	8.85	5.46	8.50	6.17	7.50	6.23

BUTTER.

[Price for 1 kilogram (2.2 pounds) in pfennigs (1 pfennig=\$0.00238).]

Year.	222	222	221	230	230	249	222	228	234	222	240	230	230	202
1899	222	222	221	230	230	249	222	228	234	222	240	230	230	202
1900	224	231	229	233	231	254	217	231	238	218	257	225	230	208
1901	233	229	232	233	231	255	224	236	242	198	240	224	230	209
1902	226	224	232	230	229	254	227	233	240	214	240	225	234	209
1903	224	224	228	231	240	262	232	241	243	214	240	220	234	205
1904	232	235	234	234	246	267	236	246	250	206	240	220	237	208
1905	238	236	247	246	251	270	243	254	254	212	247	230	246	220
1906	238	241	254	250	256	273	249	261	266	216	260	245	245	226
1907	238	241	252	247	257	271	251	256	276	220	260	248	250	213
1908	245	261	262	264	265	280	261	268	267	226	259	237	253	227

BEEF.

[Price for 1 kilogram (2.2 pounds) in pfennigs (1 pfennig=\$0.00238).]

Year.	121	128	121	125	135	148	129	124	129	140	150	144	148	126
1899	121	128	121	125	135	148	129	124	129	140	150	144	148	126
1900	121	129	122	126	135	148	129	129	126	140	150	144	148	129
1901	123	143	123	129	135	148	129	127	130	140	150	136	148	130
1902	124	143	125	134	138	151	132	127	135	144	150	139	148	134
1903	133	143	128	137	138	147	138	132	140	144	150	143	148	139
1904	130	143	132	138	139	148	141	131	143	138	150	144	154	140
1905	135	158	135	144	146	160	147	133	146	148	156	152	158	145
1906	147	163	145	154	155	172	158	150	154	160	165	165	164	150
1907	147	162	149	155	148	171	163	146	156	168	179	172	168	149
1908	144	163	148	153	141	170	161	141	148	167	177	172	168	150

PORK.

[Price for 1 kilogram (2.2 pounds) in pfennigs (1 pfennig=\$0.00238).]

Year.	123	132	147	136	130	154	130	132	171	152	144	146	142	149
1899	123	132	147	136	130	154	130	132	171	152	144	146	142	149
1900	113	127	144	134	130	152	123	130	168	150	144	144	136	138
1901	129	143	150	142	130	158	130	136	180	154	158	148	147	149
1902	135	150	156	150	147	170	138	151	185	160	161	154	154	161
1903	120	138	146	142	140	158	130	133	173	146	147	142	141	154
1904	116	132	142	132	130	156	124	126	173	140	136	136	138	152
1905	145	171	164	155	146	175	150	157	199	166	161	160	157	163
1906	159	168	182	169	166	190	160	164	217	178	188	176	167	181
1907	136	145	165	149	150	172	143	142	183	158	155	158	147	169
1908	138	140	168	151	146	171	147	149	180	161	158	155	155	171

WHEAT FLOUR.

[Price for 1 kilogram (2.2 pounds) in pfennigs (1 pfennig=\$0.00238).]

Year.	24	28	32	36	31	37	27	29	31	38	40	39	36	39
1899	24	28	32	36	31	37	27	29	31	38	40	39	36	39
1900	24	27	28	35	29	35	27	28	33	38	40	37	36	38
1901	27	29	28	35	29	35	29	28	35	38	39	40	36	36
1902	28	28	30	35	31	35	28	28	31	38	40	40	34	36
1903	26	28	30	35	29	34	28	28	29	36	40	40	33	36
1904	28	30	29	35	31	36	27	30	29	37	40	40	33	36
1905	28	30	28	35	32	37	29	30	29	38	42	40	35	36
1906	30	32	28	35	32	38	30	31	29	38	44	40	36	37
1907	34	37	30	36	36	40	34	32	33	38	45	43	37	39
1908	36	35	34	41	39	42	34	36	37	40	48	47	38	45

The foregoing statistics are from Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich (Statistical Yearbook for the German Empire), issued by the Imperial Statistical Bureau, Berlin, 1909.

WHOLESALE PRICES OF IMPORTANT COMMODITIES IN GERMANY.

RYE.

[Per 1,000 kilos, equal to 2,200 pounds.]

Year.	Good, sound, at least 712 grams per liter. Berlin.	714 grams per liter. Danzig.	Palatinate, Russian, and Bulgarian, medium. Mannheim.	Bavarian, good medium. Munich.
1899	146.0	139.5	160.8	161.9
1900	142.6	138.1	155.4	153.7
1901	140.7	134.0	147.6	157.5
1902	141.2	139.4	150.3	151.9
1903	132.0	125.1	146.8	145.4
1904	135.1	131.0	145.1	132.5
1905	131.9	142.1	158.7	145.4
1906	160.6	150.9	172.5	174.1
1907	193.2	186.2	199.0	193.7
1908	186.5	177.0	194.8	188.6

WHOLESALE PRICES OF IMPORTANT COMMODITIES IN GERMANY—Cont'd.

WHEAT.

[Per 1,000 kilos, equal to 2,200 pounds.]

Year.	Good, sound, at least 755 grams per liter. Berlin.	Danzig.	Palatinate, Russian, American, and Roumanian, medium. Mannheim.	Bavarian, good medium. Munich.
1899	155.3	151.1	179.3	178.8
1900	151.8	142.9	177.5	178.6
1901	163.6	162.9	177.0	186.0
1902	163.1	162.4	174.0	183.3
1903	161.1	156.6	175.7	171.9
1904	174.4	172.6	184.0	186.8
1905	174.8	165.2	188.2	191.1
1906	179.6	168.6	196.2	192.4
1907	206.3	202.2	223.5	220.5
1908	211.2	208.3	236.9	233.7

OATS.

[Per 1,000 kilos, equal to 2,200 pounds.]

Year.	Medium quality. Breslau.	Baden Wurttemberg medium. Mannheim.	Bavarian good medium. Munich.
1899	123.4	153.9	153.4
1900	125.8	147.9	149.2
1901	138.8	147.7	159.3
1902	145.0	161.7	164.6
1903	124.2	144.4	136.7
1904	123.5	140.9	133.5
1905	137.2	155.2	158.2
1906	154.6	172.5	173.3
1907	166.8	195.6	189.9
1908	148.9	181.0	177.8

BARLEY.

[Per 1,000 kilos, equal to 2,200 pounds.]

Year.	Medium quality. Breslau.		Baden and Palatinate medium. Mannheim.	Baden good medium. Munich.
	Brewers.	Other.		
1899	128.5	128.5	173.7	180.8
1900	129.8	129.8	162.0	171.6
1901	132.7	132.7	167.2	173.6
1902	127.5	127.5	161.0	167.4
1903	128.3	128.3	162.1	152.9
1904	130.5	130.5	155.8	157.3
1905	140.8	140.8	172.7	179.7
1906	154.1	134.1	176.7	179.8
1907	166.7	143.8	193.4	195.4
1908	167.4	148.6	210.3	201.6

POTATOES.

[Per 1,000 kilos, equal to 2,200 pounds.]

Year.	Good unasorted distilling. Berlin.	Good, sound, assorted table. Berlin.	Good, sound, Silesian table. Breslau.
1899	27.1	37.6	35.0
1900	30.5	45.0	38.1
1901	22.6	39.2	30.8
1902	19.6	36.2	28.2
1903	26.3	44.9	36.0
1904	36.9	55.6	53.7
1905	36.5	53.4	50.4
1906	20.4	34.6	33.2
1907	29.9	53.1	40.6
1908	32.6	54.0	37.7

WHEAT AND RYE FLOUR.

Year.	Wheat flour, per 100 kilos=220 pounds, including bag.			Rye flour, per 100 kilos=220 pounds, including bag.		
	No. 00. Berlin.	No. 00. Inland price. Danzig.	No. 2. Bavarian. Munich.	No. 0-1. Good average quality. Berlin.	No. 0-1. Inland price. Danzig.	No. 0. Munich.
1899	22.0	20.8	27.4	19.4	19.5	26.1
1900	21.1	19.5	25.4	19.3	19.2	25.4
1901	23.0	21.7	26.3	18.9	18.9	25.5
1902	23.1	22.4	26.3	19.6	19.7	24.7
1903	21.7	21.4	25.7	18.0	17.9	24.2
1904	23.4	22.6	26.2	17.6	17.9	22.7

WHOLESALE PRICES OF IMPORTANT COMMODITIES IN GERMANY—Cont'd.
RAW AND REFINED SUGAR AND RICE.

	Raw sugar, per 100 kilos = 220 pounds, excluding bag.		Refined sugar, per 100 kilos = 220 pounds, excluding barrel.		Rice, per 100 kilos = 220 pounds.	
	Light corn.	First product.	Small labels.	"I" (loaves).	Rangoon, table, 4 months' term.	Peeled, inferior, 1 per cent discount.
	88 per cent yield, 3 months' term.		Two months' term.		Excluding import duty.	
	Cologne.	Magdeburg.	Cologne.	Magdeburg.	Bremen.	Hamburg.
1899.....	23.5	21.8	52.3	48.9	21.9	18.1
1900.....	24.2	22.2	54.8	53.2	21.2	17.6
1901.....	20.7	19.1	57.9	57.9	21.6	17.1
1902.....	17.0	15.3	56.6	56.5	20.2	16.0
1903.....	19.5	18.0	53.7	53.3	22.3	17.7
1904.....	21.4	19.9	42.0	39.8	20.8	17.0
1905.....	24.1	22.4	46.1	43.3	21.5	16.8
1906.....	18.2	16.7	38.6	36.8	21.5	17.6
1907.....	19.9	16.8	40.5	38.3	23.5	20.0
1908.....	21.9	20.6	42.8	40.8	23.4	18.9

HERRINGS, COFFEE, AND LARD.

	Herrings, per barrel of 150 kilos = 330 pounds.		Coffee, per 100 kilos = 220 pounds.			Lard, per 100 kilos = 220 pounds.
	Scotch Crown, full.	Norwegian good medium.	Sabanilla, medium ordinary, four months' term.	Santos, per cent tare.	La Guayra, unwashed, 1 per cent discount.	Refined American Wilcox, four months' term.
	Average quality, net, including barrel.		Not including import duty.			
	Stettin.	Bremen.	Hamburg.	Hamburg.	Bremen.	
1899.....	38.3	35.6	69.3	62.5	73.1	57.4
1900.....	42.4	39.8	88.5	80.4	91.3	73.2
1901.....	33.1	32.1	75.8	66.3	73.6	88.5
1902.....	42.1	33.3	72.1	63.6	72.4	106.1
1903.....	30.5	29.5	64.9	56.7	68.6	88.4
1904.....	28.0	27.5	78.6	75.7	83.4	73.4
1905.....	35.2	46.9	83.4	81.6	87.6	76.3
1906.....	40.3	41.0	80.1	81.8	88.0	90.8
1907.....	32.2	32.6	76.7	76.9	82.6	94.2
1908.....	27.4	20.2	80.0	77.5	83.9	93.0

RAW TOBACCO.
[Per 100 kilos, equal to 220 pounds.]

	Kentucky ordinary.		Stems medium Virginia.	Domingo wrappers and filler, 6 kilos tare.	Brazil. Tare 2 kilos. Tret 1/2 per cent.	Palatinate.	
	Bremen.		Hamburg.	Hamburg.	Wrapper.	Wrapper and filler.	Mannheim.
	1899.....	47.5	14.6	75.5	136.7	108.6	88.8
1900.....	55.3	13.4	69.0	142.1	111.7	92.6	
1901.....	60.7	13.0	63.4	107.1	122.1	107.4	
1902.....	63.2	13.7	53.3	80.8	120.8	108.0	
1903.....	65.2	15.0	51.0	88.4	98.9	86.1	
1904.....	54.3	15.0	67.7	86.6	96.8	83.8	
1905.....	53.7	15.0	67.2	88.8	94.9	82.0	
1906.....	63.4	16.2	74.3	106.3	106.1	91.9	
1907.....	79.1	17.8	77.1	125.6	126.2	104.6	
1908.....	90.4	18.0	59.7	130.8	124.8	98.5	

WOOL AND COTTON.

	Wool, per 100 kilos = 220 pounds.		Cotton, per 100 kilos = 220 pounds.			
	North German sheep, medium, Berlin.	Washed Buenos Aires I, four months' term, Bremen.	Middle Uplands, Bremen.	Good Oomrawuttee No. II, Bremen.	New Orleans middle, 4 per cent tare, 1 per cent discount, Hamburg.	
		1899.....				
1900.....	280.8	384.7	103.0	83.1	103.3	
1901.....	231.3	302.8	88.5	68.3	89.3	
1902.....	255.8	336.9	91.0	70.3	91.6	
1903.....	299.2	366.4	114.8	78.3	115.3	
1904.....	297.5	376.9	124.3	96.3	125.4	
1905.....	312.5	389.8	97.2	78.7	97.5	
1906.....	348.3	414.5	113.6	86.1	114.1	
1907.....	350.0	437.5	121.5	82.0	121.1	
1908.....	316.3	375.9	107.2	79.5	107.7	

WHOLESALE PRICES OF IMPORTANT COMMODITIES IN GERMANY—Cont'd.
PIG IRON AND PETROLEUM.

	Pig iron, per 1,000 kilos = 2,200 pounds.				Petroleum, per 100 kilos = 220 pounds, including barrel.		
	German.		English (duty paid).		American standard white.		Russian, 20 per cent tare, Breslau.
	Foundry, Breslau.	Best foundry, Dusseldorf.	Scotch No. 1, Hamburg.	Middlesborough No. 1, Hamburg.	20 per cent tare, 1 per cent discount, duty unpaid, Hamburg.	20 per cent tare, Mannheim.	
1899.....	75.5	81.6	92.4	81.2	14.2	22.4	20.5
1900.....	90.7	101.4	105.1	90.8	14.6	22.7	21.6
1901.....	66.5	76.9	87.1	65.7	13.6	21.9	19.5
1902.....	61.3	65.2	85.9	69.6	13.4	21.2	18.7
1903.....	60.5	66.7	81.4	65.2	14.8	23.1	20.0
1904.....	59.5	67.5	75.8	62.1	13.6	21.7	20.1
1905.....	59.8	68.3	78.4	67.5	12.7	20.5	20.0
1906.....	69.6	78.9	85.2	72.7	14.1	22.1	20.6
1907.....	77.6	84.3	92.8	14.3	22.4	21.6
1908.....	71.1	74.7	81.5	69.7	15.6	23.4	22.8

COAL.

[Per 1,000 kilos, equal to 2,200 pounds.]

	German.				English.		
	Lower Silesia, price at mine, Breslau.	Upper Silesia, price at mine, Breslau.	Pieces for export, Dortmund.	Puddle, good fat, Dortmund.	Rough, price at mine, Saarbrücken.	West Hartley steam, rough, Hamburg.	Sunderland nuts, Hamburg.
	1899.....	13.7	9.8	10.0	9.0	10.5	15.9
1900.....	17.1	11.0	13.6	9.9	11.9	22.4	22.7
1901.....	17.8	11.8	14.0	10.0	12.8	17.4	18.6
1902.....	16.5	11.7	13.3	9.3	12.0	16.7	18.2
1903.....	15.0	11.5	12.1	9.0	11.8	16.0	17.2
1904.....	15.5	11.3	11.8	9.0	12.1	15.2	16.6
1905.....	15.5	11.1	11.8	9.0	12.0	15.0	16.9
1906.....	15.9	11.1	11.8	10.0	12.1	15.5	17.6
1907.....	16.8	12.0	12.5	10.8	12.8	18.8	20.5
1908.....	18.8	14.4	12.8	11.0	13.0	16.9	19.0

All foregoing prices are in marks—1 mark equal to \$0.238.
The foregoing statistics are taken from the Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich (Statistical Yearbook for the German Empire), issued by the imperial statistical office, Berlin, 1909.
Average prices of goods in Hamburg calculated upon customs declaration made by importers.

	Palm oil.	Turpentine oil.	Petroleum, refined.	Pepper.	Rice.	Rye.	Rosins.
1851-1855..	74.86	76.88	80.28	28.71	15.86	44.75
1856-1860..	81.51	71.65	86.92	23.78	17.13	73.75
1861-1865..	71.26	128.02	60.08	71.15	23.53	14.84	53.06
1866-1870..	79.50	62.84	42.66	78.46	22.31	19.54	55.74
1871-1875..	80.41	68.81	30.98	125.43	21.94	16.27	58.22
1876-1880..	71.55	51.99	20.77	79.58	20.65	16.88	49.14
1881-1885..	63.12	62.64	15.09	130.38	18.13	13.83	51.74
1886-1890..	42.15	58.71	33.23	135.95	17.04	11.44	42.52
1891-1895..	45.98	46.98	10.89	63.84	15.67	12.43	35.30
1896-1900..	41.60	48.89	11.37	90.00	15.27	10.38	49.81
1901-1905..	47.28	69.09	11.36	119.51	15.05	10.62	50.46
1906.....	49.19	59.77	13.52	124.94	15.24	11.03	58.18
1907.....	46.23	50.44	12.55	124.82	14.80	10.34	51.93
1908.....	48.33	63.39	12.09	126.28	14.09	10.60	59.89
.....	47.82	72.10	13.58	124.69	16.07	10.44	48.98
.....	47.75	76.40	9.86	106.22	14.59	9.99	45.37
.....	46.27	83.12	8.70	115.55	15.68	11.74	46.15
.....	52.38	87.28	10.56	106.20	16.21	11.31	53.31
.....	59.12	81.98	10.64	99.42	17.84	13.19	61.55
.....	50.24	63.66	10.97	84.81	18.20	14.47	55.06

	Lard.	Steel.	Coal.	Tobacco.	Tea.	Wheat.	Lemons.
1851-1855..	110.20	56.76	1.56	109.23	278.29	21.22	36.65
1856-1860..	118.77	66.76	1.59	149.32	327.83	20.75	36.18
1861-1865..	86.38	65.86	1.58	148.32	321.43	19.83	35.89
1866-1870..	117.09	64.67	1.55	125.29	312.17	21.02	39.66
1871-1875..	98.37	63.89	2.07	154.02	288.79	24.46	40.37
1876-1880..	87.77	73.49	1.38	138.75	244.22	20.97	31.27
1881-1885..	94.24	48.98	1.21	117.77	217.10	18.02	26.53
1886-1890..	71.04	40.01	1.27	121.80	196.65	14.73	24.37
1891-1895..	76.82	25.40	1.40	122.22	173.17	13.45	22.84
1896-1900..	58.73	27.31	1.38	130.31	152.53	13.60	18.94
1901-1905..	82.28	40.97	1.42	115.27	162.94	13.80	16.23
1906.....	69.50	36.74	1.91	127.01	150.86	13.13	19.33
1907.....	83.88	41.87	1.63	123.29	150.40	12.84	16.66
1908.....	96.75	41.29	1.45	102.69	146.01	13.00	17.67
.....	83.72	48.80	1.40	111.78	159.52	13.08	15.52
.....	72.47	40.17	1.32	121.00	155.47	13.55	14.66
.....	74.58	33.23	1.32	117.58	203.29	14.04	17.15
.....	82.65	42.23	1.35	123.41	185.77	13.93	20.88
.....	90.40	38.79	1.51	125.11	182.83	14.73	18.90
.....	91.86	39.15	1.49	126.55	155.77	16.20	15.67

Average prices of goods in Hamburg, etc.—Continued.

	Herrings.	Mahog- any.	Walnut lumber.	Cedar wood.	Honey.	Cheese.	Coffee.
1851-1855..	20.03	22.29	22.20	44.26	92.34	87.24
1856-1860..	22.94	25.17	13.41	23.86	60.97	105.01	102.85
1861-1865..	22.42	25.08	13.66	25.37	40.58	103.32	134.22
1866-1870..	22.66	19.02	15.45	20.70	58.45	117.28	105.95
1871-1875..	24.87	22.71	20.13	22.02	74.71	131.05	164.06
1876-1880..	27.72	20.32	19.71	21.02	67.07	125.68	152.14
1881-1885..	25.89	19.04	17.92	17.84	57.41	121.52	102.77
1886-1890..	19.94	19.54	17.29	15.24	47.09	108.86	144.03
1891-1895..	20.85	16.70	15.83	16.06	49.06	115.55	160.61
1896-1900..	23.66	15.76	15.44	19.10	47.35	103.66	103.56
1901-1905..	23.75	13.48	16.08	22.43	40.75	107.04	78.80
1900.....	27.36	15.46	15.44	17.84	48.81	109.30	91.63
1901.....	23.99	15.43	16.09	23.15	43.76	106.44	75.26
1902.....	24.62	13.16	16.45	21.72	39.46	109.21	75.35
1903.....	23.83	14.35	16.09	25.00	39.74	104.59	71.89
1904.....	21.53	12.87	15.07	21.05	39.09	107.10	85.23
1905.....	24.78	11.59	16.71	21.23	41.72	107.87	86.27
1906.....	26.46	10.30	17.29	23.33	43.63	119.41	83.28
1907.....	27.09	10.47	18.55	18.46	47.77	123.21	77.58
1908.....	23.97	10.43	17.41	26.58	50.17	111.77	85.63

	Cocoa.	Leather.	Maize.	Almonds.	Cotton- seed oil.	Cocoanut oil.	Linseed oil.
1851-1855..	68.81	314.34	22.22	127.54	91.42	68.87
1856-1860..	120.94	386.31	16.95	132.94	87.72	69.18
1861-1865..	117.83	386.23	23.62	118.86	72.95	93.50	74.50
1866-1870..	106.32	274.48	21.13	149.95	74.82	96.46	67.85
1871-1875..	101.45	266.49	16.11	126.09	61.86	80.35	65.21
1876-1880..	149.64	248.11	11.99	160.11	61.90	85.14	58.77
1881-1885..	150.22	252.25	12.31	142.30	56.27	70.43	51.07
1886-1890..	138.80	224.58	9.64	143.24	49.25	57.29	43.79
1891-1895..	132.65	250.48	10.38	128.50	47.82	57.03	45.21
1896-1900..	126.07	253.09	7.94	131.85	41.05	55.90	45.98
1901-1905..	118.98	284.40	9.89	130.44	49.80	65.31	54.01
1900.....	140.12	274.05	9.04	173.30	49.09	58.50	59.58
1901.....	129.23	249.03	9.38	137.41	49.67	63.26	61.48
1902.....	123.46	270.17	10.22	138.93	55.28	70.99	63.67
1903.....	116.26	295.20	9.86	127.70	51.16	62.99	55.16
1904.....	114.95	286.06	9.63	122.57	49.33	62.91	44.62
1905.....	110.73	301.54	10.34	125.63	43.54	66.39	45.10
1906.....	112.42	384.49	9.98	154.75	45.36	66.28	46.92
1907.....	167.94	388.26	10.65	161.48	53.86	71.23	52.01
1908.....	128.35	358.70	11.75	146.66	55.18	65.88	53.14

	Oranges.	Cotton and waste.	Wire, iron.	Iron, pig and smelting.	Pease.	Iron, hoop and plate.	Figs.
1851-1855..	36.70	89.47	35.19	8.48	23.21	20.11	42.34
1856-1860..	32.15	111.01	38.14	7.93	19.60	21.29	50.60
1861-1865..	31.22	278.75	34.89	7.02	27.55	19.69	43.19
1866-1870..	39.23	197.25	53.76	6.56	24.69	19.33	44.33
1871-1875..	34.23	149.59	60.70	10.56	22.46	27.15	47.97
1876-1880..	28.96	113.84	60.41	6.73	19.17	17.20	44.50
1881-1885..	23.61	105.82	47.02	5.74	18.97	17.06	47.26
1886-1890..	17.24	97.73	23.81	5.59	13.73	15.90	36.07
1891-1895..	17.40	79.94	23.97	5.41	14.57	15.68	34.06
1896-1900..	17.48	69.87	19.63	6.07	14.85	15.08	37.73
1901-1905..	13.75	78.39	24.05	6.11	16.62	16.65	33.61
1900.....	16.64	74.68	22.28	7.71	18.95	18.17	33.20
1901.....	15.06	79.92	21.69	6.49	17.59	17.33	31.28
1902.....	12.92	72.32	23.87	6.11	17.32	18.46	34.97
1903.....	12.78	78.38	23.82	5.89	16.98	16.43	33.70
1904.....	13.54	85.93	26.30	5.78	15.58	15.72	32.31
1905.....	14.45	75.39	24.55	6.29	15.63	15.32	35.81
1906.....	15.26	78.99	24.90	6.93	15.70	14.73	40.28
1907.....	13.22	79.42	29.28	7.14	16.93	16.03	44.83
1908.....	13.41	82.10	25.29	7.15	18.04	16.98	41.70

	Deer, roe, etc., skins.	Calif. skins.	Sheep and goat skins.	Meat, fresh and simply prepared.	Barley.	Hides, dry and salted.	Oats.
1851-1855..	255.01	150.51	165.78	84.69	14.82	89.84	14.38
1856-1860..	336.94	253.26	190.14	90.64	15.96	132.72	14.81
1861-1865..	265.50	264.92	165.07	73.20	13.17	105.50	12.95
1866-1870..	264.36	221.32	169.19	94.68	17.84	108.32	16.66
1871-1875..	291.44	260.88	182.14	84.79	16.44	145.35	15.79
1876-1880..	236.16	161.20	158.37	79.79	14.07	113.95	15.65
1881-1885..	272.77	171.89	167.05	85.60	12.18	122.57	13.54
1886-1890..	254.52	126.30	154.55	62.01	10.15	96.63	11.11
1891-1895..	243.46	119.87	171.19	69.71	9.74	84.55	11.76
1896-1900..	208.07	145.69	140.60	69.73	9.29	98.21	11.09
1901-1905..	241.75	156.84	154.83	78.51	9.78	111.88	12.04
1900.....	224.20	163.72	151.96	75.48	10.87	108.23	11.31
1901.....	205.67	167.24	152.28	81.86	10.23	103.02	11.68
1902.....	241.34	156.50	159.72	88.10	10.01	102.02	13.02
1903.....	278.33	144.10	157.76	78.43	9.23	111.25	12.07
1904.....	274.28	147.10	150.45	71.01	9.03	116.98	11.42
1905.....	209.14	169.25	153.96	73.14	10.39	126.15	12.01
1906.....	253.81	211.03	188.95	77.27	10.43	139.78	12.66
1907.....	256.87	184.19	197.40	74.42	12.22	145.65	14.88
1908.....	226.06	192.71	174.52	62.65	11.75	123.96	12.65

All foregoing prices in marks per 100 kilograms—1 mark equal to \$0.238; 100 kilograms equal to 220 pounds.

Table showing increase in number of foreigners domiciled in Germany, the most of whom perform manual labor.

	1900.	1905.
Italians.....	69,738	98,165
Austrians.....	371,005	493,872
Hungarians.....	19,959	31,949
Russians.....	55,494	62,932
Netherlands.....	88,085	100,997

ROBERT P. SKINNER,
Consul-General.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield forty minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COVINGTON].

Mr. COVINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to avail myself of the latitude of general debate to call the attention of the House to the present situation concerning a very simple resolution that I introduced a few weeks ago and which was duly passed on May 10. This resolution called for certain information from the Attorney-General of the United States in connection with the sale of lands in the Philippine Islands to the American Sugar Refining Company, commonly known as the sugar trust, and for certain other information relating to the evidence in possession of the Department of Justice at the time of that sale concerning prosecution of officials of the sugar trust for gross frauds on the customs. The chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, with that suavity and adroitness which always characterizes him when he desires to minimize the effect of any matter upon the Republican party, stated, in reporting the resolution and recommending its immediate passage, that he was not impressed by the great importance of a part of the information asked for in the resolution. The particular request which did not seem to impress the gentleman from Pennsylvania very greatly was that part of the resolution which called upon the Attorney-General to give the exact date and full text of the opinion rendered by him to the Secretary of War and which made possible the sale of lands in the Philippine Islands known as friar lands in excess of the limitation fixed under the act of Congress providing for civil government in the Philippines and passed in 1902.

At this time I realize that dates of public acts are delicate subjects with the Republican party. In fact, there are some dates I have no doubt that their leaders, when they get into the midst of the coming campaign, will be glad to forget [applause on the Democratic side], but in view of the recent disclosures concerning a now famous opinion by the Attorney-General in the Ballinger controversy I think that the importance of knowing just when the Attorney-General actually gives the real opinion upon which favored persons act in transactions connected with the Government can not be exaggerated.

In order that the comment which I desire to make upon the question of the attitude of the Attorney-General toward the sale of lands in the Philippine Islands to representatives of or stockholders in the sugar trust may be clearly understood I desire to read the short resolution which I introduced.

House resolution 679.

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the House of Representatives the following-named documents and the information herewith requested:

(a) The date and full text of the opinion of the Attorney-General sent to the Secretary of War informing him that lands in the Philippine Islands known as "friar lands" could be sold in excess of the limitation fixed in the act of Congress entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902.

(b) Whether or not the Attorney-General or Department of Justice, at the date of the above opinion, had any knowledge or information as to who were the prospective purchasers of the San Jose estate, in the island of Mindoro, Philippine Islands, a part of the "friar lands."

(c) The date when the Government accepted a \$2,000,000 settlement from the American Sugar Refining Company for the amount due in revenue or fines through the short-weight cases at the port of New York, together with a statement of the approximate amount of revenue the Government had lost from the American Sugar Refining Company at that date by the short-weight frauds, as disclosed by evidence in the possession of the Department of Justice.

(d) Whether or not the Department of Justice at the date of the consummation of the sale of the San Jose estate, on January 4, 1910, had possession of any of the facts and evidence upon which was based the indictment of Charles R. Heike, secretary of the American Sugar Refining Company, in the United States district court for the southern district of New York.

This resolution was reported with an amendment that the information be furnished "if not incompatible with the public interest." The Digest of the Rules of the House seems to indicate that this qualification is only used when calling on the President for information, but from some motive, I know not what, it was tacked on to the few easily answered questions I submitted to the Attorney-General. A few days ago the Attorney-General transmitted a reply to the Speaker of the House

giving the opinion which he had rendered authorizing the sale of the "friar lands," simply stating that the opinion was dated December 18, 1909, and that at that date neither he nor any other representative of his department, so far as he knew, had any knowledge as to who were the prospective purchasers of the San Jose estate in the island of Mindoro. He did not give any statement of the approximate total amount of money the Government had lost through the short-weight frauds of the sugar trust, but he said that the Government could assert a legal claim for about \$2,700,000 and that the trust was settled with for \$2,100,000 in round figures, the amount he was advised by his assistant could be recovered by civil suit. He admitted that at the time of the consummation of the sale of the San Jose estate, a part of the "friar lands," the special attorneys on his staff were in possession of some of the evidence upon which the secretary of the sugar trust was indicted for frauds on the customs. In connection with this answer I now want to present some facts from which the people may judge what manner of man presides over the legal department of the Government and determine for themselves whether fidelity to the country or complacent aid to a criminal trust has actuated him in connection with the sale of certain of the "friar lands" in the Philippines. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In order that the position of the sugar trust with respect to sugar lands in the Philippines may be fully understood and the supreme necessity for it to obtain speedy special privilege from the Government be realized, I want very briefly to present its situation in the summer of 1909.

The passage of the Philippine tariff act in the summer of 1909 marked a new era in the business of the sugar trust. The Republican party, apparently carrying out McKinley's idea of benevolent assimilation, had, through President Taft, urged and secured the passage of a bill which practically established free trade between the Philippine Islands and the United States. No other apparent purpose was involved in this bill except the cementing of the bonds of friendship between two peoples whom fate and an unfortunate policy have linked together.

This bill provided that 300,000 tons of sugar per year should enter the United States free of duty. At first blush this may not seem to be a large amount, but when it is calculated in pounds it must be remembered that it is a quantity of sugar large enough to represent a tariff duty of \$11,000,000 annually at the present rate imposed upon raw sugar imported from other countries. In other words, this quantity of sugar represents more than one-fifth of the total revenue of \$52,000,000 derived from the importation of sugar annually for the last ten years under the Dingley tariff law. In the hands of independent American sugar refiners, or in the hands of active Filipino competitors of the sugar trust, think what that amount of sugar imported into the United States free of duty would mean. For the first time in many years there would be a genuine competition established with the sugar trust.

The sugar trust with its Machiavellian management, characterized by cunning and criminality unequalled in the history of the industrial corporations of America, was no doubt keenly alive to the tremendous importance and relation to its business of the passage of the Philippine tariff act. It knew that it must always do one of two things—control the tariff policy governing the importation of sugar from all sources or control the lands that produce the raw sugar to supply its refineries. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That it may be understood that the assertion that the sugar trust was alive to the possibility of Philippine competition is not an idle statement I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that President Roosevelt on January 23, 1908, in closing a special report on the Philippines in recommending certain legislation, stated that it should be with such reasonable limitations as may remove fear of interference with the tobacco and sugar interests of the United States. In other words, it was known and recognized that cheap Philippine raw sugar constituted a menace to the business of the sugar trust.

When the Philippine tariff act became an accomplished fact, therefore, with the keenness of perception and adroitness of action that has always characterized its ruthless and criminal career in the United States, it did not take the sugar trust long to arrange for its programme of exploitation of the Philippines. On September 3, 1909, Mr. John Henry Hammond, a member of the law firm of Strong & Cadwalader, of New York, the firm of which Attorney-General Wickersham was a leading member prior to his entrance into the Cabinet of President Taft, and of which Henry W. Taft, the President's brother, is another member, came to Washington to discuss with the Bureau of Insular Affairs the matter of the purchase of large tracts of land in the Philippine Islands. I do not know whether Mr. Hammond visited Attorney-General Wickersham. If he did so

he may have discussed Halley's comet or the weather; he may have exchanged simple felicitations, passed the time of day, and left; or he may have come and gone without even so much as making known his presence to his old associate in the practice of the law.

But certain it is that he was here in Washington on that important mission, because in a note to House Report No. 1015, in explanation of a certain cablegram to the Philippines in October, 1909, regarding the sale of friar lands is found this statement:

The Mr. Hammond referred to in this cablegram had called at the Bureau of Insular Affairs on September 3, 1909. Major McIntyre was in charge of the office on that date and went over very generally with Mr. Hammond the land laws of the Philippine Islands. The question of the amount of land which an agricultural corporation could hold in the Philippine Islands, the amount of land of the public domain which a corporation or individual might purchase, and related matters were discussed. Major McIntyre thinks that Mr. Hammond did not bring up the question of the purchase of any special piece of property in the Philippine Islands, nor is he positive that he mentioned the purchase of land on the friar estates, though from the cable from Manila he believes that Mr. Hammond must have done so.

However, after going over the subject Major McIntyre gained the impression that Mr. Hammond's clients desired to form a corporation to carry on agriculture in the Philippine Islands and to obtain land holdings from the Philippine government.

The records of the Bureau of Insular Affairs also contain two letters of about this time, bearing date October 22 and October 23, 1909, freighted with potential information for a prudent Attorney-General, who was to render an opinion concerning their sale of the friar lands. To give these letters their full import, I shall insert them in the Record:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, October 22, 1909.

MY DEAR MR. HAMMOND: When you were in the office about the 3d of September, among other things with reference to the land laws of the Philippines discussed was the application of these laws to the friar estates. Very little attention was paid to this feature of the case, as I explained to you that I was under the impression that no effort was being made to sell any of the friar estates in large blocks, and specifically that I did not understand that the Philippine government was making any effort to sell the San Jose estate of about 56,000 acres on the island of Mindoro. You will recall that you had received advice from Manila, or that your clients had received advice, that this estate was in the market. In any case, I am satisfied that I gave you the impression that the limitations of the act of Congress relating to the public lands had been extended to the friar estates.

I now desire to correct both of these impressions. A cable received from Manila to-day indicates that it is desired to sell the San Jose estate, and I inclose two acts of the Philippine legislature amending "the friar lands act," which make it clear that the unoccupied lands on the friar estates may be sold to individuals without any limitation as to area. I do not know that you are still interested in this matter in any way, but I do not desire that you should be under any misapprehension as to the matter, due to our conversation.

Sincerely, yours,

FRANK MCINTYRE,

Major, Eighth Infantry, Assistant to Chief of Bureau.

JOHN HENRY HAMMOND, Esq.,
Care STRONG & CADWALADER,
40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

(Includes acts Nos. 1847 and 1933 of the Philippine Commission.)

40 WALL STREET,
New York, October 23, 1909.

MY DEAR MAJOR MCINTYRE: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your very kind letter of yesterday inclosing copies of acts Nos. 1847 and 1933 of the Philippine Commission relating to the sale of the friars' lands.

After careful consideration and in view of the fact that it may be necessary for my former clients to request some discretionary action on the part of the government officials, I decided that they had better be represented by other counsel; accordingly the firm of Cravath, Henderson & de Gersdorff has taken up the matter. I have sent your letter and the inclosures to Mr. Leffingwell, of that firm.

Thanking you for your courtesy in the matter, I remain,

Sincerely, yours,

JOHN HENRY HAMMOND.

Maj. FRANK MCINTYRE,
War Department, Bureau of Insular Affairs, Washington, D. C.

Mark you, then, it was a matter of documentary evidence in September and October, 1909, at the Bureau of Insular Affairs that a member of the firm of Strong & Cadwalader was seeking to purchase large quantities of friar lands in the Philippines for corporate clients.

And Strong & Cadwalader was the law firm of which the Attorney-General himself had been a member.

At this point a cablegram dated October 22, 1909, and on file in the Bureau of Insular Affairs, becomes interesting reading, as revealing information which an Attorney-General zealous in the people's interest might well have scanned. It is as follows:

OCTOBER 22, 1909.

SECRETARY OF WAR, Washington:

Prentiss and Poole desire to purchase unoccupied sugar lands on San Jose friar estate, Mindoro; say Hammond was informed by the Bureau of Insular Affairs an individual can not purchase more than 40 acres friar lands. Can not understand this, as acts 1847 and 1933 were passed amending friar-land act to give government right to sell vacant friar lands without restriction as to area. Attorney-General concurs in the opinion that this has been accomplished. Please confirm by telegraph to satisfy these gentlemen.

FORBES.

If Hammond, from feelings of delicacy, or because of a mere social breach, failed to call on the Attorney-General in Washington in September, here at least was the document which could give the Attorney-General the names of Hammond's clients.

And I want the American people to note that Hammond, the member of the firm of Strong & Cadwalader, the former partners of the Attorney-General, only turns the negotiations over to other lawyers after they are well advanced toward the final stage where the Attorney-General must himself render a legal opinion on the transaction. In other words, Mr. Wickersham's firm, of which the President's brother is still a member, had charge of all the preliminary legal matters leading up to the sugar trust's invasion of the Philippines.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Before the gentleman proceeds with this part of his discussion, I would like to make an interjection—

Mr. COVINGTON. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado (continuing). Supplementing what he has to say about the call of Mr. Hammond, of the firm of Strong & Cadwalader. In the correspondence, which General Edwards, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 14, with his letter of April 11, and in other places General Edwards makes it appear that he personally had no knowledge of Mr. Hammond's visit, and had no conversation with him; that whatever conversation did occur was between Mr. Hammond and Major McIntyre, General Edwards's assistant. General Edwards says they did not talk about the friar lands in the Philippine Islands, but only about the Philippine land laws and the Philippine lands generally. But now, note you, on May 14, in response to House resolution 691, General Edwards sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a copy of a letter written by him to the governor-general of the Philippine Islands on September 27, 1909, in which occurs this language:

A representative of a New York law firm, one of the best in New York, has visited this office in connection with the purchase of the San Jose friar estate in Mindoro.

GEN. C. R. EDWARDS.

Mr. COVINGTON. Just one other link in the confirmatory proof with regard to what took place between the firm of Strong & Cadwalader and the Government at that time, and an evidence that afterwards as little information as possible relating to the whole transaction was made public.

It is now proper to call attention to a speech of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN] in this House on March 25, wherein he quotes a news dispatch to the Chicago Tribune of December 6, 1909, as follows:

MANILA, December 6.

E. L. Poole, of Habana, Cuba, to-day closed a deal with the Philippine government for the purchase of the San Jose friar estate of 55,000 acres in the island of Mindoro. The purchase price was \$367,000.

The tract will be used for the cultivation of sugar, and it is understood that the buyer represents the Havemeyers. The property is a part of the friar estates, which were bought from the church by the Government.

Here is the public information, on December 6, 1909, in one of the great Republican daily papers of the United States that E. L. Poole represented the purchasers, and the cable goes on to state whom he represents—the Havemeyers. It must not be overlooked that in the cablegram of October 22 I have before referred to Poole is shown to be the client of Hammond, the member of the firm of Strong & Cadwalader.

I leave it to the saving common sense of the American people whether or not there was enough substantial and accurate documentary information in existence and obtainable prior to December 18, 1909, for any man to find out who were the real purchasers of the San Jose estate in the island of Mindoro, a part of the friar lands in the Philippines.

But, in addition thereto, a simple inquiry at the Bureau of Insular Affairs by the Attorney-General would have disclosed valuable verbal information about the purchasers.

In the hearings before the Committee on Insular Affairs, on April 13, 1910, appears testimony relative to interviews that took place at the Bureau of Insular Affairs in Washington in October, 1909, as follows:

Mr. GARRETT. What is the name of the person who bought that land?

Colonel MCINTYRE. Mr. Thomas Poole.

Mr. GARRETT. Do you know for whom he was acting—is that known? General EDWARDS. There were three people in it.

Colonel MCINTYRE. The attorney for those people came to the office, Mr. de Gersdorff—this matter had been referred to in the papers as the sugar trust invading the Philippines, as I remember—and he said that he did not represent a corporation in any way, but that the men who were putting up the money were Mr. Horace Havemeyer, Welch, and Mr. Senff. I am not certain as to that name; it is a decided German name—he said that two of those men owned stock in the American Sugar Refining Company and the third he thought or was positive did not.

Now, consider for a moment. Everyone knows that the Rockefeller family dominates Standard Oil, and if a Rocke-

feller buys an oil field, it does not take a wizard to discover that the oil field will become a part of the trust source of supply. It is a matter of equally general knowledge that the Havemeyers have been and are to-day equally potent in sugar-trust affairs. A Havemeyer purchase of sugar lands may, therefore, safely be called a sugar-trust purchase. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I assert that the question with whom the Government is to deal in a great business transaction is always one of transcendent importance. It certainly ought not to engage in any business relation with a crook. But in the very face of the evidence I have detailed, Attorney-General Wickersham, under date of December 18, 1909, sent an official opinion to the Secretary of War to the effect that the "friar lands" could be sold without limitation as to acreage. We shall see later on whether the Attorney-General did or did not know that the sugar trust was a great criminal.

The records of the Bureau of Insular Affairs show a cable of the substance of this opinion as follows:

DECEMBER 22, 1909.

FORBES, Manila:

The Attorney-General of the United States is of the opinion that limitations in section 15, act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, do not apply to the estates purchased from religious orders. Attorneys of purchasers so notified to-day. Copy of opinion by mail.

MCINTYRE.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply marshaling the undisputed facts in this seemingly scandalous case. I want the discriminating sense of justice in the American people to render the final judgment. With that purpose in view, I am bound to say that it is true that Colonel McIntyre, Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, in his statement before the Committee on Insular Affairs on April 13, 1910, testified as follows:

Colonel MCINTYRE. Mr. Atkins, who had recently been made a director of the American Sugar Refining Company and who was formerly interested in sugar in Cuba and now is, wrote a letter to General Edwards in which he said that he had seen in the New York Journal of Commerce the statement that the American Sugar Refining Company had invested in Philippine lands. He said it was not true; that they had no investment whatever in the Philippine Islands and did not contemplate any. He went further and said that he had made inquiry and he could find no one connected with the American Sugar Refining Company who had any interest. He went into this matter quite fully in a letter, and shortly thereafter he was going to Cuba, and he came in the office and went over the same ground verbally.

Unfortunately, however, the word of the sugar trust, through its representatives, is not to be taken where its selfish and criminal interests are at stake. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In Hampton's Magazine for March, 1910, the well-known writer, Judson C. Welliver, has the following paragraph:

On January 12, 1910, the American Sugar Refining Company (the trust) held its annual meeting. The next day the trust published in its annual report, over the signature of Secretary Charles K. Helke, the following:

"This company has no interest whatever, either directly or indirectly, in Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippine Islands, or in any foreign country; it does not share in the advantages that owners of sugar plantations in these countries may have in sending sugar to this market."

Mr. Welliver then shows by carefully collated data that as a matter of fact the Cuban-American Sugar Company, of New Jersey, was formed in 1906 with an authorized capital of \$30,000,000 by trust interests, and to-day owns a string of the finest sugar estates in Cuba, containing 526,000 acres and producing 297,000 tons of raw sugar. It dominates the whole Cuban sugar situation.

And to make the story of false protestations more complete, it should be said that the Edwin F. Atkins just referred to is the same man who, on November 17, 1908, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of this House to explain that he held large sugar interests in Cuba, and spoke apparently for Cuba and the Cuban people; whereas, in fact, he was allied with the trust, and is now a director in it.

It will be seen, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that perjured statements and falsified reports are the ever-ready weapons of the sugar trust when occasion demands it to maintain its position as the chief bandit among the band of plunderers who thrive on legislation in their interest at the hands of the party now in power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Perhaps some apologists of the Attorney-General may ask how he was to know that the sugar trust is such a criminal corporation that the Government should under no circumstances facilitate its operations or sell sugar lands to its stockholders. There is in law, Mr. Chairman, the phrase "judicial notice," meaning that certain matters are so well known they need no proof. I believe the bad character of the sugar trust might be placed within that category. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But in order that there may be no doubt about what even so reticent and retiring a gentleman as the Attorney-

General should have known at the date of his opinion, I append a few newspaper extracts:

[From the New York Sun, November 7, 1909.]

THE CANCER OF A REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION.

The sugar trust, which is the most corrupt and rotten trust in existence, has achieved its repulsive eminence under the direct patronage and protection of Republican administration. A Republican administration protects it to-day. * * *

A Republican administration at Washington, in return for money and for other valuable considerations, sheltered the sugar trust from the consequence of its crimes, sheltered it so effectually that its directors escape the penitentiary only by the interposition of the statute of limitations. * * *

The whole political weight and force of the Republican political machine (of which the New York custom-house is an integral part) is now concentrated on the defense of the sugar trust, on commuting the penalties which it can not wholly evade, and affording it the opportunity to settle with the United States Treasury by disgorging \$2,000,000 when it had stolen \$30,000,000.

The Washington Times of January 11, 1910, referring to prosecutions of sugar-trust employees which had then been under way for several months, said in an editorial:

Four employees of the sugar trust were sentenced yesterday to one year each in prison. These are the men who manipulated the scales in order to depress the weights of raw sugar when it passed over the scales for the purpose of determining the weight on which duty should be paid. It will be recalled that these men worked for \$13 per week, and each received on pay day an envelope marked "\$13" on the outside, but containing \$18. That these men were mere cogs in the machine of fraud is perfectly clear. Above and behind them was the executive intelligence which directed their peculations and reaped big profits from them. * * *

The sugar trust and its operations have become a stench in the nostrils of the community. It is realized that the ablest business men and the most skilled lawyers have worked together to make it the great effective instrumentality for fraud which it has become. To punish a few of the tools of these men, but let the principals escape, will bring a new measure of reproach upon the administration of justice and the processes of the courts.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

In the New York Sun of January 16, 1910, is the following news item:

Charles R. Heike, secretary of the sugar trust, is described as the man higher up than the Government was after. * * *

Several government officials, Collector William Loeb, jr., among them, announced yesterday that the indictment of Heike as an executive officer of the company was the object of much hard work on the part of the special investigators for eight months. Efforts to bring a really important officer of the sugar trust into the case began last June, and all the time that Henry L. Stimson and Winfred T. Denison were working up cases against the minor employees of the company, they were at the same time getting closer to Heike. * * *

When the sugar trust was on trial in a civil suit to recover stolen duties it was brought out early in the case that Secretary Heike was familiar with discrepancies in the weighing of raw sugar received at the docks of the Havemeyer & Elder refinery at Williamsburg.

This shows that the Department of Justice had since the summer of 1909 been employing special attorneys to catch the elusive criminal owners of the sugar trust. The Attorney-General is the head of this department. He is credited with being a very astute man. I wonder if it is possible that he did not know the work on which his special assistants were engaged. The Review of Reviews, December 1, 1909, had a long article recounting the wickedness of the sugar trust. This is a great Republican magazine. Surely the Attorney-General must have seen this article. I append portions of it:

One of the subjects most urgently brought to Mr. Taft's attention in the middle of November was the further unraveling of the shameful conspiracy on the part of the sugar trust and certain custom-house officials to defraud the Government by the false weighing of imported sugar on the docks and by other kindred forms of dishonesty. The first disclosures in this shocking scheme of theft were made about two years ago. Evidence was difficult to secure, but the work of faithful investigators gradually discovered the methods by which the weighing machines were made to give false reports. Indictments and convictions were found and the sugar trust paid the Government more than \$2,000,000 in confession of amounts unmistakably due on cargoes which had been underweighed. Collector Loeb pressed the investigations with vigor and the United States prosecuting officers rendered every assistance in their power. Continued inquiry in November brought to light the fact that a much larger number of government officials in the weighing department were involved in the conspiracy than had been supposed at first. Much excitement followed the discovery that one of the most important and long-trusted superintendents of the refining business of the sugar trust was also involved.

To what extent still higher officers of the American Sugar Refining Company had been connected with the frauds had not yet become a matter of public knowledge. Nor is it possible as yet to hold the view that any high officers of the customs service at New York or of the Treasury Department at Washington have ever aided or connived at the guilty practices of the sugar trust. There is, however, much reason to fear that there was guilty knowledge in high and authoritative quarters on the part of the sugar trust, and that there was lack of strong disposition on the part of some of the high officials of the Government to demand a thorough probing of offenses which had begun to be rumored, if not quite proven. It seems probable enough that there will be a congressional investigation and an opportunity for high officials to make clear their attitude of unhesitating vigor against lawbreakers, if their reputations have in any quarter been unjustly assailed. * * *

It is a mistake to suppose that the process of refining, as carried on by the trust, constitutes one of our large and important American in-

duties. What it does constitute in point of fact is one of the most outrageous impositions upon the American public that has ever been carefully arranged by conspiracy between political leaders and commercial bandits.

Mr. Chairman, while I think it is nearly always safe to take the united declarations of the reputable press of America as to the truth of any great public fact, Attorney-General Wickersham has himself written the evidence of this knowledge that the sugar trust was a criminal corporation with criminal officers. On June 27, 1909, he wrote to United States District Attorney Wise at New York cautioning him to be sure to have no directors of the sugar trust indicted for complicity in frauds unless he be certain the offenses are not barred by the statute of limitations. There is here the practically express recognition of the criminality. And, by the way, what a remarkable letter; the legal adviser to this great country is become the solicitous friend of the directors in the trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I just want to say that the gentleman has overlooked the fact that Mr. Wickersham's law firm was counsel for the sugar trust while he was a member of it and before he came into the Cabinet. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COVINGTON. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for recalling the fact to me. I will supplement his remark by stating that it was in a case which involved the wrecking of the Pennsylvania Sugar Refining Company, the only individual competitor of the sugar trust in the United States. And Henry W. Taft was the member of the firm who conducted the case. [Applause.]

Ah, but the Attorney-General may say he had nothing to do but to construe the law. If the section in the act of 1902, providing a limitation on the amount of public land that may be acquired in the Philippines is clear and unambiguous, and one of simple construction, no one could question him for the disastrous result to the public from the removal of the limitation. On that matter, however, I desire to quote from the opinion of Moorfield Storey, esq., one of the ablest of American lawyers and a great student of Philippine affairs. His opinion has been made a matter of record by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL]. In it he says:

I can not therefore resist the conclusion that the power to sell the land purchased from the religious orders and then added to the public domain is subject to these precise limitations as to quantity.

Moreover, when we consider the purpose of these limitations, which was to prevent the exploiting of the Philippine Islands by American or other capitalists, and to provide that these lands be "administered for the benefit of the inhabitants thereof" in the words of section 12, no reason can be suggested why the very choice agricultural lands which were held by the religious orders should be thrown open to exploitation, or why the general policy clearly contemplated by the act should have been abandoned in dealing with this very important portion of Philippine agricultural land. The reason which required the limitation in other cases applies with equal force to these lands, and I can not doubt that it was the intention of Congress that the policy should be the same.

In this view Mr. McCALL himself concurred, and on the floor of this House on March 22 last he said:

I would say that it seems to me the opinion of Mr. Storey is right, and in that I am confirmed by the opinion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], who has given a great deal of attention to Philippine matters, and who was chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs when this government act was passed.

So we see that Mr. Storey's opinion is supported by the distinguished gentleman who was best informed as to the legislative purpose at the time the Philippine act was passed fixing the limit on land sales.

The situation on December 18, 1909, and prior thereto, in the fall of 1909, was therefore a simple one. A legal question of great doubt arose in connection with the proposed sale of friar lands. The law applicable to the situation was expressly made to prevent exploitation of the Philippine Islands; the Attorney-General, with the people as his client, very accommodatingly gave an opinion against the interest of the people to further an exploitation scheme by an organization he knew to be a great corporate criminal. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not know the motive and I make no charge. I simply state the facts. But I do say that it is my personal belief that this Government should be too great and righteous to have any dealing with its criminal classes except to bring them within the relentless clutches of the law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That it is considered that the Attorney-General is the real party responsible for the trust invasion of Mindoro, I read from the Baltimore Sun of April 28, as follows, referring to one of the resolutions of inquiry:

While the resolution calls upon Secretary Dickinson to submit the facts, Attorney-General Wickersham is really the party in interest, for

without his astonishing construction of the public-land laws pertaining to the Philippines no question as to the good faith and proper action of the War Department officials could have arisen.

With the insidiously corrupt methods of the sugar trust and the despicably criminal character of its dominating factors, so easily learned by him as a former partner of Strong & Cadwalader, Attorney-General Wickersham might well have pondered long over such a dubious question, and instead of the accommodating opinion in the interest of the trust have remembered that he is the attorney of a nation, the legal guide for 90,000,000 freemen, the best the sun ever shone upon, and have taken unto himself the moral implied by that old quatrain—

I hear a lion in the lobby roar;
Say, Mr. Speaker, shall we shut the door,
Or shall we open it to let him in,
And see if we can put him out again?

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, the surprising story of the sale of the San Jose estate is not yet over. It will be remembered that the Attorney-General gave his opinion on December 18, and it was cabled to the Philippines on December 22, 1909. Presumably no prudent person would buy until after that. As if to confirm that idea, the following cablegram was sent from Manila to Washington:

SECRETARY OF WAR, Washington:

Sale Mindoro estate consummated January 4. First payment, \$83,500, has been received.

JANUARY 13, 1910.

FORBES.

Let us now look at the activity of the thrifty agent Poole, the reputed representative of the sugar trust and the client of Hammond, of the firm of Strong & Cadwalader. The tale is best told by a newspaper clipping.

The Weekly Times, Manila, P. I., on Friday, January 7, 1910, published a news item as follows:

The payment of P166,000 was made Tuesday to the insular treasurer by the manager of the San Jose sugar estate in southwestern Mindoro. This is the first installment, which is to be paid annually on January 4, until P700,000 have been turned over to the government purse, in payment for the 22,000 hectares of land.

Work has already been started at San Jose by E. L. Poole, who purchased the estate. Soundings for the new dock at Pandarochan Point, near Mangarin, have been taken and the materials for the construction of the dock have been ordered.

The survey for the railroad which will run from the dock through the estate, a distance of 14 miles, is now in progress; the seed cane, which has been selected from the very best stock in the islands, has been planted, and the guinea grass, to provide a proper amount of forage for the animals on the plantation, is now in. Buildings have also been started for the shelter of the construction gangs and employees, and there is now an opportunity for a large number of natives to obtain employment on the estate. Mr. Poole hopes, by paying fair wages and extending fair treatment, to be able to secure the necessary labor to carry on the work.

Upon Mr. Poole's return to the plantation a hospital will be constructed and a doctor secured to look after the health of the employees. The best sanitary arrangements will be carried out in the construction of the cottages and buildings.

Does any man in his sound senses believe that all this could have been done after the opinion of December 18, only thirteen days before? It was plainly the work of several months, and the sugar trust does not put up its money unless it has absolute assurance it will get it back. I leave to the public to draw the conclusion whether some advance assurances were or were not given. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And as a final circumstance, and one that should cause the love of fair dealing and the chivalric nature of Americans toward a weaker people a distinct shock, I assert that there exists in the Philippines to-day the belief that our Government is an oppressor and not a benevolent friend of the islands. The idea is abroad there that like Cuba they have been commercially annexed by the sugar trust. I quote from an editorial in the Vanguard, Manila, P. I., February 25, 1910:

With the decision of Attorney-General Wickersham legalizing the sale of friar lands in large blocks the gates have been thrown wide open to the trusts, and it is most evident that they have nothing to fear from a Government which extends a most affectionate welcome to the worst oppressors of the people in the home country.

Mr. Chairman, when I think of the career of the sugar trust, and of the knowledge of the Attorney-General in regard to its criminality at the time he made possible the sale of the friar lands, and when I think of the fact that no lawyer can do an act of more doubtful propriety than to aid a scheme by which the Government enters into business relations with a notorious criminal and thereby puts within control of the criminal the very instrumentality that is a necessity for its future crimes, recalling then that the Attorney-General has apparently become by repute at least the real advisor of the present Republican administration and has assumed to state who is and who is not within the party fold, I am moved to think that we must look elsewhere, with all due respect, than to gentlemen on

the other side of the House for relief from this situation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Unless the recent signs of the times are all wrong the great American people are thus looking. They realize that there is no hope for relief from oppression and monopoly at the hands of the Republican party; it has cemented too close a partnership with the predatory corporate interests. Their view is turned away from the setting sun of a decadent and disgusting commercialism in government and is turned toward the east and toward the dawn of that day next November when the first battle cry will be raised for the victory which will only be complete in a Democratic triumph in November, 1912. In the meantime that there shall be a constant memory of the iniquities that imperil us I can imagine from many firesides going up this fervent prayer of Kipling:

God of our fathers, known of all,
Lord of our far-flung battle line,
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine;
Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McKINLAY of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland in regard to the sugar lands of the Philippine Islands, but I would rather have the gentleman submit a little better evidence than clippings from newspapers, either of Chicago or Manila, in support of his contention that the lands in question were being purchased for purposes of exploitation by the sugar trust.

I happen to have traveled through the Philippine Islands considerably, and have been over the island of Mindanao. I listened to hearings upon the sugar culture of the islands some five years ago in the city of Manila, and the records will bear me out when I state that at those hearings it was demonstrated that the best lands of the Philippine Islands produced only about 1½ to 2 tons of sugar under scientific cultivation to the acre; that there is only one ratoon crop at the very best, and sometimes not that in the growth of the cane. In the Hawaiian Islands the sugar lands produce from 8 to 10 tons an acre; and I understand in the Southern States that they have plenty of land that produces from 6 to 8, and would, under scientific methods, produce 10 tons to the acre. It seems to me very unreasonable that the sugar trust would go 7,000 miles across the ocean to purchase lands that could not produce more than 1½ tons under expert farming and less than 1 ton to the acre under ordinary farming, especially since in the Philippine Islands the cost of labor is rapidly increasing since the American occupation. When we took the Philippines over into American possession, the provisions of the Chinese-exclusion laws were extended over the islands, and the only labor that can be profitably used in cultivating sugar cane in the Philippine Islands as well as Hawaii is Chinese or Japanese labor. The Philippine labor is of soft and effeminate Polynesian character and will not labor in the cane fields. It is only the Chinese and Japanese that will submit to the arduous hard-breaking labor of the sugar-cane culture of the Tropics.

This subject is very interesting, and I am sure the House and the country desire to be fully informed. So I will ask the House to submit to some facts and arguments in answer to the gentleman who has just concluded, and to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN], who interrupted him on two or three occasions.

The gentleman from Maryland has made, as have other gentlemen before him on the Democratic side, a number of statements reflecting in part on a very high official of the Government. I asked leave to question the gentleman, but he refused to answer a question. I was going to ask him upon what he based his assertions, and since the gentleman did not submit to a question, I will now answer the allegations of the gentleman in so far as they reflect on the administration.

I am not called on to defend the sugar trust. I do, however, regard it as my duty and the duty of the House to see that the administration in its prosecution of the sugar trust should have its hands upheld, and not be harassed by petty baseless criticisms in this body. I will, however, say that in my opinion the question of the friar lands in the Philippine Islands is one with which the sugar trust is wholly unconnected. The gentleman from Maryland believes that the sugar trust has purchased the San Jose estate, on the island of Mindoro, because he saw it in two newspapers. This does not convince me.

I have seen something of the Philippine Islands, and it is absurd on the face of it to believe that the sugar trust would go across 3,000 miles of American continent and 7,000 miles of ocean to one of the wildest islands in the Philippine group,

from which transportation is expensive and in which labor is scarce, to extend its field of operations.

We must remember that the Chinese-exclusion act applies to the Philippine group. Therefore this labor, the only labor we can obtain in that region, is excluded from the Philippine Islands; nor is there cheap labor in the Philippine Islands even of the class that might be obtained. Since the American occupation the price of labor has gone up in the Philippine Islands until it is as high as 1½ to 2 pesos per day.

Furthermore, the island of Mindoro has not heretofore been a sugar-producing island. The friar estate which has been sold by the Philippine government is something over 55,000 acres, but there are on that island over 2,000,000 acres of public domain not under cultivation in any form. The attempt to grow sugar in the island of Mindoro is a pioneer effort; the result of the experiment is doubtful. It is notoriously accompanied by many difficulties.

If these people, whoever they are, that have bought this land—these 55,000 acres—can cultivate it profitably, they will have demonstrated for the Philippine people that they have on that island some 2,000,000 acres of valuable land which they can homestead or purchase under the public-land act of the Philippine government. It will be a profitable lesson to the people.

I attended hearings in Manila five years ago, where the sugar planters of the islands demonstrated conclusively that the Philippine Islands would never be a great sugar-producing section of the world. These hearings showed that even under government experts on the experimental farm never had there been produced a crop of more than a couple of tons to the acre. The average production on average plantations was less than a ton to the acre. Many of the islands, such as Mindoro, owing either to the nature of the land or to the absence of labor, produced no sugar at all. Furthermore, in the Philippine Islands there is, generally speaking, no ratoon crop—that is, no second crop—grown spontaneously without replanting.

Now, let us look at Hawaii. Sugar is produced at the rate of from 6 to 9 tons per acre. In my remarks on the floor of the House I placed the yield of the Hawaiian lands at from 8 to 10 tons to the acre. They have two or three ratoon crops. In some of the Southern States, I am informed, there are lands that produce from 4 to 6 tons per acre, or even more under scientific methods, such as used in Hawaii or Cuba. I now find on inquiry that the figures should be from 6 to 8 tons. Taking these facts into consideration, I am satisfied that the sugar trust as a corporation never purchased the lands in question in Mindoro, and this is in no way based on the evidence of the director of the company, who has been referred to heretofore, who has positively stated that the trust was in no way interested in any lands of the Philippine Islands.

The gentleman from Maryland argues that, in so much as there was a Mr. Havemeyer interested in this purchase, it must have been purchased by the sugar trust. It is apparently the gentleman's belief that the Havemeyers receive no personal profit from the sugar trust; that whatever is Mr. Havemeyer's belongs to that corporation. If so, that would put a benevolent construction on the operations of the Havemeyers which is not generally taken. It may be that some of the profits which Mr. Havemeyer has received from the sugar trust have been invested in the Philippine Islands. This is all that the evidence discloses, and it does not disclose that except inferentially; but, as I stated before, I am not called on to defend the sugar trust. What I shall say will be perhaps an unnecessary defense—certainly unnecessary to the discerning—of those who are at present prosecuting the sugar trust for alleged criminal acts.

The gentleman from Maryland bases his remarks on House resolution 679, introduced by him, calling on the Attorney-General for certain information. He adds:

Now that ten days have elapsed since he (the Attorney-General) was apprised of the desire for the information without so much as a word from him, I think I am justified in concluding that he proposed to treat that information as incompatible with the public interest, and I am therefore warranted in commenting freely on his failure to answer the allegations.

Now, as a matter of fact, the gentleman's resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives May 10, 1910. It was sent to the Attorney-General, who made a complete reply thereto on May 13, 1910, which was published in Document No. 911, Sixty-first Congress, second session, House of Representatives, having been received in the House on May 14, 1910, and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed. It was printed, and was available one week before the gentleman made the speech in which he charges that no reply had been made to his resolution. This is a sample of the accuracy pervading the remarks of the gentleman. He lays great stress

on the fact that the Attorney-General should have known who the proposed purchasers of the San Jose friar estate were. He apparently believes that the decisions of the Attorney-General's office should depend not on the law but on the persons affected by the opinions. If the gentleman will read the document which his inquiry brought forth, he will see how ridiculous it is to suppose that ignorance or knowledge on the part of the Attorney-General of the names of these purchasers should have affected his decision. His decision had to do simply with the question as to whether it was legal for the Philippine government to make a certain sale. He was not called on to advise the sale. His decision in no way compelled the Philippine government to make the sale, and the legality of the sale could in no way depend on the name of the individual.

The Attorney-General says he did not know the name of the purchaser. This is borne out by the record, and it is not seen what possible connection there could be between the legal question of the right of the Philippine Islands to sell this land and the name of the purchaser.

The gentleman, however, makes one statement which he bases on the opinion of Mr. Moorfield Storey, which might, if true, be an error chargeable to the Attorney-General. Mr. Storey differs with the opinion of the Attorney-General, and holds that the sale of lands is not legal, notwithstanding the opinion of the Attorney-General. I shall return to this feature of the allegation later.

The gentleman further says that we must not forget that the selling price of the San Jose estate of 55,000 acres was at a price of about one-third of its cost to the Government. Why should we not forget this? I do not think we could now find the father of the statement. The House has before it evidence showing that the Government received for this property approximately \$70,000 more than it paid for it. The statement which is now repeated by the gentleman from Maryland was first suggested by the gentleman from Colorado, who was permitted to interrupt the gentleman from Maryland, but the gentleman from Colorado no longer repeats his statement. Why he should have ever made it, while in the same speech he referred to a letter from the department which he had seen which gave exact facts in this regard, is still unexplained. Would it not be better to forget this and remember the facts which have been furnished the House several times, that this friar estate was sold at its cost to the Government, increased by the interest which the Philippine government had paid on the bonds issued for its purchase at the rate of 4 per cent per annum and the cost of administering the estate, or, in round numbers, the Philippine government had paid \$298,000 for the estate, and it sold for \$367,000. This is another example of what we have been furnished on this subject by the gentleman from Maryland, who, having first overflowed with misinformation, has since daily bubbled over with foolish questions, in the hope that they could not receive answers.

Referring to the legal aspect of the questions involved, I prefer to leave the answering of the various points to my eminent colleague from Indiana, Judge CRUMPACKER, who informs me that he intends dealing with the whole friar-land question from the legal side. As he has been a member of the Insular Affairs Committee since the passage of the organic law for the government of the Philippines, I deem him more qualified to properly set forth the attitude of the Philippine and American governments on those questions, together with the various rulings of the attorney-general of the islands and the Attorney-General of the United States and the decisions of the insular courts than I am.

But this last attack upon Attorney-General Wickersham by the gentleman from Maryland, together with the interpolation of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN], as found on page 6684 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—

Mr. MARTIN. I just want to say that the gentleman has overlooked the fact that Mr. Wickersham's law firm was counsel for the sugar trust while he was a member of it before he came into the Cabinet—

Calls for an answer.

The references of the gentleman from Maryland, the interpolations of the gentleman from Colorado, and the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], delivered on the floor of this House April 14, 1910, are all of one pattern; their evident purpose being to make Democratic war medicine by endeavoring to place the administration in the eyes of the public in an attitude favorable toward the sugar-trust prosecutions. The idea is preposterous, unfair, and criminal; but it is the only kind of politics left a party which has been vainly and ineffectually endeavoring for more than half a century to find some issue upon which they could induce the voters of the nation in majority numbers to support them.

Thank God, the constructive laws of the country for nearly sixty years are of Republican origin and a part of Republican legislation and administrative policy. In those sixty years the office of vilification, abuse, denunciation, and billingsgate has been confined to the Democratic party. And this debate evidences that the same old Democratic party is again hammering in the same old way. This whole debate on the sugar trust has been and still is another wild attempt to secure some petty partisan advantage by trying to prejudice the minds of a few voters against the President and trusted members of his Cabinet. The speech of the gentleman from Illinois was a fair example of Democratic campaign literature, and as that was a little more complete and scientific than those of the gentlemen from Colorado and Maryland, I shall devote more time to an answer to it than to the others.

Mr. Chairman, after reading the full speech of the gentleman from Illinois, delivered on the floor of this House on April 14, 1910, it must be apparent to any fair-minded man that there are occasions when the privileges of debate accorded to Members of Congress by the Constitution and laws are grossly and wantonly abused. The most liberal and charitable interpretation of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois on that occasion can not elevate them above the level of the most violent demagogic partisanship, their purpose being, without doubt, to cast reflection and suspicion on the attitude and action of the President of the United States and one of his Cabinet, the Attorney-General, toward the so-called sugar-trust prosecutions which are now engaging the active energy and ability of the Department of Justice.

This untimely and unnecessary attack on the administration can not be construed in any other light than that of partisanship, its evident purpose being to increase the difficulties of the President and Attorney-General in dealing with a very exasperating situation, caused by the violation of the laws of the United States and the robbery of the Treasury by the American Sugar Refining Company.

That portion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois dealing with the formation and history of the American Sugar Refining Company is probably substantially correct, excepting that part in reference to the Spreckels Sugar Company. I do not think that it is necessary for the gentleman to grow pathetic over the fight between the Spreckels Sugar Company and the American sugar trust. Out in California we know more about the Spreckels Sugar Companies than is known in the East, and we know that the Spreckels Sugar Companies have always been able to take pretty good care of themselves, whether in the production of beet sugar, in which they are extensively engaged in California, or in their successful attempt to force concessions and terms from the sugar trust, which was the occasion for their building a great refinery in Philadelphia several years ago to enable them to enter into active competition with the sugar trust, but which was afterwards sold out to the trust at an enormous profit. No; there is no occasion to weep tears of sympathy over that great contest of capitalistic interests.

The Spreckels Company did not get the worst of the contest by any means, and the sugar trust did not drive them out of business either in Hawaii or in California. They are still doing business in both places, and undoubtedly under an agreement with the sugar trust for the division of profits. Outside of the inaccuracies of statement as to the facts in several places, all that portion of the gentleman's remarks dealing with the formation and history and operations of the sugar trust since its formation furnishes very interesting reading; the only trouble is that the subject is so old, so very old. The magazine-reading public have been going over it again and again at recurring intervals for many years. About every so often the magazine writers apparently exhaust all other material; then, probably from sheer habit, turn back again and take another swat at the sugar trust.

But nobody cares for that. The sugar trust has no friends outside of its own organization, either out of or in Congress, the gentleman from Illinois to the contrary notwithstanding. The record of the sneaking and thieving operators of the sugar trust now being brought so prominently to light under the vigorous and successful prosecutions now being conducted by the Attorney-General have so disgusted the general American public that there are very few, if any, persons who would make any kind of a stand for the sugar trust; they are entirely outside the pale, so far as their business operations are concerned, particularly in relation to the Government of the United States.

But what seems strange to me is that when at last we have a strong, able, vigorous, and thoroughly in earnest Attorney-General, directing all his energy and abilities toward ferreting out and the prosecution of frauds committed by the American Sugar Refining Company since its formation as a corporation,

and when this course of Mr. Wickersham is indorsed and supported by the President, who is most anxious to bring every guilty man to account, and when, as a result of the harmonious action of the President and Attorney-General, the sugar-trust violators, both the little fellows and the higher-ups that are being prosecuted with great vigor, gentlemen can be found standing on the floor of this House criticising and finding fault with the methods employed and apparently endeavoring, by opposing the methods of both President and Attorney-General, to render the criminal prosecutions futile and abortive.

Four or five points in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois stand out in distinct prominence. First, that Attorney-General Wickersham was a member of the law firm of Strong & Cadwalader prior to his appointment as Attorney-General, and up until that time that the firm of Strong & Cadwalader had, while Mr. Wickersham was a member, accepted employment by the American Sugar Refining Company in the defense of a suit brought by the Pennsylvania Sugar Company, and as a member of that firm participated in the fee paid by the American Sugar Refining Company to the firm of Strong and Cadwalader, and the fee alluded to is "an enormous fee."

Now, it looks as if this statement is made for the purpose of influencing public opinion by innuendo and suggestion, on the theory that because Mr. Wickersham had once belonged to a firm of lawyers, one member of which in his individual capacity, because of his skillfulness as a trial lawyer, received employment in a civil suit in the defense of the American Sugar Refining Company, when that company was sued by the Pennsylvania Sugar Company, that because of that perfectly legitimate employment of his firm associate, Mr. Wickersham himself not participating in the conduct of the cases involved or knowing anything about them, he must therefore, three years after, when he is appointed Attorney-General, favor and desire to shield the American Sugar Refining Company in its attitude as a criminal at the bar of the United States court, he himself being the chief prosecutor. The innuendo is monstrous. I will ask the gentleman if he, being a lawyer, refuses to accept any honorable employment in his professional capacity? I will ask him if he could not have acted for the American Sugar Refining Company in the suit brought against that corporation by the Pennsylvania Sugar Company as a firm member, or even as an active participant in the case, and if later on—three years later—he received an appointment as Attorney-General of the United States, would he have felt himself disqualified to act as a prosecutor against his former client, if that former client was detected violating the criminal laws of the United States? Would he feel that his former employment would prevent him from doing his full duty as a sworn officer of the Government? I would not wish to think so ill of the gentleman from Illinois as to think he could not, yet—

Out of the fullness of the heart the mouth speaketh.

In order to assist in the correction of errors which may have been created by the gentleman's remarks on April 14, as they have gone out over the country, I have taken pains to gather facts pertaining to Mr. Wickersham's connection with the firm of Strong & Cadwalader and his participation for the defense in the trial of the suit of the Pennsylvania Sugar Company against the American Sugar Refining Company and also I have ascertained the amount of the fee which seems so large to the gentleman from Illinois—a fee amounting to the tremendous sum of \$26,750, all told, which fee was dumped into the general pot of a firm of seven members and divided among them, although that fee was earned by one of them as an individual in the trial of the case in question.

The fact is, Attorney-General Wickersham never was "a sugar-trust attorney," and his only familiarity with the methods of the sugar trust has been obtained since his connection with the Government in connection with the systematic, effective prosecution of that company and its officials for violations of law.

The only connection that any member of his former firm ever had with the sugar trust was this: In February, 1906, proceedings were initiated by George H. Earle, jr., as receiver of the Pennsylvania Sugar Refining Company, against the American Sugar Refining Company and others, in New Jersey, in the court of chancery. The firm of Landabury, Depue & Faulks were retained as attorneys for the defendants and appeared in that suit. John G. Johnson, esq., of Philadelphia, and Henry W. Taft, of New York, were also retained as counsel for the defendants.

Another branch of the same litigation was shortly afterwards commenced in the United States circuit court, southern district of New York, as an action for treble damages under the Sherman Act. Henry B. Closson, esq., of New York, appeared in that action as attorney for the American Sugar Refining Com-

pany and the defendant Havemeyer, and Tompkins McIlvaine, esq., for the defendant John E. Parsons. Henry W. Taft, of New York, and John G. Johnson, of Philadelphia, were also retained as counsel for the defendants. The suit in New Jersey was tried and resulted in a judgment for the defendants, after trial lasting about a week. The suit in New York was tried and also resulted in a judgment for the defendants, the court dismissing the complaint. (Reported in 160 Fed., 144.) An appeal was taken from the latter judgment to the United States circuit court of appeals in the second circuit, and on December 15, 1908, the judgment was reversed, the court holding that the facts set forth in the complaint, if proved, established a cause of action, and that the plaintiff was entitled to an opportunity to prove them if it could. A new trial was therefore ordered.

For the services rendered in these cases, Mr. Henry W. Taft received in all fees aggregating \$26,750. This amount he paid into the firm of Strong & Cadwalader, of which he and six other persons, including Mr. Wickersham, were members, and the Attorney-General participated in those fees by receiving his agreed percentage of the net profits of the business up to the time of his retiring from the firm on assuming office as Attorney-General, March 4, 1909.

The services of Mr. Taft were those of trial counsel, he being recognized as one of the leading advocates of the New York bar. Mr. Wickersham took no part in the cases, did not consult with regard to them, and had no connection with them save as above stated. After Mr. Wickersham had retired from the firm of Strong & Cadwalader the case came on for trial again in the circuit court in New York before Judge Holt. At the close of the plaintiff's testimony a motion to dismiss was denied by the court upon the ground that the plaintiff had established prima facie the facts averred in the complaint which the circuit court of appeals had decided made out a cause of action. A settlement was thereupon negotiated between the parties, which settlement was afterwards approved by the court in Philadelphia, as the suit was being actually prosecuted in the interests of the creditors of the company. Immediately upon this occurrence the Attorney-General instructed the United States attorney in New York to secure a transcript of the evidence taken on the trial and to submit the case to the grand jury. This was done, and the grand jury voted an indictment against the American Sugar Refining Company, members of its board of directors Gustav E. Kissel, a banker, and Thomas B. Harned, former president of the Champion Construction Company, the holder of the majority of the capital stock of the Pennsylvania Sugar Refining Company. The transaction which gave rise to the litigation took place in 1903, and the counsel for the respective defendants strenuously urged that the offense was barred by the statute of limitations.

On June 24, 1909, United States Attorney Wise wrote to the Attorney-General a letter—printed below, marked "No. 1"—in which he advised the Attorney-General of the legal questions involved, and stated that Messrs. Milburn and Bowers, counsel for defendants, had appealed to him to permit them to submit briefs, to which he had consented, and which they were to give to him on Monday morning.

The Attorney-General wrote to him on the 25th a letter—printed below, marked "No. 2"—stating:

I do not think I can add anything to the instructions already given you in this matter. I feel great personal regret that men of the prominence of these gentlemen should be indicted, but the facts under the law as laid down by the circuit court of appeals seem to justify no other course. I entirely approve of your giving counsel for the defendants until Monday to submit a brief, because it shows that the Government is proceeding with deliberation and is willing to give a patient and careful hearing to those involved.

On Sunday, June 27, 1909, the Attorney-General wrote a personal letter to District Attorney Wise, which is printed below, marked "No. 3," in which he stated that he had received a proof of a brief in support of defendants' contention that the statute of limitations had run in favor of defendants Parsons, Kissel, and Harned; that if the only overt acts to carry out the objects of the unlawful conspiracy were those referred to in that brief he should think they were insufficient to save the bar of the statute; that a strong effort would be made on the morrow to interfere in some way to prevent the indictments—

* * * but, aside from that, no indictments should be returned against anyone if there is no reasonable ground to believe they can be sustained; if, for instance, the offenses charged are clearly barred by the statute.

Adding—

What I want to impress upon you is that if you have any reasonable doubt in the matter, you either have the grand jury ask the court for instructions, or, if that is not feasible, that you advise the department of the specific charges on which you rely to save the statute before actually having the indictments brought in.

The legal question involved as to whether or not the statute of limitations barred indictment was a close one. After hearing before the district attorney of the arguments of defendants' counsel in New York, Mr. Pagan, an attorney of the Department of Justice, brought the proposed indictment to the Attorney-General, who thereupon took up with the President and the other lawyers of the Cabinet the legal questions involved, and after full discussion it was agreed that the weight of the argument was with the Government and therefore that the indictments should be found, and on July 1 indictment was returned against the defendants above referred to. Two of the defendants, by special plea, promptly raised the question of the application of the statute of limitations. The Attorney-General appointed Hon. Charles F. Brown, former presiding judge of the New York supreme court, appellate division, second department, as special assistant to the United States attorney to assist in the prosecution of this case.

The demurrers interposed by the Government to pleas in bar of certain of the defendants raising the question of the statute of limitations were fully argued, but on October 26, 1909, Judge Holt overruled the demurrers to the plea and dismissed the indictment upon the ground that the offense charged was barred by the statute of limitations. The Government at once took the case on error to the United States Supreme Court, where it is now pending, and will be reached for argument early in the fall. The question involved goes to the root of the matter, and if Judge Holt is sustained, no further prosecution can be maintained for that offense. If his decision is revised the case will be pressed for trial.

The facts concerning an effort to cause this matter to be prosecuted by the United States under the previous administration are contained in a message from President Roosevelt, transmitting, in response to a Senate resolution of January 22, 1909, correspondence relating to this matter. (S. Doc. No. 687, 60th Cong., 2d sess.)

In regard to the statement that "the general counsel for the sugar trust is an ex-assistant attorney-general of the United States, loyal to the Republican party, familiar with the methods and the secrets of the Attorney-General's office," it is sufficient to say that Mr. James M. Beck, the gentleman referred to, was an assistant attorney-general of the United States, but resigned from that office on April 30, 1903, long before any questions arose between the Government and the sugar trust.

Prior to March 4, 1909, Mr. Stimson, United States attorney in New York, was led by the revenue department of the Government to make an investigation of certain suspicious circumstances in connection with the settlement with the Government by the American Sugar Refining Company for duties on imported sugar and the bringing of a suit by him to recover penalties for alleged violations of the statute, which resulted in a verdict in the United States district court, southern district of New York, on March 5, 1909, in the sum of \$134,411.03, based upon proof of systematic frauds practiced in the weighing of sugar on the docks of the Havemeyer and Elder refineries in Brooklyn, N. Y., between the years 1901 and 1907. Shortly after the recovery of this judgment Mr. Stimson, the United States attorney, tendered his resignation, to take effect April 1, 1909, as he was desirous of entering upon private practice. The Attorney-General, however, prevailed upon Mr. Stimson to accept a retainer as special assistant for the purpose of prosecuting the sugar frauds, and Mr. Stimson associated with him Mr. Winfred T. Denison. The details of the work done under the direction of these gentlemen are shown on the statement below, marked "No. 4." As will be seen, it has resulted in the collection by the Government of almost three and one-half million dollars, besides the indictment of a large number of the individuals guilty of participation in these frauds.

In November, 1909, by direction of the Attorney-General, the United States attorney in the southern district of New York began a comprehensive investigation into the sugar-refining business of the United States for the purpose of determining the extent and character of the so-called sugar trust. This investigation has involved a number of hearings before the grand jury in December, 1909; January, February, and March, 1910; and an enormous amount of work by the attorneys and agents of the Government in collecting evidence, analyzing records, locating witnesses, and so forth, and the work is at present going on, and is approaching fruition. It would be contrary to the public interests to make public at the present time the exact status of that proceeding, or the precise objects sought to be accomplished by it. An extract from the Attorney-General's annual report to Congress in December, 1909, relating to this matter, is printed below, marked "No. 5." In his message to Congress, the President, on December 7, 1909, expressed the

opinion that an investigation of the frauds by Congress at the present, pending probing by the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice, as proposed by them, might by giving immunity and otherwise prove an embarrassment in securing conviction of the guilty parties. An extract from his message on the subject is printed below, marked "No. 6."

The provision of the statutes which the President undoubtedly had in mind in the reference above given in his message, in section 859, United States Revised Statutes, which is printed below, marked "No. 7."

It might be remarked that the investigation into the various frauds on the revenue, alleged to have been committed by the American Sugar Refining Company, has been conducted in co-operation between the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department, and has been the subject of constant personal conferences between the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney-General, and those two officials and their subordinates are in hearty accord with the entire progress of the work and with the policy which has been adopted and is now being pursued. It is true that the last of the specific frauds discovered in weighing the sugars imported by the American Sugar Refining Company occurred on November 20, 1907, just before the discovery of the frauds by the United States officials. The statute of limitations with respect to those specific frauds does not run until five years after the commission of the fraud, and the penalty for conspiracy to defraud the United States not until three years from the commission of the last overt act performed pursuant to such conspiracy. There is therefore ample time for the apprehension and indictment of all of the offenders who can now be reached before the bar of the statute will run.

The second part brought prominently forward is the connection of Mr. Henry W. Taft, a brother of the President, with the firm of Strong & Cadwalader, and his participation as a trial lawyer in the defense of the cases of the Pennsylvania Sugar Company against the American Sugar Refining Company. Well, supposing that Mr. Henry Taft was and still is a member of the firm of Strong & Cadwalader. Supposing that he did participate in the trial of the cases mentioned as an attorney for the defense. Does that fact have any bearing on the actions of Mr. Wickersham as Attorney-General of the United States? Or does the gentleman from Illinois flatter himself that by suggestion he can make the American people believe that President Taft would countenance for one moment any abatement of the prosecutions now being carried on against the sugar trust because of his brother's membership in the law firm of Strong & Cadwalader?

The fact is that Mr. Henry W. Taft is considered to be a trial lawyer of the highest rank, and as such his services are being constantly sought after by the larger interests of the country. But there was nothing in his employment by the American Sugar Refining Company in the action for damages brought against them by the Pennsylvania Sugar Company that in any way violated the ethics of the legal profession. So if the gentleman from Illinois had wanted to be fair in his remarks, why did he not call attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Henry W. Taft had been employed as special counsel by the United States Government in the prosecution of the American Tobacco trust in a very important series of cases which involved the licorice trust, and also in behalf of the United States Government in the *Hale v. Henkel* case, found reported in United States Reports, No. 201, page 43, in which it is held that a witness must produce books and papers in response to a subpoena duces tecum issued by a grand jury, even if the evidence given might tend to incriminate him?

This interpretation of the law in the cases of *Hale v. Henkel* has since its rendition been of great value in enabling United States attorneys to secure evidence in the pending sugar-trust frauds. Why did not the gentleman from Illinois, if he had wanted to be fair, point out that Mr. Henry W. Taft had accepted no employment against the Government since his brother was inaugurated President, so careful has he been to avoid the appearance of evil; but it seems, despite all his care and all his fairness, he does not escape the calumny of unjust and suspicious men.

Why does the gentleman from Illinois bring in the name of Henry W. Taft and mention his connection with the American Sugar Refining Company cases, which were civil suits between private corporations in which the Government of the United States was not interested, and fail to mention that at the call of duty Henry W. Taft had used his great talents in securing substantial victories for the Government in the cases I have here indicated? Let the gentleman answer. Was his conduct dictated by a desire to honestly place the whole matter

before the House or was it for the purpose of creating adverse public opinion in regard to the administration's attitude in these all-important prosecutions?

Running through the body of the speech of the gentleman from Illinois are many statements which to me do not seem to be correct. For instance, quoting from page 4695 of the RECORD, the gentleman says:

At the present time there is a deficit in the Treasury, constantly growing larger.

My information from the Treasury Department is that though there is a deficit in the Treasury it is constantly growing smaller instead of larger under the operation of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, and within a year, if the present ratio of decrease continues, which it probably will, the books will again balance, and as a result another "View with alarm" on the Democratic side of this House will be wiped out.

Again, the gentleman uses very extravagant figures. When estimating the amount the sugar trust probably swindled the Government out of he places his estimate at \$125,000,000 in one part of his speech. One of the attorneys working on the cases informed me that the Treasury had figured back to 1894, to the first traces of the frauds, and the \$2,000,000 settlement covered substantially all the losses to the Government because of the manipulation of the scales and weights. He was sure his statement was correct, for as to the amounts of the frauds accurate records had been secured. The Treasury Department seems to be satisfied, and Mr. Loeb, collector of the port of New York, seems to be satisfied, that the full amount has been recovered in the \$2,000,000 settlement. These men have given the matter their personal attention, and therefore I am inclined to think their judgment can be relied upon, even if their figures are widely divergent from those of the gentleman from Illinois, as they appear near the bottom of page 4699 of the RECORD of April 14, 1910.

Again, the gentleman, on page 4695, fixes the date of the criminal operations of the sugar trust as within the last fourteen years, while, as a matter of fact, the trust settled with the officers of the Treasury Department for frauds as far back as 1894, this showing that the trust was engaged in illegitimate practices all through the second administration of President Cleveland, and through a period when Democratic officials had full control of the business of the Government. Most of the weighers and checkers indicted by the grand jury were Democratic appointees, some of them being appointed during Cleveland's first administration and holding through Harrison's and Cleveland's second administration, and then placed under civil service; and from that time they continued in the government service to the fraud exposure. The frauds were carried on through both the Cleveland and Harrison administrations, under the clerical collectors and surveyors of the port of New York.

Simon Mescall, who has just been convicted for defrauding the Government while acting as assistant United States weigher, was appointed during Cleveland's second administration, October 28, 1895.

Joseph Quinn, whose trial is now going on for similar offenses, was appointed assistant United States weigher under President Cleveland's second administration, October 19, 1894. Charles W. Bligh, who is also under indictment awaiting trial, whose trial has been delayed on account of illness, was also appointed under Cleveland, April 1, 1886, in the first administration.

Charles Drew, one of the five head district weighers, who has been dropped from the service for complicity in these frauds and whose case is under investigation by the grand jury, served throughout both of Cleveland's administrations.

Charles Wardell, another one of the five head district weighers, and who has also been dropped from the service and whose case is also under grand-jury investigation, was appointed to that position under Cleveland's second administration (May 10, 1894).

George Beddell, chief clerk of the weighing division, who has been dropped from the service for complicity in these frauds and whose case is under investigation by the grand jury, also served all through Cleveland's second administration.

James P. Highland, who was foreman weigher and who was dropped from the service for complicity in these frauds, served all through President Cleveland's administration.

Perley Chase, assistant weigher, also implicated in the sugar-weighing frauds, served all through President Cleveland's administration.

Fred B. Sawyer, also an assistant weigher, implicated in these frauds, was appointed under Cleveland's second administration (November, 1895).

Henry C. Taylor, another assistant weigher involved in these frauds, served through Cleveland's second administration.

I insert this record of the appointment and time of service of the men under indictment for the sugar frauds to show that the sugar frauds were not confined to the last fourteen years, which would confine them to the last three Republican administrations; but, on the contrary, they had been going on through Democratic and Republican administrations alike, and the employees implicated were Democrats and Republicans alike.

The sugar trust played no favorites, therefore I do not see how the Democratic party can make medicine for the coming campaign, especially in view of the fact that the exposures were made and prosecutions were commenced under the administration of President Roosevelt and continued most vigorously up until the present hour under President Taft.

But the gentleman from Illinois wants a congressional investigation. Mr. Taft has pointed out in a letter, which I will insert, with leave of the House, that such an investigation would be unwise at this time and might result in immunity to some of the persons charged with criminal conduct. The gentleman from Illinois says, under section 859, Revised Statutes, immunity would not be given. This is his opinion. I have never heard the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois quoted extensively as final authority on the question of immunity.

President Taft has his doubts, as shown by his letter, and President Taft is a pretty good lawyer.

I think we must concede that the President knows what is best in regard to the advisability of having an investigating committee of Congress at this time to go into the sugar frauds. Of course, the loose manner in which hearsay evidence, opinion, and suspicion are admitted as evidence in such investigations might furnish some campaign material if adroitly used and exploited by the gentleman from Illinois.

Again, I ask the purpose of the gentleman from Illinois in demanding a congressional investigation and in such unfair terms and intemperate language supporting that resolution? He may use or abuse as he will the privileges of debate accorded him by the Constitution of the United States as a Member of the House of Representatives, and his own sense of justice and fairness and magnanimity must be his only check against extravagant language and unfair suggestion.

The President can not retaliate. His high position alone must cause him to look with disdain upon the feeble efforts of the gentleman from Illinois to discredit him. If this were the first time the gentleman had attacked the administration of President Taft directly and his personal integrity by innuendo and suggestion, under the guise of a resolution for a congressional investigation into some kind of a mare's nest, and in support thereof delivered himself on the floor of the House in wild denunciation, it might go unchallenged; but on other occasions he has seen fit to attempt to drag in and implicate in some unwholy action members of the President's family. I notice that his attempt to involve Mr. Charles P. Taft in a scandal because of alleged irregularities in connection with the purchase of the Panama Canal franchise and also in other alleged transactions connected therewith resulted in utter failure; and his boast, made February 22, 1909 (see bottom p. 2939 of Record, vol. Feb. 15 to Mar. 4, 1909), to bring Mr. Cromwell and others to account before the country, is still in abeyance, while a breathless nation hangs in fearful suspense.

Would not it be just as well for the gentleman to clear up the situation created by his resolution of February 22, 1909, before he involved Congress in another such an experience? Would it not be well to make good the first attempt to besmirch a member of the President's family for political purposes before commencing another attack against another member for political purposes?

The American people are patient and long-suffering, but once in a while they require boasters to make good, else they are inclined to relegate those who fail to back their assertions with proof to the Doctor Cook corner of oblivion.

No. 1.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,
New York, June 24, 1909.

Hon. GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM,
The Attorney-General, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Since my talk with you Sunday night I have been constantly at work on the investigation in the sugar matter. The evidence has been fully presented to the grand jury, and the grand jury on Tuesday voted an indictment against the American Sugar Refining Company, Washington B. Thomas, Arthur Donner, Charles H. Senff, John Mayer, George H. Frazier, John E. Parsons, Thomas B. Harned, and Gustav E. Kissel. All of the individual defendants above named, with the exception of Harned and Kissel, are, or were, directors of the American Sugar Refining Company. Harned was president of the Champion Construction Company, which was the

holder of the majority of the capital stock of the Pennsylvania Sugar Refining Company, and Kissel was the man who represented the sugar company in the transactions.

I have very carefully studied the law and the facts, and, in my opinion, the case is one which comes within the description of a combination or conspiracy in restraint of interstate commerce and an attempt to monopolize such trade and commerce, and also foreign trade. The conspiracy was originally formed in the month of December, 1903, but there have been various acts in furtherance of it down to 1907. The offense itself is in the nature of a continuing one, and, it seems to me, outside of the overt acts, the courts should be called upon to pass upon the question of whether or not, where interstate commerce is being restrained, even though the original conception of restraining it is more than three years old, such offense can be punishable.

I have had visits from Mr. McIlvaine, representing Mr. Parsons; Mr. Milburn and Mr. Bowers, representing Mr. Thomas; and Mr. Guthrie, representing Mr. Kissel. Of course, McIlvaine represents not only Mr. Parsons, but the American Sugar Refining Company and all of its directors. They have been afforded full opportunity to present all of the facts from their viewpoint and the law. I am satisfied, from the facts, that I should not assume the responsibility of deciding that no offense has been committed, and also from these facts and the law that I should not assume the responsibility of determining whether or not the statute of limitations has run. Bearing upon the question of the statute of limitations, I beg to refer you to the case of *Ware v. United States* (154 Fed. Rep., 577-585, C. C. A.).

The grand jury did not hesitate to find the indictment. This, of course, may partly be attributable to the state of the public mind. Messrs. Milburn and Bowers have appealed to me to permit them to submit briefs, which I have consented to, and they are to give them to me Monday morning. The indictments have been drawn, and I do not believe that they will be able to present any argument that will persuade me to assume the responsibility of saying that no indictment should be found, and unless some very powerful proposition of law, which I have not yet discovered, is suggested by them, the indictment will, in all probability, be filed by the grand jury Monday afternoon.

You have, no doubt, read the voluminous statements about what is to be done which have appeared in the newspapers. As I stated to you Sunday night, I am not responsible for these things, and have remained absolutely mum upon the subject. The civil case was tried here, as you know, but a few days ago, and the papers then had very full reports of the testimony in that case, and the reporters have, by hanging around the court-house, been able to observe the different witnesses called before the grand jury, and in that way write up from their previous knowledge statements purporting to be what had been testified to before the grand jury, and have also played upon their imaginations in stating what would happen.

If you have any further instructions to give to me upon the subject, I will be glad to receive them before Monday.

Sincerely, yours,

HENRY A. WISE,
United States Attorney.

No. 2.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
June 25, 1909.

HENRY A. WISE, Esq.,

United States Attorney, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. WISE: I have yours of 24th instant with reference to the sugar matter. I do not think I can add anything to the instructions already given you in this matter. I feel great personal regret that men of the prominence of these gentlemen should be indicted; but the facts under the law, as laid down by the circuit court of appeals, seem to justify no other course. I entirely approve of your giving counsel for the defendants until Monday to submit a brief, because it shows that the Government is proceeding with deliberation and is willing to give a patient and careful hearing to those involved. Of course I understand about the newspaper statements. The reporters are bound to get the drift of what is going on from the general atmosphere surrounding the court-house.

Faithfully, yours,

Attorney-General.

No. 3.

WASHINGTON, Sunday, June 27, 1909.

MY DEAR WISE: Senator Root has sent me the proof of a petition signed by Bowers, Milburn & Guthrie in support of their contention that the statute of limitations has run in favor of Messrs. Parsons, Kissel, and Harned. If the only overt acts done to carry out the objects of the unlawful conspiracy were those referred to in the brief, I should think they were insufficient to save the bar of the statute.

A strong effort will be made to-morrow to persuade the President to interfere in some way to prevent the indictments; but, aside from that, no indictments should be returned against anyone if there is no reasonable ground to believe they can be sustained—if, for instance, the offenses charged are clearly barred by the statute. I need hardly say this to you.

What I want to impress upon you is that if you have any reasonable doubt in the matter, you either have the grand jury ask the court for instructions, or if that is not feasible, that you advise the department of the specific charges on which you rely to save the statute before actually having the indictments brought in. You may telephone either to me or to Mr. Ellis, if I should be out of the department when you call, on this point.

Faithfully, yours,

GEO. W. WICKERSHAM.

P. S.—As I am writing from my house and have no copy of this, will you kindly have your typewriter make and send me a copy?

No. 4.

STATUS OF THE PROSECUTIONS AT THE TIME WHEN PRESIDENT TAFT AND ATTORNEY-GENERAL WICKERSHAM CAME INTO OFFICE.

The criminal prosecutions had been, up to the time of the inauguration of President Taft, in charge of the United States attorney for the eastern district of New York. Several indictments against employees had been found. One of these had been tried in March, 1908, and had resulted in the acquittal of the defendant. The other indictments had remained throughout the year without being pressed.

The Government's civil claim for penalty against the company was in charge of Henry L. Stimson, United States attorney

for the southern district of New York. This was properly considered the fundamental case, which should establish the fact of the frauds, and upon which the Government should lay a foundation for the restitution of duties and the criminal punishment of the individual guilty persons. On this case Mr. Stimson and his assistant, Mr. Denison, had spent substantially six months of very hard work, having during that period a large number of men at work under them, including over 20 expert accountants from the customs-house, who were employed throughout that time in the preparation of the figures which should demonstrate the fact of the underweighing and the extent of the Government's loss. This involved the examination by these accountants of the papers and books as to every entry of the company back to 1898 and, with some study, back to 1894. The suit was brought to trial in February, 1909, and, on the day of the inauguration, was being summed up.

On the following day the jury rendered a verdict in favor of the Government for the whole amount of the claim, over \$134,000, being a fine or penalty on the corporation for the commission of the frauds. This case, which is particularly known as "The Case of the Seventeen Holes," finally established beyond question the fact of the frauds, which theretofore had been denied by the company and had been considered a matter of doubt. The company announced its intention to appeal from the judgment entered upon this verdict.

The Government's claim for loss of duties was also in the hands of the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, but had been held, awaiting the outcome of the test case above referred to. Suits were pending to recover \$2,000,000, the amount of this claim, and the company announced its purpose to contest these suits along with its appeal from the penalty case.

At the time when Attorney-General Wickersham became responsible for this litigation there was, therefore, a judgment for the United States for the sum of \$134,000, from which an appeal was to be taken, a contested claim for \$2,000,000 duties, and various indictments of employees, which had lain dormant for a year, and one indictment, in which an acquittal of the defendant had been obtained.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL WICKERSHAM'S PROVISION FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF THE PROSECUTION.

On April 1, 1909, Mr. Stimson, United States attorney for the southern district of New York, and Mr. Denison, assistant United States attorney, resigned their positions, having remained in the government service longer than they had intended, to complete the trial of the penalty case.

In view of their complete knowledge of the case and their successful conduct of the penalty action, Attorney-General Wickersham decided to retain them as special assistants to him and to put in their charge the entire subject, including not only the civil suits of which they had had charge, but also the criminal prosecutions, which theretofore had been in the eastern district of New York.

At their request the Attorney-General appointed as special assistants to aid them Messrs. Felix Frankfurter, Francis W. Bird, and Thomas D. Thacher—all of whom had had special experience in similar prosecutions—and also Messrs. W. C. Runyon, F. H. Mills, De Lancey K. Jay, and George Roberts.

Attorney-General Wickersham also provided them with all of the assistance in the nature of detective work and accountants and clerical work which they desired, and the Secretary of the Treasury, at the suggestion of the Attorney-General, provided them also with a large number of expert custom-house accountants.

In order also that the field might be extended as far as the facts would warrant and that the situation elsewhere than at New York may be examined in the light of the experience there, on February 1, 1910, President Taft appointed Mr. Denison an Assistant Attorney-General.

RESULTS OF THE WORK OF THIS ADMINISTRATION IN THE CIVIL CASES.

As is well known, the Government's counsel compelled the sugar trust to abandon its intention to appeal from the judgment for penalties and also to abandon its contest for the liability for duties. This was done by the threat to sue for additional fines and forfeitures in case the judgment for fines already obtained was not paid up in full and the Government's entire loss of duties restored.

As a result of these threats, the company did pay the judgments in full, and, in addition, the sum of \$2,000,000, which was the Government's entire loss of duties, as computed by the custom-house accountants, running back to the beginning of the tariff of 1894.

In addition to this the Government's counsel have compelled similar restitution from the firm of Arbuckle Brothers, amount-

ing to substantially \$700,000, and from the National Sugar Refining Company, amounting to over \$600,000.

Thus a total collection of substantially three and one-half million dollars has been forced within a year.

CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS.

Immediately after Attorney-General Wickersham placed the criminal prosecutions in their hands Messrs. Stimson and Denison proceeded to lay the case, as thus far developed, before the grand jury, and procured indictments against the employees of the company who, up to that time, had been clearly implicated.

They adopted the policy which, in such a case, is absolutely necessary in the conditions, of beginning their prosecution at the bottom, where the facts began, and then working on up, fixing the responsibility step by step as the facts developed.

They also adopted the further policy of not indicting any man against whom there was not a substantial assurance of an actual conviction by a petit jury.

The first group of men whom they indicted were six in number, being four of the employees who actually applied the fraudulent springs to the scales, the dock superintendent under whose charge they were, and the cashier of the refinery, who was next in rank above him. This group was brought to trial in November, 1909, being the first opportunity which the sittings of the court permitted. The trial occupied a month and resulted in the conviction of all of the men excepting the cashier, as to whom the jury disagreed. The Government's counsel opposed the granting of bail to the five men found guilty and they are now actually in prison serving sentences.

Immediately on the termination of this case, and with the additional information which it developed, and which had been developed in the grand jury in the interval, an indictment of a second group of the employees of the company was obtained. This group included the two remaining weighers who applied the springs to the scales, the assistant superintendent of docks, the cashier of the refinery—the man as to whom the jury had disagreed in the trial just referred to—the general superintendent of the refinery, and the secretary and treasurer of the Wall street office of the company.

This group of defendants is to be tried on the 10th of May.

"THE MAN HIGHER UP."

During the time of the frauds the chief executive officer of the company was the president, H. O. Havemeyer, who died two weeks after the discovery of the frauds. The executive officer at the Wall street office next to the president in activity and closest to him in confidence was the secretary and treasurer, Charles R. Heike. His position was of great importance in the Wall street office of the company, and his salary was \$25,000. As stated above, he has been put under indictment and his trial is set for the 10th of May.

The general superintendent of the refinery, Ernest Gerbracht, who also is to be tried on the 10th of May, was the head of the Havemeyer & Elder plant in Brooklyn, one of the chief branches of the company, and as such head he had to an unusual degree an autonomous power. His salary was \$25,000.

The man directly in charge of the details of the fraud, and undoubtedly the brains of the details of the enterprise, was Oliver Spitzer, the dock superintendent, who, as stated, has been convicted and is serving his sentence.

James F. Bendernagel was the superintendent of the Havemeyer & Elder refinery.

Heike, Gerbracht, Bendernagel, and three "checkers," Walker, Voelker, and Halligan, were indicted jointly for conspiracy to defraud the Government by underweighing sugars imported by the American Sugar Refining Company. Their trial before Judge Martin and a jury in the southern district of New York was commenced on May 16, 1910. Oliver Spitzer, the convicted superintendent of docks, appeared as a witness for the Government and testified fully, giving a history and description of the frauds from their inception. After he had finished the three checkers plead guilty. The trial is still pending as to the other defendants.

It will thus be seen that of those Wall street executive officers who are still alive, the one most active in the administration of the company has been put under indictment and is on trial, as is also the executive head of the plant in which the frauds occurred.

THE QUESTION OF A CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION AS COMPARED WITH A GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION.

Attorney-General Wickersham and the counsel who have been assisting him in these matters have been considerably hampered in their investigation by the difficulty of getting time of the grand jury.

At the suggestion of counsel and of the district attorney in New York, the Attorney-General asked Congress at the begin-

ning of its session to authorize the impaneling of an extra grand jury. The bill for this purpose, however, did not become law until March 26. Immediately a grand jury was impaneled in New York, and its sessions are being given entirely to the subject of these frauds.

The suggestion that there should be a congressional investigation was advised against by President Taft and Attorney-General Wickersham as being premature and antagonistic to the idea of criminal prosecutions. You can not practically have both a grand-jury investigation and a congressional investigation of the same subject at the same time. They are mutually inconsistent.

Especially is this inconsistency apparent in view of the provisions of section 859 of the Revised Statutes.

THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

Mr. RAINY claims that the statute of limitations was practically expiring on these prosecutions.

In fact, the statute will not expire until November 20, 1912, the statute in this line of cases being five years, and the last offense having occurred on November 20, 1907.

No. 5.

FRAUDS UPON THE REVENUE.

[From the Annual Report of the Attorney-General.]

An investigation was undertaken during the year 1907 into certain alleged frauds upon the Government in the underweighing of sugars imported into the United States by the American Sugar Refining Company and its predecessor, Messrs. Havemeyer and Elder. This investigation resulted, among other things, in a suit by the United States against the American Sugar Refining Company, and the recovery of a judgment against it in the district court for the southern district of New York in the sum of \$134,411.03, based upon proof of systematic frauds practiced in the weighing of the sugars on the docks of the Havemeyer & Elder refineries in Brooklyn, N. Y., between the years 1901 and 1907.

Mr. Henry L. Stimson, the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, tendered his resignation, to take effect on April 1, 1909, as he was desirous of reentering upon private practice, but I retained him as special counsel for the Government to continue the prosecution of the American Sugar Refining Company, and also to conduct a thorough investigation into the subject of frauds practiced upon the Government by that company and other importers of sugar into the port of New York.

The evidence in the suit above referred to revealed a long-continued system of redefrauding the Government of unparalleled depravity. Following the judgment above mentioned, the defendant opened negotiations, which resulted, in the latter part of April, 1909, in the making of a compromise whereby the company paid to the Government the amount of the above-mentioned judgment of \$134,411.03 and in addition the sum of \$2,000,000 on account of duties fraudulently withheld by it from the Government on account of short weighing of sugar imported by the American Sugar Refining Company, of New York, and the American Sugar Refining Company at the Havemeyer & Elder refineries in Brooklyn, or at its Jersey City refinery.

This compromise was approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and by this department, and was accepted in full settlement of all civil liabilities of the American Sugar Refining Company and the American Sugar Refining Company of New York for any penalties affecting the weighing of any sugar imported at either the Jersey City refinery or the Havemeyer & Elder refinery in Brooklyn up to April 28, 1909, without, however, waiving, but, on the contrary, expressly reserving to the Government the right to prosecute criminally all individuals who might be shown to have been responsible for the frauds, wherever occurring, even if such individuals were officers of the company. This settlement was recommended by Mr. Stimson as a highly satisfactory conclusion of the civil litigation, and, after full consideration of the matter with him and with the Secretary of the Treasury, it was accepted as such. I believe it is the largest individual recovery ever secured by the Government on a claim of that nature.

Since the payment of that sum the investigation into the criminal liability of participants in the frauds has been vigorously pushed. It has resulted thus far in the indictment of a number of individuals for various crimes committed in connection with frauds, and the investigation is still pending. It is but simple justice to Mr. Henry L. Stimson that I take this opportunity of commending his services to the Government in this matter, which have been distinguished by extraordinary intelligence, persistence, learning, and address, and which have resulted in the collection of so large an amount and in the bringing to justice of many of the participants in these frauds. The evidence has disclosed a network of corruption, not confined to the American Sugar Refining Company, extending over a period of years, affecting both importers and officers of the Government, and it is as yet premature to state the precise extent of the conspiracy or the amount of the revenues of which the Government has been defrauded. While it is feared that the statute of limitations may have run in favor of many of the malefactors who are responsible for these frauds, yet no effort will be spared to ascertain the precise amount of which the Government has been defrauded, to recover all moneys due, and to punish all those who may be found to have participated in any respect in the frauds, whether as officers or agents of the importers or as officials of the Government. I earnestly request a special appropriation of \$50,000 to enable this work to be effectively prosecuted. (Report of the Attorney-General, 1909, pp. 11 to 13.)

No. 6.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—FRAUDS IN THE COLLECTION OF CUSTOMS.

I regret to refer to the fact of the discovery of extensive frauds in the collection of the customs revenue at New York City, in which a number of the subordinate employees in the weighing and other departments were directly concerned, and in which the beneficiaries were the American Sugar Refining Company and others. The frauds consisted in the payment of duty on underweights of sugar. The Government has recovered from the American Sugar Refining Company all that it is shown to have been defrauded of. The sum was received

in full of the amount due, which might have been recovered by civil suit against the beneficiary of the fraud, but there was an express reservation in the contract of settlement by which the settlement should not interfere with or prevent the criminal prosecution of every one who was found to be subject to the same.

Criminal prosecutions are now proceeding against a number of the government officers. The Treasury Department and the Department of Justice are exerting every effort to discover all the wrongdoers, including the officers and employees of the companies who may have been privy to the fraud. It would seem to me that an investigation of the frauds by Congress at present, pending the probing by the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice, as proposed, might by giving immunity and otherwise prove an embarrassment in securing conviction of the guilty parties. (President's message to Congress, Dec. 7, 1909, pp. 21-22.)

No. 7.

No testimony given by a witness before either House, or before any committee of either House of Congress, shall be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding against him in any court, except in a prosecution for perjury committed in giving such testimony. But an official paper or record produced by him is not within the said privilege. (U. S. Rev. Stat., sec. 859.)

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the Republican party has been the ardent and consistent champion of the policy of protecting American industries and American labor, by wisely discriminating in customs exactions, ever since the civil war. All the civilized nations of the world, except the United Kingdom, China, and Abyssinia, have discovered by experience that a rational policy of protection conduces most to commercial and industrial development. The last Republican national convention committed that party to the proposition of revising the then existing tariff along protection lines, and fixed as the true measure of protection the difference in the cost of production of competitive commodities between this country and foreign countries plus a reasonable profit to American producers. The philosophy of that declaration was, and is, that American industries should be adequately protected against cheap foreign competition on the one hand, and the American consumer should be protected against unjust and extortionate prices on the other hand.

In view of the marked tendency toward combination and monopoly upon the part of great producing corporations, it was deemed wise and just to fix the quantum of protection just high enough to protect law-abiding industries, and not so high as to shelter monopoly while it fattens on the substance of the people. The standard fixed is ideal and impossible of exact attainment, because of the lack of stability in industrial conditions and the fluctuations in the cost of production in the various nations, but it is the ideal toward which all tariff revisions should be directed. Practical certainty in governmental affairs is all that can be achieved, and it will not be difficult to adjust the tariff schedules in this country in substantial conformity with the platform standard. The producers must be satisfied with that standard and the consumers are entitled to it as a matter of right and justice.

The difficulty in the past has been a want of trustworthy information respecting the cost of production here and abroad. The Ways and Means Committee in the preparation of the Payne bill devoted more time and energy in securing information to enable Congress to make an intelligent revision of the tariff than was ever done before in the country's history.

Compilations of customs statistics for a period covering fourteen years were made, and they afforded much assistance. Abstracts of decisions of courts construing customs law were provided, and over 10,000 pages of evidence, statements, and briefs were submitted, and yet there was a sad lack of reliable expert evidence respecting the actual cost of producing commodities either here or abroad. Much of the so-called evidence was made up of assertions and unsupported opinions. No one can read the hearings before that committee without being impressed with the unreliable character of much of the evidence. But few of the witnesses were able to give an intelligent statement of the cost of their own products, let alone of products of foreign make. Much of the evidence was clearly random assertions colored by the interest of the witnesses. This was not true of all the statements. There were a number of witnesses who gave in detail the cost of their products. This was especially true of the manufactures of steel and iron, but the evidence of cost in foreign countries consisted largely of price lists, tables of wages, and general assertions.

The compilation of customs statistics was a great aid in reaching certain results. For instance, when the duty seemed high and there were practically no importations, it was easy to reach the conclusion that the duty ought to be reduced, but there was nothing to indicate how great the reduction should be. It had to be determined largely by guesswork, and in the absence of trustworthy information it was deemed wise to give our own industries the benefit of the doubt rather than jeopardize their safety by cutting the duties too much. The same

difficulty was found when the duty was low and the importations were disproportionately large. How much of an increase should be made? It could only be determined by a guess, resolving doubts in favor of the American producer.

A tariff made after that fashion can never be satisfactory or just to the producer or the consumer. It is not a difficult matter for experts in the various lines of manufactures to ascertain the cost of production in their respective lines with reasonable certainty. There can be no just and businesslike arrangement of the tariff until expert information relating to the cost of production here and abroad of all competitive products shall have been obtained.

It is not a matter of vital importance how that information is gotten, whether through an administrative bureau, through a tariff commission, or through the board of experts appointed by the President under the Payne law, as long as it is comprehensive and reliable.

It is not difficult to understand why the Democratic Members of the House oppose the proposition of collecting reliable expert information upon this subject, for they favor a tariff-for-revenue-only policy, and that means a tariff that makes no kind of discrimination with the view of promoting industrial development. It means a blind imposition of duties on a revenue basis, a policy that no intelligent people on the face of the earth has ever seriously considered. But where discrimination to promote industrial growth is the policy of the nation, that discrimination can only be justly and intelligently made upon accurate and comprehensive knowledge of industrial conditions and cost of production in the competing countries.

This country is under great obligations to President Taft for his determination to use the authority conferred upon him by the Payne law under the maximum and minimum section to make a thorough and exhaustive investigation by competent persons of all questions bearing upon the cost of production in this and foreign countries, and Congress should not hesitate to make the appropriation he requests for that purpose.

The report of that board will be invaluable to the country. It may require several years to complete the investigation, but it should be exhaustive and accurate, though it does take time and money. Let there be an end of random and guess-work tariffs.

The report of the board will only be advisory, for the Constitution imposes the duty of levying customs duties upon Congress, but it will enable Congress in the future to perform that work in an intelligent and businesslike manner.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the gentleman's platform has indorsed the Aldrich-Payne bill, and that his state platform has repudiated the Aldrich-Payne bill. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman whether this board is to be used for the purpose of ratifying the Aldrich-Payne bill, or whether it is to be used for rejecting the Aldrich-Payne bill, and ratifying his state platform.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman declines to answer the question, because it has no kind of relevancy to the question he is discussing.

Of course Congress will not be obliged to give any consideration to such a report at all, but the report will be given to the public and the influence of an intelligent public opinion will not likely be ignored by Congress. The investigation will in no manner invade the province or impair the dignity of Congress. It will enable Congress to do its work more intelligently and justly, and thereby incidentally increase the respect the people have for legislation. How many Members of this body have ever given the several thousand items in the tariff careful and critical study? How many know the difference in cost of production of competitive commodities on the dutiable list between this and foreign countries?

But we are warned that a tariff board will cause constant agitation and industrial embarrassment. Will it? Let us not deceive ourselves. There will be agitation by the people of this country until they are assured that the tariff is established upon a business basis. There will be agitation until the people are convinced that the tariff has been established upon the basis fixed by the national Republican platform of 1908. The people are not only willing but they insist that duties shall afford adequate protection to producers and wage-earners; but they likewise insist that they shall not be any higher than is reasonably necessary for that purpose.

A tariff board will allay agitation and promote industrial repose and stability. When the tariff is once established upon a scientific basis there will be confidence and security.

Manufacturers will likewise feel no alarm over tariff revision when they are assured that ample protection will be afforded them. Under the old policy they realized that Congress had to work under the handicap of imperfect information, and in fixing duties by the rule of "guess" they might make mistakes and bring ruin to a whole line of industries. With reliable information bearing upon the vital facts there will be no danger of disastrous mistakes, and the manufacturers would rest in a sense of safety. One of the strongest arguments in favor of the tariff board is that it will allay agitation and industrial disturbance consequent thereon. Germany, France, and many other countries have tariff bureaus, boards, or commissions, and there seem to be no industrial disturbances resulting therefrom. On the other hand, their tariffs are established upon business principles, and beget confidence and security.

The only fear the industries of this country need entertain is the Democratic party, with its fatuous advocacy of its grotesque tariff-for-revenue-only policy. [Applause on the Republican side.] Many of our well-meaning citizens declare that the tariff is a business question, and it ought to be divorced from politics. It is, in a sense, a business question, but it will not be separated from politics for generations to come. As long as the policy of protection is opposed by any considerable number of our people the tariff will remain in politics. The industrial policy of the country will be settled at the polls, but when it is so settled the quantum of protection will be determined upon scientific principles, if the protective policy be upheld by the people. I can well understand why some great industries that are so organized as to be able to artificialize the prices of their output and which may be protected by unnecessarily high duties oppose cost and industrial investigations. It is a matter of dividends with them; but no government can afford to shelter monopoly so that it may unjustly exact tribute from the people. All honor to our great President for giving this vital reform the impetus of his powerful support and influence. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of the provisions of the section under consideration, appropriating \$250,000 for information, and so forth, as now worded, wherein it leaves to the mere discretion of the President the giving of the information obtained to Congress, but I am disposed to be friendly to and to favor a reasonable appropriation that will aid in bringing beyond question to both the President and Congress all the facts necessary to the enactment of more equitable tariff schedules and to at least a partial revision of the present unjust tariff law; and that information may be valuable to a Democratic House in succeeding terms of Congress and to Republicans alike. For myself, I favor a reasonable appropriation for an unbiased and nonpartisan tariff board or commission that will bring, not leisurely, but speedily, to Congress and the American people, as well as to the President, all needed information to help Congress to enact a better tariff law or to correct schedules in the present law, to the end that justice may be done to all classes of the American people; but I am opposed to an appropriation to merely bolster up for partisan purposes the present high-tariff law.

The promises of the Republican party and its leaders to revise the tariff, and quickly, at a special session, were induced by the known disapproval by the American people of the harsh provisions of the Dingley tariff law. And the Republican party did not dare to longer delay paying heed to the angry protest against the high schedules of that law, denounced everywhere by all, except those responsible for its enactment, and agreed to be iniquitous, at least in many of its schedules, by its party apologists; and not being able to longer delay its repeal and remain in power, they promised its revision for political purposes, knowing that they dare not delay its revision. And not only were they forced to promise revision, and that speedily, but their newly chosen leader and nominee for President, Mr. Taft, deemed it prudent and proper, while asking for the suffrages of the American people, to reiterate the promise of his party and to solemnly state that, if elected President, he would immediately call Congress into special session to enact a new tariff law, and that his party would not only revise the tariff, but would revise it downward. These promises made by the Republican party and its nominee for President gave to the party a new lease of power and enabled it to elect Mr. Taft as President. They proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of the land the doctrine that the tariff ought to be revised by its friends, and not its enemies, and the American people listened and trusted them again.

While these promises so made inured to the benefit of this great political organization, the failure to keep these promises brought quick retribution and rebuke of the party that failed

to keep faith with the American people. So embarrassing was the situation become to this great party, in control of the Government in all of its departments, so high has the tidal wave of disapproval risen in protest that this party, buttressed even though it is by such control and by the support of great corporate interests favored in the new tariff measure, known as the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, that even Republicans responsible for its enactment are now admitting that some of the schedules of this newly enacted law are too high and are unjust to the American consumer; and are at this early day admitting the necessity of new revisions in at least some of the schedules, and now come at this first session of Congress after the passage of this law, attacked in all sections of the country as unjust and iniquitous, and enacted in violation of solemn party pledges, and ask for the appropriation of a quarter of million of dollars:

To enable the President to secure information as to the effect of tariff rates or other restrictions, exactions, or any regulations imposed at any time by any foreign country on the importation into or sale in any such foreign country of any agricultural, manufactured, or other product of the United States, and to assist the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, as required by the tariff act approved August 5, 1909, including detailed information of the cost, and of each and every element thereof, of producing at the place of production and at the place of consumption of all articles specified in said tariff act, both in this country and in the country from which such articles are imported, so that the cost of all such articles produced abroad may be compared with the cost of like articles produced in this country, the President, in the employment of persons required and authorized for such service, may appoint a tariff board, and he may also employ, under his personal direction or under the direction and supervision of such tariff board, such competent experts in the business and methods of cost keeping and such clerical and other personal services, including rent of offices in the District of Columbia, traveling, and other incidental expenses as may be necessary in the work of said experts engaged in such investigations; and the compensation of all such persons, whether employed permanently or temporarily, shall be fixed by the President; and to enable the President to have such information classified, tabulated, and arranged for his use in recommending to Congress such changes or modifications in any existing tariff duties as he may deem necessary to prevent undue discrimination in favor of or against any of the products of the United States, \$250,000.

This appropriation is asked, I understand, by the President to gather information for his use, and as far as the terms provided in the section are concerned to be given or not given to Congress, as he may deem necessary. This is the same President, who, in substance, admitted at the time he approved the bill and it became a law that some of the schedules in the Payne-Aldrich law were wrong, excessive, and unjust to the American people, and who confessedly was not able to induce his party to enact a law satisfactory and just to the masses of the people, but who afterwards declared "the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill to be the best tariff bill that the Republican party ever passed." The American people relied upon his promise and assurance for the enactment of a tariff law, revised downward, that would mean a substantial reduction and that would bring relief to the consumers, who were paying unnecessary and unjust tribute to special and protected interests by reason of the inequitable and unjustly high schedules in the Dingley law; and yet, with all his commanding power and influence, he either was not able or was unwilling to sufficiently so exert and use that power and influence as to force upon his party the enactment of such a tariff law as would be known to be a compliance with the promises made to the American people when he sought their suffrages. What influence was so potent, so powerful, as to be able to force through Congress a measure admittedly unjust in many of its schedules and those most important for the comfort and necessities of the American people—a measure in violation of party pledges and prior election promises of its presidential candidate? Must it be admitted by this party, the most closely organized political party on earth, and the Executive of this great Republic, clothed with almost as much power as any potentate on earth, that there are forces working against the best interests of the Republic more potent than the powers of the American Congress and the President of the United States combined? Must it be admitted that there are certain protected special interests bearing such close relation to the party in power that it can not control its own actions in matters of legislation that affect the profits of these favored and protected interests, and that these forces are so powerful that they control the leaders of the Republican party, and that these leaders can even stay the hand or mellow the voice of the President himself and temper his utterances about matters of vital importance to these favored interests?

Is it any surprise that the public rebels and enters a protest against this condition brought about by powerful influences? Is it strange that the inquiry is made, Is there a power behind the throne so potent and so powerful that the majority party owes some duty to in the way of political obligation, in the matter of pre-election promises that the party must regard in the en-

acting of laws, affecting the weal and prosperity of the masses, upon whom the heavy hand of tribute is laid by unjust laws favorable to protected interests? Is it strange that loud utterances of discontent and protest are heard, emphasized by recent elections in widely different sections of the country, against party perfidy and broken public promises made in platform and political speeches—broken, it is believed, because the dominant party of the nation was indebted in some way to these special interests for whose benefit it legislates? Will the people be satisfied by a proposition to spend a quarter of a million of dollars to bring information merely to the President, to be used or not, as he sees fit, to correct the mistakes and iniquities of an obnoxious law?

Amend this proposed section to the end that all the facts be required to be given to Congress, the lawmaking body, so that there may be no concealment or withholding of any information necessary to pass remedial legislation, and so that Congress will get the benefit of the real facts necessary to correct these iniquitous schedules, and Democrats will join in the passage of a law providing for a reasonable appropriation, but not for mere party benefit. Too much secrecy, too much political legislation; give us more publicity and less political legislation, laws for the benefit of all classes and the people everywhere, without favoritism, and not for special interests, and contentment will come in the place of discontent, manifestations of approval instead of angry protest; less mere partisan politics written in the laws of the land, and less unrest and dissatisfaction will be in evidence.

That there is unrest and revolt against the arrogant conduct of those who have controlled the dominant party is now unquestioned. There is abundant evidence of an independent spirit in the country that will not longer brook or be satisfied with arbitrary conditions imposed by the majority of the dominant party. No fair man will find fault with that spirit of independence, whether it shows its disapproval of despotic conduct in one party or another. And I bid welcome to that independent spirit that manifests disapproval in the only effective way it can—by public protest followed by its vote in the halls of legislation and at the polls—when it appears that its party is controlled by some organized power or influence secretly or openly controlling the conduct of its party to its detriment and against the best interest of the masses everywhere.

The people to-day are growing in a measure restless and careless of mere party regularity. They are caring more for country and equitable laws promised by parties and party leaders than they are for mere party rivalry; and of this fact there are none better informed than the Members of this body who hold their seats here by favor of the electors in their several districts, and every utterance made by you upon the floor of this House, and every act by you done, is said and done, that you may gain or retain the favor of your constituents, and many of you fear the result of your conduct here, as you hunger for the approval of your constituents at home. But be not deceived, this spirit of independence is abroad in the land—mere party prejudice will not longer hold the voter at the polls, nor continue in office him who fails to serve his country first, as the best service he can render his party. There is less party prejudice among the masses to-day than ever in the past. In my judgment the day when special interests shall dominate party is nearing its close, and the public cares not so much which party shall control the Government as it does, that the party in power shall be free from the control of special interests. The party that throws off and breaks away from all alliance with special interests will meet the favor of the American people. And whatever grant of power may have been given to the party now in control of the Government by alliance with these protected interests, there is a large and influential, a powerful and ever-increasing element in the Republican party that will not longer stand for this alliance, that claims no allegiance to these special interests, and are fighting in the open to help rid the Republican party of that domination that means ultimate political death. This fight is on, and will continue till progressive Republicanism has won its battle for freedom from longer domination of special interests in their own party, or until they are driven out into open alliance with the Democratic party.

The country looks on with approval and applauds these so-called insurgents, while they struggle to unshackle their party. The representative of the administration, Attorney-General Wickersham, may go into the West and denounce them and seek to discredit them and say they are no longer worthy of the name of Republicans, but only the timid heed and hesitate and run to cover and respond to the lash of party politics. The boldest leader of the regulars, Speaker CANNON, may go into the great metropolis of the Nation and declare "that shooting

were too honorable a fate for certain Republican insurgents," and suggest that hanging should be their fate, yet the contest will continue in the East as well as the West until "Cannonism" shall cease in the land. The evidence of the strength of this protest is already recorded, not only in the recent elections, but it has borne fruit and made its record in this Hall of Representatives—the power to name the Committee on Rules has been taken from the Speaker, and the power of the insurgent force is not all spent. It is alive and active here in Congress as well as in the country—in the House and in the Senate—a courageous force for good legislation; and the fight, in which they have joined with the Democrats, will go on and on—here and elsewhere—until right and the people shall triumph and come into their own, and the day of the domination of special interests shall cease forever.

But the insurgents here have only won success when they have joined with the Democratic party to unhorse the Republican regulars; when they have stood for country rather than party regularity; when they have stood with the Democratic party and its principles for a reasonable tariff and reasonable railroad rates; for the rights of the individual and the masses everywhere as against special interests.

The public regards the progressive Republican who, under the name of insurgent, is abroad in the land; and his name will be memorable in political history as an active protest against the domination of his party by special interests unless he wears of the contest. But will he live only in history as a protest, or as an active force that helped to bring substantial reform? If he wears himself out in a futile attempt to reform the dominant element in his party, he will fail. If he joins with that party with which he thinks and feels on these great and living questions, he will have served his country and not have made his fight in vain. To which party does he properly belong?

Edmund Burke defined a party as a "body of men united for promoting, by their joint endeavors, the national interest upon some particular principle in which they all agreed." Why not, when working together in fact or trying to work together, join forces in a common cause and help to bring relief to the country? You are denounced as unworthy of the name of Republicans by those high in authority, and fit only for hanging by the high priest of Republicanism. You need not in retort use the harsh language of a prominent insurgent Republican Representative [Mr. FOWLER] from the State of New Jersey, who recently, in addressing his constituents in that State, said: "Will you lend yourselves to advance the cause and interests of NELSON W. ALDRICH and JOSEPH G. CANNON, two political pirates, two public enemies, whose cause and interests are the special interests, whose constant study is to do the people instead of doing something for the people?" These harsh words against the leaders of the Republican party brings no settlement of the controversy between you and them. You can not win against them, their alliances are too strong. The forces back of them are powerful, stronger than you. They can be overthrown alone by the Democratic party; that is, fighting the battle against what is termed "Cannonism and Aldrichism." There are but two great parties in this country—the Democratic party and the Republican party. Choose between them. The regulars dominate the Republican party and will continue to. You can not change it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield forty minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Foss].

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there has been an election in Massachusetts [applause]; otherwise I should not have been here to-day. I come as a Democrat [applause] to represent what has been known as the most representative and strongest Republican district in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, if not in all New England.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak to the section of the bill before the House which authorizes the appropriation of \$250,000 for the use and purpose of a tariff commission.

Now, I want to say in the first place that I have always been in favor of such a commission—that is, the right sort of one, and under the right conditions.

Many reciprocity and tariff reform leaders have urged for years the creation of such a commission, believing, as we all do, in the broadest and deepest kind of tariff investigation.

So far our requests in this direction have been persistently refused, and by the same people who are now so ready and willing to favor a commission.

Naturally it looks a little strange to some of us—after all this long delay and after the people have themselves discovered the worst evils of our tariff system, which such a commission could have exposed years ago—that it is now brought forward at this eleventh hour.

Clever editors of leading journals have stigmatized this proposition, since its introduction here, as a "sop to Cerberus" or a "tub to the whale." They evidently have in mind the panicky feeling that pervades the "stand-pat" section of this very Chamber, as well as of the other Chamber, and the Republican machine the country over. [Applause.]

There is among them a great "searching of hearts" as to what can be done to quench these burning issues of tariff and taxation reform, and how this great people's movement on these issues can be diverted.

We are amply justified, after our recent experiences of these "Greeks bearing gifts"—after our experience in the bogus revision of the Payne-Aldrich tariff—in being suspicious of further dilatory and fraudulent subterfuges.

For it can not be denied that the people, rightly or wrongly, have come to regard this whole "revision" scheme of the Republican party leaders, as planned in the last national campaign and as promulgated in their platform, and as finally butchered in the special tariff session of Congress, as an intentional and deliberate "bunco game" from start to finish. [Loud applause.]

It is the sense of this imposition that has aroused such resentment and disgust among the people, as has been shown in these recent congressional by-elections, and other manifestations we see on all sides.

Right in this connection too, some of us, veterans in the reciprocity movement can not help remembering how the same sort of a game has been played for the last ten or fifteen years with that great and statesmanlike principle and policy.

"STAND-PAT" TREACHERY TO RECIPROCITY.

We recall how the Republican party solemnly pledged itself to reciprocity as its consistent and dominant policy, especially in its national convention of 1896, when McKinley was nominated, in whose platform it was acclaimed as the "twin principle of protection." The exact words of that platform were: "Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand."

We recall how the Republican administration of that time, how McKinley and Hay and their associates tried hard and faithfully to redeem the pledges of the party, and to inaugurate reciprocity by means of many treaties with other countries. How even Nelson Dingley himself strove against powerful domestic interests to achieve a measure of reciprocity with Canada. How McKinley, almost with his dying breath, affirmed reciprocity as the ruling keynote of his prospective second term. And how the nefarious "stand-pat" influences and interests in the Republican party, by all sorts of underhand means, succeeded in defeating all these treaties, nullifying all this effort, and treacherously betraying and assassinating reciprocity "in its own house." [Applause.]

Many reasonable persons have regarded the course and conduct of the Republican oligarchy, the autocratic "stand-pat" element, on this great matter of reciprocity, as the worst political and economic crime of recent years. [Applause.] At any rate it was that sort of a fearful blunder which was "worse than a crime."

It is our belief that if this principle and policy had been developed as pledged by the party, as carried forward by McKinley and Hay, and as further pledged and affirmed by Roosevelt on his tragic accession to the Presidency, the troubles we have experienced in the last few years would have been better prevented; the people relieved, the industrial, transportation, and other trusts and monopolies better restrained, and general prosperity maintained, than by all the other policies and devices put together which have been resorted to.

But the "stand-pat" oligarchy sowed the wind and we are all reaping the whirlwind. Reciprocity was sacrificed to selfish and mercenary influences by the politicians, against the people's interests; prostituted by them to the purpose of hoodwinking the public, just as they have now recently prostituted "revision."

So I say we are justly suspicious of another like scheme. We do not want to see a "tariff commission" used as another dilatory subterfuge, to again sidetrack tariff reform, just as reciprocity and "revision" were used. [Applause.]

THE RIGHT TARIFF COMMISSION.

The true friends of the tariff commission idea do not want to see it fall short of its mission. We believe that this act should provide:

First. That the personnel of this commission should be absolutely nonpartisan, and made up of men of such character and standing that no one shall question its integrity, its independence, or its capacity for the work.

Second. That the commission should report directly to Congress. [Loud applause.] Since this commission is intended to furnish information as a basis for legislation, and since only

Congress can legislate, the functions of the commission must be necessarily such as are related to Congress rather than to the Executive.

In this connection I would ask why the administration seems to be so solicitous that this commission shall be put absolutely under the control of the Executive, seeing that it is primarily intended for legislative purposes. Is there an ulterior motive here?

If the commission is to be merely an executive instrument and report only to the President, how is Congress to receive the information, except as the President may elect to transmit it, and what is to prevent the executive department from withholding or suppressing or coloring such information, as has more than once been done heretofore? [Applause.]

It looks more like a political than an economic purpose. [Applause.] Is there not an evident fear that the control of this commission will too soon come into the hands of a Democratic and reform Congress? [Applause.]

But I repeat, that broadly speaking, I am in favor, as I said at the outset, of a commission rightly constituted, and am entirely willing that it should be endowed with all necessary powers.

However, let it be distinctly understood that we are utterly opposed to holding up an honest revision and reduction of the tariff until such time as any commission may report. [Applause.] I recognize that the people have lost confidence in the Republican party [loud applause on the Democratic side] and that they are no longer looking to it for an honest revision. [Renewed applause.] The Republican party has already proved faithless to its pledges to the people, and has forfeited the confidence of the country. [Renewed applause.] The people have turned to the Democratic party. [Applause.] The result of the recent congressional by-elections demonstrates this fact, and this fall it will be still further emphasized. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, the responsibility of an honest revision of the tariff is up to the Democratic party, with the aid of such insurgent and independent elements as will ally themselves with it.

The Democratic party must go to the country with a consistent and progressive policy. This is the only way in which it can succeed, and it is the only success that will mean anything to the country or to the party. [Applause.]

ANOTHER SPECIAL TARIFF SESSION.

The people demand that the revision and reduction of the tariff, which was promised them two years ago by the Republican party, be carried out by the Democratic party as soon as the new Congress can convene. [Applause.] I mean to say that the Democratic party ought to raise the issue that there shall be an extra session convened next spring to do the work which this Congress has failed to do. [Applause.]

In fact, the people are themselves making this issue to-day, and all we have to do is to accept it. The people have made the immediate reduction of the tariff the issue, and the Democratic party must pledge itself in a most distinct and specific way to carry out their will; in order that the mandate shall be a compelling one; that the victory shall be so complete that the Republican Executive will be forced to acquiesce in it and call Congress together.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption at that point?

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. You will excuse me. I can not be interrupted at that point. [Laughter on the Republican side; applause on the Democratic side.]

We appreciate that in proposing this logical and straightforward course we are running counter to certain so-called conservative influences in the Democratic as well as in the Republican party. These will avail nothing against the will of the people, or against the sheer necessities of our political and economic situation.

We well know that efforts are being and will be made to again indefinitely postpone these urgent reforms, on the ground that the business of the country will suffer because of this agitation; but I contend, on the contrary, that only by thus obeying the will of the people and settling these great issues—which never can be settled until they are settled right—can all the commercial and industrial interests of the country be benefited and strengthened. [Applause.]

BUSINESS DEMANDS REVISION.

What is the political and business situation to-day and how does the one affect the other? There is no denying the fact that there is, at the present time, great political unrest and discontent throughout the country. This is particularly true in the Republican party, as shown by the intense insurgent movement in it. [Applause.]

As must inevitably be the case, there is corresponding unrest and uncertainty in the business world. The inflation of prices and consequent reduction in large classes of exports, and other causes, all conspire to maintain this unrest.

Here are the ruling facts in both the political and business world which can not be denied or evaded. They are conditions and not theories which confront us to-day. The party now in power is being held by the people responsible for these conditions. The people look to the party which is coming into power for the remedy. I am no alarmist, nor do I wish to magnify our troubles, but they do exist and are threatening our prosperity and we must recognize them and seek the remedy. [Applause.]

I repeat that next March is none too soon to revise the tariff. Revision—which meant reduction—was so urgent and necessary two years ago that the Republican party had to make a campaign issue of it, and afterwards call a special session of Congress for the purpose. It failed to reduce the duties, hence there is necessity for immediate action.

Granted the special session of Congress for revision, reduction, and reciprocity, what specific and definite programme should we pledge ourselves to put through? Certainly the people have such a programme. They are demanding the repeal of these oppressive duties. They are demanding, for one particular and essential thing, free wool and cheaper clothing; and, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we can not do better than accept this principal demand of the people as our shibboleth in the coming contest.

FREE WOOL AND CHEAP CLOTHING.

During the agitation in England sixty years ago of the great "corn law" fiscal reform the popular rallying cry was, "Free grain and cheap bread." We will make it, "Free wool and cheap clothing." [Applause.] At that time numbers of the people in England were actually starving because of the protective tariff on grain for the benefit of the landlords. To-day millions of our people are deprived of comfort and health and even of life by the so-called protective tariff on wool and woolsens for the benefit of the sheep ranchers and woolen trusts. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

This wool and woolen tax maintained by the combination of the woolgrowers and manufacturers is not only the greatest infliction upon the people, but it is now acknowledged to be the keystone of the "stand-pat" system.

President Taft, in his famous Winona speech, which has had such a disastrous effect upon his administration, acknowledged in substance that when the question of the wool and woolen schedule came up in conference, the combination of woolgrowers and manufacturers was in a position to make such demands that nothing could be done but accept their terms; terms exacting not only the shylock "pound of flesh" but our blood as well. The President's exact words were:

The interests of the woolgrowers in the far West and the interests of the woolen manufacturers in the East and in other States, reflected through their Representatives in Congress, were sufficiently strong to defeat any attempt to change the woolen tariff, and had it been attempted it would have beaten the bill reported from either committee.

Note that even the President refers to the "Representatives in Congress" of the woolen manufacturers.

The administration and the party had to yield to the "hold-up" or see the whole legislation and session wrecked.

This seemed to be the only weak and lame palliation that President Taft could advance for what he admitted to be the iniquities of this schedule.

THE STAND-PAT KEYSTONE.

For years past "stand-pat" protection has claimed, under the powerful influence of the wool magnates, that these onerous taxes are the keystone of their whole system. In the Payne-Aldrich law, whose worst feature they have thus dictated, they again throw down the gauntlet to the country. It is up to the Democratic party to pick it up. [Applause.]

This wool and woolen tax is the most flagrant instance of the effect of the present policy in depriving the people of the necessities and comforts of life.

As an illustration, witness the declaration now unanimously made by the most important branch of the woolen industry in this country—I refer to the straight woolen manufacture, which includes blankets and underwear and the most popular lines of cheap and warm woolsens for clothing. This branch ought to have had the utmost consideration, but we now see its representatives protesting against the Payne-Aldrich law as the worst for their industry ever enacted.

They assert without apparent contradiction that it not only works to deprive us of these necessary woolen goods and clothing, but also tends to ruin the manufacturing industry itself and drive those engaged in it out of business and employment.

A great deal of valuable information has come from inside sources in this particular discussion; enough to convince thoughtful persons that the greatest branch of woolen manufacture would be far better off under free wool.

In regard to sugar, if this burdensome sugar tax were not so large a producer of revenue, I would advocate its removal or at least bringing it down to the Canadian or even the English basis.

At any rate, we ought to undertake to eliminate present obvious abuses and trust-fostering features of it, especially in view of the recent fearful scandals connected with its operation in this country. [Applause.]

It is said that the worst joker in this schedule is that by which the importation of high-grade sugar for direct consumption among the masses of the people is practically prevented. Certainly, if this is the case, it is our duty to rectify any such abuse.

MY OWN INDUSTRY.

The people also demand further large reductions in the iron and steel schedule. Now at this point it devolves upon me, as a manufacturer in the iron and steel industry, employing large numbers of skilled workmen and using large quantities of the finished products of the Steel trust, to state publicly that in my judgment, my industry and the people employed in it would not suffer under free-trade conditions. That is to say, the 45 per cent duty on machinery can be entirely removed without injury, provided these conditions apply to the whole iron and steel industry, from the coal and ore up. [Applause.]

I further would state that from my own experience, interest in and knowledge of other staple industries, this statement is equally true of them.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield to a single question?

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. I can not now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. In fact, I believe to-day that under free-trade conditions we can compete in the markets of the world in most, if not all, of these industries, and compete to better advantage than we do now.

I am constrained to make this statement, because the tariff reformer among the manufacturers has generally been regarded as desiring to remove the duty from the other fellow's product and still retain it upon his own [applause]; that he is in the habit of asking what he is not willing himself to grant; that when he asks for free raw materials, for instance, he is not willing to abate his own tariff protection. I am not that kind of a tariff reformer.

I am not alone, for if I recall aright, one of the largest manufacturers of boots and shoes in New England appeared before the Ways and Means Committee during the tariff hearings, and declared that he would welcome conditions of free trade in his own great industry.

I am reminded that I am not the first Representative in Congress, interested in a great American industry, who has made a similar statement to his colleagues.

I have been informed that the then United States Senator James Smith of New Jersey, at that time, if not now, the largest manufacturer of patent leather in the world, declared from his seat in the Senate, ten years ago, that so far as his industry was concerned, it absolutely did not need and did not want protection. [Applause.]

I instance these examples from the shoe and leather industry because, like agricultural implements and many other great interests, it is distinctly an American industry, in which with very moderate protection we have been able to retain our home markets and enter the markets of the world.

Recurring finally to the subject of iron and steel, did not Mr. Andrew Carnegie, if not the greatest authority, surely the most successful one in that trade, appear at these hearings, with the same story in regard to that immense industry which he had himself done so much to build up?

Did he not deny the necessity of further protection upon the bulk of its products, and did he not acknowledge that they were produced in this country cheaper than anywhere else in the world?

FREE FOOD PRODUCTS.

Now consider all the duties on food products which the people are also demanding shall be removed, the duties especially on grains, cattle, meats, fish, fruit, and vegetables. While these duties are unquestionably so manipulated as to place an enormous burden upon the consumer, there is very great doubt whether they are now or have ever been of any direct or indirect benefit to the producers—that is, the farmers of the country.

All these staple agricultural products have always been upon an export basis in regard to price at the farm, take them year by year. Some good authorities insist that this applies as well to such products as butter, cheese, eggs, and provisions generally.

In view of these assertions, what reasonable objection can there be from any source to the removal of duties on food products? They are certainly not producers of revenue to any great extent. Nor is it an adequate defense of a tariff law to say that it is a great producer of revenue. If revenue is the chief purpose of tariff legislation, we should get it honestly, and openly, and fairly, and without laying upon the people great and unequal burdens of taxation which oppress under the guise of protecting.

I have here outlined, as well as I can in the time at my command, what I believe ought to be our course in this great issue before the country of immediate tariff reform.

INCOME TAX ADVOCATED.

In my judgment, the people of this country will no longer stand for our present forms of taxation, which, based upon consumption, bear altogether too heavily upon the masses.

They would be bad enough if they were purely revenue taxes, by which the Government received what the people paid, instead of such, as President Taft declared at Seattle, as "take the money from the people not for government but for private interests." [Applause.]

We must have a system of taxation which removes these abuses and eliminates this graft.

The best and the only way out, I believe, is through the income tax. [Applause.]

It is the just and common impression that the wealth of the country is not bearing its fair share of the taxation which is so largely for its own protection and benefit. It is up to the wealthy classes to carefully consider these things at this time.

The necessity for this change, by which the income tax will relieve and replace the excessive tariff taxes, is so obvious that, it seems to me, we all ought to favor it.

MANUFACTURERS AND THE TARIFF.

Talk about protection, Mr. Chairman! The people are demanding protection to-day against the Payne-Aldrich tariff. [Applause.]

Its burdens are felt as keenly by employers as employed. The cost of raw materials, for instance, in our industrial establishments is so high that business is checked.

Our manufacturers recognize that the wages of labor have not advanced proportionately to the advance in the cost of living [applause], but they are not in a position to raise wages, for the reason that these tariff burdens weigh so heavily upon the industry itself.

I say that our manufacturers are getting their eyes open to the fact that this high tariff is no longer a protection, but that it has actually become a restriction upon industry. They are demanding that these burdens be removed.

For example, the manufacturers of New England, as I have already indicated, in asking for free raw materials and the necessities of life and industry, recognize that most of the present duties, even on their own products, are superfluous, and largely conducive to monopolistic graft.

Every intelligent manufacturer knows that successful industry is dependent upon two fundamental requisites:

First. That the industry must have its raw material on as favorable a basis as exists elsewhere in the world; and by raw material I mean not only what goes into the plant itself but the food and clothing and the necessities and comforts of life for every operative employed.

Second. The industry must have the widest possible market for its product.

I believe that the time has come when these raw materials, in their broadest sense, should be placed on the free list, and that this can be done without injury to any section of the country.

Conditions have so changed that these demands which are necessary to the comfort and prosperity of the people can be effected with injury to none and great benefit to all.

All our manufacturing interests are recognizing more and more every day the absolute necessity of foreign markets.

Our products are becoming specialized in so great a degree that the domestic consumption is becoming more and more insufficient. The best authorities say that in the boot and shoe industry, for instance, the domestic trade is supplied in eight months' operation out of the year. The same is the case, to my knowledge, in other industries.

If we are not to have in this country a commercial policy which commands for us not only full and free access to the markets of the world, but a full and free share in the development of these markets, then we should indeed be solicitous for our future; that stagnation and decay do not threaten us.

Again, because of the tremendous and increasing demands not only for raw materials but for the necessities of life, that our industrial armies may be fed and clothed, we must also have access to the world's markets. [Applause.]

"REVIVE RECIPROCITY" THE DEMAND.

Right here I want to reaffirm my belief in *reciprocity* as the right policy. That is, I believe not only in tariff reduction but in reciprocity; in fact, that they are identical. I believe in reciprocity as a principle, and think it is just as practicable and workable as the policy of free trade or protection.

Reciprocity is the policy of "recognition." It is the policy which recognizes the sisterhood of nations, their mutual interdependence in the material as well as the moral and political sense.

For instance, that other nations can furnish us with many things to better advantage than we can produce them ourselves, and vice versa, and on terms mutually profitable.

I am here to urge upon the Democratic party that it shall revive reciprocity as the keynote of our fiscal system; first, because it is the most salutary policy for the country; secondly, because, since the Republican party has abandoned it, it becomes our duty as well as opportunity to adopt it. [Applause.]

DEMOCRACY AND RECIPROCITY.

Again, it is an original principle of the Democratic party. Thomas Jefferson, the father of democracy, is also the father of reciprocity in this country. This is a fact not generally recognized. To quote from one of the first authorities on the subject, the late Hon. John A. Kasson:

During the first administration of Washington, in 1791, Congress desired to do something for the development of the commerce and navigation of the United States, but felt itself lacking the necessary information on the subject. The House of Representatives passed a resolution requesting the Secretary of State to report to Congress on the "nature and extent of the privileges and restrictions of the commercial intercourse of the United States with foreign nations, and the measures which he should think proper to be adopted, for the improvement of the commerce and navigation of the same."

Mr. Jefferson's report, submitted after two years of inquiry into the facts, presents the conditions of our infant commerce of that day. Small as it was, the foreign restrictions upon the trade and upon our vessels engaged in it were extremely various and vexatious, especially in all that related to commerce with the colonies of European powers.

After reciting them he asks the question, "In what way they may best be removed, modified, or counteracted?" He answers the question as follows:

"As to commerce, two methods occur: First, by friendly arrangements with the several nations with whom these restrictions exist; or second, by the separate act of our own legislature for counteracting their efforts. There can be no doubt but that, of these two, friendly arrangement is the most eligible! * * *

"Some nations, not yet ripe for free commerce, in all its extent, might still be willing to modify its restrictions and regulations for us in proportion to the advantages which an intercourse with us might offer. Particularly, they may concur with us in reciprocating the duties to be levied on each side, or in compensating any excess of duty by equivalent advantages of another nature."

Here was foreshadowed exactly the reciprocity of to-day. He proceeds as follows:

"But should any nation, contrary to our wishes, suppose it may better find its advantage by continuing its system of prohibitions, duties, and regulations it behooves us to protect our citizens, their commerce and navigation, by counter prohibitions, duties, and regulations also. Free commerce and navigation are not to be given in exchange for restrictions and vexations, nor are they likely to produce a relaxation of them."

He prefaces his recommendations with this expression: "The following principles, being founded in reciprocity, appear perfectly just, and to offer no cause of complaint to any nation."

He admits the inconvenience of a system of discriminating duties, but supports it as necessary to avoid greater evils, and comes to the following conclusions:

"Still it must be repeated that friendly arrangements are preferable with all who will come into them; and that we should carry into such arrangements all the liberality and spirit of accommodation which the nature of the case will admit. France has, of her own accord, proposed negotiations for improving, by a new treaty, on fair and equal principles, the commercial relations of the two countries."

Here is the absolute proof that Thomas Jefferson at that early date advocated reciprocity and recommended it as a ruling principle.

Broadly speaking, there have been in the past only two alternative commercial policies; on the one hand protection, on the other free trade. This is no longer true. A third commercial policy is before us to-day. I would urge reciprocity as a consistent and effective policy for the development of this nation.

The policy of reciprocity is a constructive one. It does not tear down, it builds up. It strengthens both our industrial and commercial systems. It gives us raw materials and the necessities of life, and the means to pay for them. It provides a wider market for both our products and our purchases.

One great benefit will be that it will afford us, as the richest and mightiest nation on the face of this earth, and consequently that ought to be the most generous and magnanimous one, the opportunity to modify greatly our past and present unfortunate attitude toward other countries, especially on this continent.

By reciprocity we mean fair trade; we mean hearty recognition of these nations which buy liberally of us, and thus become our commercial allies and make our prosperity their own.

Reciprocity naturally carries with itself a large measure of tariff revision. It would mean either large reduction or entire

removal of duties which would otherwise remain to burden the people and obstruct trade. It will provide our consumers and producers with constantly enlarging access to the markets of the world.

Reciprocity is being adopted by some of the leading nations, like France and Germany. Canada has adopted it as the keynote of her own commercial system and is putting it into effect by several different means, legislative and administrative; that is, not only through treaties, wherever she can make them, but by a system of schedules called, respectively, "General," "Intermediate," and "Preferential." There is also a punitive feature, called the "surtax." She applies this whole system with due regard to the interests of her customers abroad, especially within the Empire, by proffering to them favorable duties on many classes of goods in which these nations specialize.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

On this most momentous and practical question, that of Canadian reciprocity, which confronts us to-day in our commercial relations, I would urgently recommend as one good means of attaining that great end that we entirely remove the duties on the principal Canadian products and reduce the rest to the level of Canada's own tariff. [Loud applause.]

We should do this regardless of Canada's present action or attitude, because, first, under this reciprocity system of hers she would be bound to recognize and respond in good time; secondly, this action will permanently offset certain powerful manufacturing and other influences in Canada, which are constantly demanding the further obstruction of our commerce with her.

We can not consistently object to these Canadian influences, since they are simply the echo of our own "stand-pat" policy and since we are responsible as a nation for the present high-tariff tendencies and commercial hostilities of the world.

I say that reciprocity on our part will go far to change all this, not only with Canada, but with all nations.

I want to say another thing with reference to our relations with Canada. They ought to be of a neighborly spirit. They ought to be sentimentally right. There are other elements in these relations than the merely material ones. It has always seemed to me that our natural and spontaneous attitude toward Canada ought to be essentially that of an older brother toward a younger sister; that we ought not only to feel but to show the Dominion that we are solicitous for her welfare.

Some one has said:

We have grown and prospered to the marvel of the world; it is right that we do not intoxicate ourselves with the reflection of our growth or the egotism of power. Let us turn from ourselves to watch the upbuilding of a neighbor nation, to aid and encourage her, that she may profit in the results of our expansion, and that we may profit in the development of her resources. On this ground, I appeal to your selfish instincts, the most vigorous of our human characteristics. But there are other and more altruistic motives, which should appeal to you and which should cause us to desire closer relations with our neighbor, Canada.

You are the progenitors of a nation grander than has been, and the keepers of your children's inheritance. Shall you foster the maintenance of a wall of suspicion and of antagonism, which will increase in strength as our two nations swell in growth and power? Shall you leave an inheritance of commercial rivalry which will engender social jealousy and hate between two peoples of the same blood, with the same history of development? No, I say! Let us break this barrier already raised and turn again to the first principles of justice, that our mutual development may be fostered and that the ties of blood, friendship, and trade may be firmly and lastingly cemented for all time.

The exercise of this spirit is the first and best thing. Our treatment of Canada in the past, with respect to commercial relations, at least, has been such that we can not expect any advances on her part.

They must in future come from us. I hope and believe that these advances are about to be made. Our own people are becoming permeated with this right spirit, which promises so much for international peace and prosperity.

"SECTION 2" RIDICULED.

It looks as if "retaliation" has finally been knocked out. The ridiculous upshot of "section 2," which we have so lately witnessed, for the gayety of nations and amidst the smiles of the world, indicates the final abandonment of retaliation.

"Section 2" of the Payne-Aldrich law is, and was intended to be, the incarnation of retaliation pure and simple. It was deliberately framed for the purpose of finally substituting retaliation for reciprocity, which is what the stand-patters have been conspiring and trying to do for years.

But public indignation has prevented, let us hope forever, the progress of their scheme, and has throttled it at the start.

I say that the Republican party has been forced practically to repeal "section 2." It now stands in the tariff act a mere derelict.

Of course, we know the claim that we got something out of it—out of France and Germany; most absurd of all, out of

Canada, at which the whole idea was principally aimed at its original inception. But we also know that this is mostly bluff. We know that the so-called concessions we obtained amounted to very little.

We now understand that all these negotiations were mere parade, to "save the face," as the saying is, of the administration; and of course we as Americans are gratified that this has been accomplished at home if not abroad, and that our friends, the other nations, have been willing, good-naturedly, to assist us.

ANGLO-SAXON UNITY.

This leads us right up to our relations with the whole British Empire. There has been much discussion recently of these relations, and some of our leading journalists and publicists are discussing some sort of an Anglo-Saxon unity.

Our increasing intercourse with the northern Dominion which bounds us by land and sea for thousands of miles, our identity in race, language, and institutions, and the fact that Canada is a part of the British Empire, these considerations alone should demand that we have some such understanding or alliance.

There is a tendency to this belief. For example, the venerable leader of Canadian liberalism, Sir Richard Cartwright, in a recent speech, expresses the hope and expectation that Canada herself will prove the medium for such an alliance. This alliance, more than any other one thing, would make for the peace and prosperity of the world.

I believe that the great popular party of this country ought to sympathize with and encourage the Liberal party of Great Britain. That party is now engaged in the great work of liberalizing their institutions, of finally granting justice to Ireland, and especially of maintaining the historic policy of free trade.

In this connection it has been said that the open door which Great Britain has given us the past sixty years, under the system of Bright and Cobden, those two firm friends of America, has done more to build up this country than all our protective tariffs.

When our Republican friends dwell upon the panic of 1893 and attribute it entirely to the Wilson bill, they seem utterly oblivious of the essential fact that that depression was primarily caused by commercial disaster in Great Britain, largely due to the failure of the Barings; and that it was the gradual resumption of British prosperity, enabling them to buy enormously of our products in the years from 1895 to 1900, paying us in gold, our great balance of trade against them, which enabled us to resume our own prosperity.

This is a fact in modern financial history which has been ignored but can not be denied, and this fact alone goes far to refute the claim that the Wilson bill was the cause of our troubles at that time or the Dingley bill the means of their remedy.

I believe in what I call reciprocity and recognition, reciprocity with and recognition of friendly nations which are really our commercial allies and invaluable customers; and on this ground I maintain that we should extend to Great Britain the recognition to which she is entitled for her commercial attitude toward us.

This subject is a momentous one to the future of this country. Britain has become, in a sense, an old and tired country and is looking to the great American Republic, which represents the flower of Anglo-Saxon achievement, to take a large and increasing share in the development of her immense possessions and interests by sea and land the world over.

One great point we have in mind is that probably only in this way can be brought about such a commercial alliance with Canada as we all so much desire.

Who can estimate the benefit and advantage that accrued to this country when its area was practically doubled by Jefferson's acquisition of the Louisiana territory?

Who can estimate the similar and equal benefit and advantage that would accrue from such a union as I have spoken of with Canada; a country in area as large as our own, including Alaska, and rich beyond imagination in natural resources of the soil, forest, sea, and the mine.

It should be our highest object and purpose to make this commercial union possible. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. I should like, if I can, to extend for a few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the privilege of extending in the RECORD.

Mr. HAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended, so that I may address a question to the gentleman from Massachusetts. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The time, under the order of the House, is under the control of the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great pleasure to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I would be glad to see many of the ideas which he has propounded carried into law. I wish to remind him that the idea of reciprocity which he so happily advanced and which was in the McKinley law was killed by the action of the Democratic party in the passage of the Wilson bill.

I wish to say to him further that reciprocity with Cuba, on the first attempt to pass it in this House, was killed by a solid Democratic vote, by votes of the men with whom he is now associating, coupled with the votes of 33 men on this side. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts rose. The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HILL. No. I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts, courteously and fairly, to yield to me for a single question, and he declined. I propose to put the question to him now.

A year ago when the tariff bill was being framed by the Ways and Means Committee, of which I was a member, the gentleman from Massachusetts was a Republican, and at the hearings over in the Office Building no word was ever received from him or from the institution with which he was associated, a great, magnificent manufacturing establishment; no word from the great capitalist, which I recognize him to be, that he was in accord then with the views which he is now advocating for the reduction of the duty on his own product. [Applause on the Republican side.] We had it from other people, and I will read him what I voted for in his absence: For a reduction on cash registers, jute-manufacturing machinery, linotype and typesetting machines, printing presses, sewing machines, typewriters, and all steam engines, 30 per cent, instead of 45.

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. Good. Mr. HILL. I was in favor of putting sewing machines still lower, to 15 per cent.

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. Good. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. The only reason why we did not, I think, may possibly have affected the gentleman's action now. I was afraid that American manufacturers would take their capital abroad, as many are doing, and manufacture under European wages and send their own products into the United States.

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. That is what the tariff is doing now.

Mr. HILL. Now, when the gentleman from Massachusetts comes and says that all these products could bear a lower duty, I ask him why did he not come, as a Republican, before the Ways and Means Committee and testify to it then, and include his own?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HILL. I will extend my remarks in the RECORD. Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I will yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Foss].

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Connecticut that I was ruled out of the Republican party a good deal more than a year ago—five or six years ago—by the leaders in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. HILL. Why did not the gentleman come before the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. I considered myself at that time a member of the minority party.

Mr. HILL. What difference does that make? Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. No particular difference; but the people knew exactly where I stood. That had been in evidence for some time.

Mr. HILL. I know where the gentleman stands now; but I want to know why he did not appear before the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. FOSS of Massachusetts. I want to say that I agree with the gentleman from Connecticut that I have not been in sympathy with the tariff policy that has been sending capital out of the country for the last ten years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It has been sending \$300,000,000 of capital across the line to build up branch industries to compete with us in the foreign market to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HAMER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAMER. I would like to know by what process I may ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question and receive an answer.

Mr. STANLEY. Send him a wire.

Mr. BURNETT. Change the rules.

A MEMBER. Write him a letter. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gregg].

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss the Humphrey bill, which is commonly known as the ship-subsidy bill and which has been favorably reported to this House.

I wish, first, to dispose of the contention which is made and which has been sent broadcast over the country that this bill will not cost the taxpayers anything. That there is a profit on the ocean mail and that this profit—the difference between what is received as postage and the amount paid out for carrying the ocean mails—will pay the subsidies provided in this bill.

This pretense that the amount paid in subsidies will be derived from the profit on ocean mail is not a fair statement of the case. If there is a profit on part of the mail carried, it should be used to make up the loss on the other; all receipts should be put into a gross sum, and the difference between the receipts as a whole and the expenses should be ascertained. No true balance can otherwise be struck.

The postal deficiency last year was \$17,000,000. This was after using the \$3,000,000 profit on ocean mail. If this \$3,000,000 had been paid out in subsidies, the deficiency would be \$20,000,000; and instead of taxing the people to pay the \$17,000,000, they would be taxed to pay \$20,000,000. Does not this make the subsidy cost the people \$3,000,000? Then why should an effort be made to deceive the people and make them believe that this subsidy will cost them nothing?

Mr. Chairman, for ten years or more the advocates of a ship subsidy have stalked into this Chamber and vexed our souls with their importunate, insatiate demands for relief by Congress to the perishing shipping interests of this country. In all previous appeals the cry for help came from the Cramps, Griscoms, and from the shipbuilders of Maine. The successive defeats they encountered caused a change, and the demand is now urged by the Merchant Marine League of Cleveland, Ohio. Knowing that there was a prejudice west of the Alleghenies against the continued voting away of the people's money to build up the commercial interests of the northern and eastern seaboard States, this league located its headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio, and from these headquarters they issue a newspaper, or magazine, in which they do not hesitate to attribute improper and unpatriotic motives to all who do not agree with them.

Here they have organized and located a bureau having for its pretended object the enlightenment of the farmers of the country, but the real object is to mislead them. They have flooded all the Middle Western, Western, and Southwestern States with literature, seeking to enlist the farmers' unions, farmers' alliances, and farmers generally in advocacy of their scheme, the direct object of which is to filch money from the toiling masses of this country and pour it into the laps of less than 100 men, who for forty years have fed and fattened at the public crib, and who alone have any interest in this contemplated raid on the Treasury. They have enlisted in the service of their propaganda several ex-Members of Congress, and now and then a farmers' paper, which it is believed has influence with the agricultural element in its particular locality. These ex-Members of Congress and other representatives of this league have visited state fairs, farmers' congresses, and other such gatherings, and in ex parte statements, with none to question or deny, have endeavored with arrays of statistics and distressing calculations to show that all the woes and evils which afflict the farmer's life in this country are attributable solely and directly to the lack of a sufficient amount of ship subsidy. [Applause.]

Our Government does not nominally pay any other subsidies than postal subsidies. The amount paid for the carriage of our foreign mails by the Government is extravagant in price, and to the extent the amount paid exceeds what the service is reasonably worth it as a bounty pure and simple. To an American ship carrying mails to Europe we pay \$1.60 a pound for letters and post cards, and 8 cents a pound for other articles. In addition our Government pays the American Line \$12,000 for each voyage, while theoretically the amount paid is simply the freight for carrying the mails in truth, and in fact in these foreign subsidized mail contracts the Government of the United States is fleeced to the extent that the amount is more than the service is worth. It is simply a bounty paid by the Government for a service which, if open to the world, could be had for one-half the amount now paid. Hereafter lexicographers in defining an American ship subsidy will say that it is simply a

bounty paid by the Government to enable the shipbuilders and shipowners of the United States to conduct their business at a loss.

THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE IN SHIP SUBSIDIES.

Experience is a dear school, but fools will learn in no other, it is said. The Government of the United States has not even learned in that severe school. Ship subsidies in the United States have a history. That history is a record of unbroken and disastrous failures. In 1846 the first postal subsidy was granted and a line was established between New York and Bremen, Germany. After struggling along for twelve years it gave up the job. In 1847 a subsidized line was established between New York and Havre, France. It received a subsidy from the United States Government. After struggling along for a few years it failed. In 1850 the Collins Line was started. It received a liberal subsidy from the Government of the United States. In 1858 it went out of business. In 1865 the Pacific Mail Company was subsidized and a liberal contract was made with it by the Government of the United States to carry its mails. It was granted a monopoly of the trade with China and Japan. How scandalously it ended is known to all. In 1867 the California, Oregon and Alaskan Line was liberally subsidized by the Government. In 1873 this line voluntarily withdrew from the business. In 1891 a Republican Congress enacted a new and very liberal subsidy law. It has been in operation now over nineteen years. In this year of our Lord 1910 five lines only are operating, to wit, the American Line, from New York to Southampton; Oceanic Line, San Francisco to Australia; New York and Cuban Mail, New York to Cuba and Mexico; Red D Line, New York to Venezuela and Dutch West Indies; American Mail, Boston and Philadelphia to Jamaica. In the report of the Merchant Marine Commission January 4, 1905, it is stated that the law has undeniably failed; that while the older American lines have been sustained and developed and a few new lines have been created, yet the law has not sufficed to give the United States a complete system of mail communication with the great ports of the world and the chief markets for American merchandise. In fact, only three lines have been established. The Ward Line and the Red D Line were in operation before the law of 1891. The Pacific Mail Line was in operation before the act of 1891 went into effect. Mr. R. P. Schwerin, vice-president and general manager of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, in his testimony before the Merchant Marine Commission in San Francisco, Cal., on August 5, 1904, stated as follows:

The Pacific Mail Steamship Company was operating under the mail subsidy or postal act of 1891 when I was elected an officer of the company. I may add here that at this time the company was practically bankrupt, owing \$1,100,000, and it was a very serious question whether the directors would elect a new general manager or go in the hands of a receiver. I found, after having an opportunity to make an examination of the finances of the company, that trying to comply with the mail contract (under the law of 1891) was the cause of the serious financial condition of the company. So I sent a telegram to Washington, asking that the contract be abrogated. It was done, and we began to earn money and we have earned enough to keep going ever since.

Since 1897 the subsidy hunters have beseeched Congress to amend the law, increase the subsidy, raise the tonnage taxes, and shut out the foreigner. The act of 1891 was very liberal to the large vessels. Notwithstanding this, in the fiscal year 1909 there was only one line, to wit, from New York to Southampton, England, which was running vessels of the first class and entitled to a subsidy of \$4 a mile. The report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, shows that there is one subsidized line of vessels running from New York to Venezuela once in every two weeks, which is composed of vessels of the third class and received \$1 per mile. There was one line running from New York to Maracaibo, Venezuela, making trips once every two weeks, composed of vessels in the fourth class and receiving from the Government 66½ cents per mile. There was one from New York to Mexico, calling at Habana, composed of vessels of the third class, and also a line from Boston to Jamaica and from Philadelphia to Port Antonio in vessels of the fourth class. These are all the lines now in operation under subsidy contracts. The total cost of this service on all these lines for the fiscal year 1909 was \$1,127,245.72, a net excess of \$324,172.08 over the maximum amount allowed by law to steamers not under contract. The bill now sought to be enacted raises the compensation of vessels of the second class to \$4 per mile, the rate provided in the law of 1891 for vessels of the first class.

It seems impossible to satisfy the advocates of a ship subsidy. Unless this tendency to higher prices for the carriage of mail to foreign countries is checked, the postal deficiency every year will amount to many millions more than it does now.

There is no guaranty that the present law will succeed if enacted. All schemes of subsidy in the past failed miserably.

With this ghastly record of the disastrous failure of every ship-subsidy policy adopted by the United States since 1844, is it not time that a new policy should be adopted? It is admitted by all that our merchant marine has largely disappeared from the ocean. For more than sixty years the policy of subsidies, bounties, subventions, and other quack remedies has been tried, but the patient still languishes. The policy pursued has galvanized the invalid into a convulsive existence, but it is dying and will soon be dead.

Now, I submit that the cause of the decay of our merchant marine is not hard to find. In 1855 the United States was the mistress of the seas. In that year England began the construction of iron vessels, and the United States lost the great advantage which she possessed in cheap materials used in the construction of wooden vessels. England seized the advantage, and began the construction of iron vessels. She manufactured iron with improved scientific methods, while the United States continued the manufacture of iron without any change from the old methods. Rolled bar iron was manufactured in England, and the iron manufacturers of the United States, instead of adopting new methods and manufacturing bar iron by rolling, tried to save their old plants and keep progress out of this country, and succeeded in doing so. To protect the domestic manufacturers of iron in the United States against British competition a prohibitive duty was levied against the importation of rolled bar iron, which was equivalent to about 100 per cent of its value. As a consequence, England developed the manufacture of iron and steel steamers, and to quote the words of that great shipbuilder, John Roach, who testified in 1869 before a committee of Congress appointed to inquire into the decay of American shipping:

America has lost her commerce, and what has she obtained in exchange for it? Simply the right for a few men to charge \$9 per ton, in gold, on the importation of pig iron. Pig iron was the basis of all other metals connected with the making and repairing of ships. There has been a revolution in shipbuilding, and iron is the material from which they are now built. The high cost of iron produced with the tariff upon it is one of the principal difficulties our commerce has to contend with.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Fiftieth Congress reported to the House that the substitution of iron and steel in the manufacture of ships gave to England the supremacy of the seas. The committee said:

About the year 1856 England commenced to build iron and steel ships, and as fast as they were built and equipped the commerce of the world was transferred to them, because of their superior speed and supposed safety. To compete with such vessels with wooden sailing ships was, of course, as futile as it would be now to send an army with bows and arrows against a modern army with guns and artillery of the most approved type.

On November 25, 1904, Hon. Eugene T. Chamberlain, our able and efficient Commissioner of Navigation, appeared before the Merchant Marine Commission, and in a very able address on the American shipping said:

From the time when iron became the chief material of marine construction up to the present it is useless to seek for any other cause than that for the decline of our shipping.

He further says:

But our annual output of iron and steel has now at times exceeded that of Great Britain, and soon the cost of its production must be less here than abroad.

Now, we exceed Great Britain in the production of steel and iron. We undersell Great Britain in her own markets with steel and iron. According to the testimony of several witnesses before the Marine Commission it was shown that the steel trust sold in 1904 a hundred thousand tons of steel plate at Belfast at \$24 a ton, while they were charging the American consumer \$32 a ton. This outrage even struck a majority of the American Merchant Marine Commission. In their report they say:

Whatever may be said for the occasional sale abroad of surplus manufactures below the domestic price, this, manifestly, is a case for which the familiar defense is quite impossible. American shipbuilding is terribly depressed; it is essentially an unprotected industry in the foreign trade, and when American steel mills, long and amply protected, sell material to foreign shipyards at \$8 or \$10 below the price asked from American yards, these steel mills simply heap an unjust and intolerable burden upon an interest now well-nigh prostrate.

A sense of fair play, or even cool business prudence, should make it manifest to the steel companies that they ought to do their utmost to encourage the struggling American shipyards.

The Marine Commission, in its report, states among other things that the prominent cause of the decay of our shipping is, first, the higher cost of the building of an American ship. It is stated that there is a difference between 30 and 50 per cent in the building of an American ship in favor of the British ship. Circumstances must certainly have changed and for the better since the filing of that report. In the Washington Post of the 31st of January, this year, in an editorial it is stated:

Argentina has authorized the construction of two *Dreadnoughts*, equal to the most formidable war craft afloat, and the shipyards of Europe and of the United States competed for the construction of them,

with the result that the contract was awarded to a private shipyard in New York as the lowest bidder.

There is a simple fact that knocks the trotters from under volumes of theories such as the subsidists have been firing at Congress for years and years. If our shipyards can compete with foreign shipyards in the construction of a battle ship, they can compete with them in the building of a merchant marine.

The prices of steel and iron have already gone down and must continue to go down as the processes of iron and steel manufacture improve. If this is so, and the cost of iron has been the prominent cause of the decay of our shipping interests, as shown by the Marine Commission, it is likely that this obstacle to building up a merchant marine will right itself without any subsidy. [Applause.]

One of the main reasons, but not assigned by the advocates of this bill, why we have not built up a greater merchant marine is that capitalists have preferred other investments for their money. When the civil war ended in 1865, American capital turned to the development of our internal resources and improvements, which yielded a larger, more certain, and a quicker return than money invested in shipbuilding. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that the large and reasonably safe returns on investments in the building of railroads, factories, and other lines of business in the United States prevent the American capitalist from investing in the shipping business. The shipping business necessarily requires a very large investment. Its profits are not very large, its returns are slow, and it is undoubtedly a very hazardous business. When the time comes that the American capitalist can invest his money in the shipping business and he can employ it to a better advantage than he can in investments on land, then the shipping business will revive and flourish.

The capitalists will then invest in this business regardless of whether any subsidies are paid; but as long as this business fails to return a revenue equal to other businesses, he will not invest even if subsidies are given. [Applause.]

For a period of ten years after the civil war, for the purpose of promoting internal improvements, our railroad companies were granted the right to import their iron rails and all other iron used by them free of duty. If this was good to promote the building of railroads, why is it not equally as good to grant to shipbuilders the right to import their materials free of duty? [Applause.] It is true that in the law there is a pretended provision for the free importation of such material, but it is so hedged in that in practical operation it is a delusion and a snare. [Applause.]

Another cause assigned by the advocates of ship subsidy for the decay of our merchant marine is the higher wages paid to American seamen. The Marine Commission in its report assigns the higher shipboard wages as one of the causes for the decay of the American marine.

Says the commission:

But higher cost of construction, chiefly because of the higher range of shipyard wages, is only one of the present handicaps on American shipping in over-sea trade. There is also the higher range of wages of officers and crew, and the higher cost, because more liberal variety and quantity of food on shipboard.

The commission in its report says that the handicap of wages against the American ships ranges from 30 to 60 per cent, except on the Pacific, where rates for white crews in the coast trade are the highest in the world. If the higher wages paid to American seamen prevent the growth of American shipping, how is it that, down to 1856, the wages paid to American seamen were relatively much higher than those paid to British and other foreign seamen and yet our merchant marine dominated the seas? England pays higher wages than Germany or any other foreign nation save the United States, and she does the carrying trade of the world. One thing seems certain, nothing can tempt—as is stated by one of the witnesses before the Marine Commission, Mr. R. P. Schwerin—American boys graduated from our common schools and high schools to become mere laborers on board a ship. Their position is necessarily a menial one and an educated American boy will not fill that position. Besides he can obtain higher wages or more comfortable positions ashore and as long as he can, you can not tempt him into a seafaring life. Therefore, whatever higher wages are paid will go to the foreigner, the Asiatic, or the negro. The result of this legislation, I venture to say, will be that the amount advanced as subsidy will go not into wages, but into the pockets of the shipowner and shipbuilder. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if we desire to rehabilitate the American mercantile marine, the way to do so is plain, so plain that a way-faring man, even though he be in favor of a ship subsidy, can not mistake it. Let us repeal our absurd navigation laws. In 1790 and 1792 Congress enacted practically Cromwell's navigation laws. The United States is the only civilized nation which has such an absurd code governing navigation. Do this and

then give us free ships. The present bill provides that seagoing steel steamers of 2,500 gross tons or over, wherever built, which are to engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippines, being wholly owned by citizens of the United States, and no other, may be registered as directed in this act. This is only a step in the right direction. Give us free ships of any size or dimension, whether owned by our own citizens either in whole or in part, and then the American mercantile marine will revive and dominate the seas. Give to all ships, not only for two months or six months, but for all time, the right to engage in the coastwise trade of the United States. We are clamoring for the open door in China and the Orient and shut our own doors full in the face of every foreign nation. Ever since the foundation of our Government the coastwise trade of the United States has been confined to our own citizens. It is time this monopoly was destroyed. [Applause.] The coastwise trade of the United States is a monopoly. They charge what freights they please; they have no competition except by the railroads, and in some cases not even by them. They are not subject to the interstate and foreign commerce law. They are unchecked in their operations. In other words, coastwise shipping is a trust pure and simple.

Every Republican Congress down until the present have set themselves against free ships in any form. In the hearings before the Marine Commission all the owners of shipbuilding yards and the chairman of the commission and some of the members of it rose up in opposition to free ships, and said that the admission of foreign-built ships to American registry meant the destruction of the American shipbuilding interests. England is the largest shipbuilding nation of the earth. She admits foreign-built ships to British registry. Germany admits foreign-built ships to German registry, and she has the second largest shipbuilding industry in the world.

But, Mr. Chairman, I now propose to point out to the committee the main and most potent cause of the decline of our merchant marine.

The protective tariff is the cause of the decay of the American merchant marine!

Mr. Chairman, you may have free ships, you may authorize the American shipowner to hire his crew where he can get it cheapest, but we will never have a merchant marine until we tear down our tariff walls and admit the commodities of all foreign nations to be imported into the United States upon the payment of a moderate tariff duty. Until a tariff for revenue only becomes the accepted policy of the United States we can never have a merchant marine worthy of the name. [Applause.]

Our merchant marine disputed with England the mastery of the seas when we had a tariff for revenue only, and our decline is coincident with the imposition and maintenance of a high prohibitive duty on rolled iron and other commodities.

When we abandoned the wise policy of a tariff for revenue only and threw ourselves into the foul embraces of a monopolistic protective tariff, we surrendered to foreign ports and proclaimed a blockade against trade and commerce with foreign nations.

We can only sell where we can buy. All trade is at last barter. Until our tariff is lowered to a revenue basis our ships may export our products to foreign ports, but they will return without a cargo and in ballast only. The shipping business to be successful must have the benefit of an outgoing and an incoming cargo. American ships have not now, and for the last forty years have not had, in a great majority of voyages, a return cargo. The city of Galveston, Tex., which I have the honor to represent in Congress, is in volume and value of exports second only to the city of New York in the United States. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, there were exported from the city of Galveston commodities of the value of \$189,464,335. In the same year there were imported into the port of Galveston commodities of the value of \$3,355,354. Of this amount there were imported free of duty commodities of the value of \$2,198,750. There were imported dutiable commodities of the value of \$1,156,604, and the same proportion holds good in every port of the United States with the exception of New York City.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to any form of a ship subsidy. It is simply protection applied to the ocean. Nearly forty years ago Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, in a debate declared that it was as much unconstitutional and wrong to grant these subsidies to Americans as to foreigners and that he could not support them.

UNCLE JOE ON SHIP-SUBSIDY LEGISLATION.

I have what was until recently unimpeachable Republican authority for the proposition that a man who would favor a ship subsidy in the manner which is proposed in this bill should

be put into a lunatic asylum. In the year 1897 strenuous exertions were made by Mr. John Roach to obtain a subsidy for a line of steamers between the United States and Brazil. In the course of that debate, Mr. CANNON, now Speaker of this House, on the 28th of February, 1897, said:

Now, what is this proposition? Oh, it is to give John Roach \$3,000,000 as a practical gratuity and to charge that as a tax on the cotton and provisions, and tobacco, and wheat, and grain, and bread-stuffs, and oil that we produce. What for? To enable somebody to sell something that he has made, which it cost \$1.43 to make here, while it costs only a dollar to make it in Europe, and both manufacturers have to go to the same market, namely, Brazil. Why, gentlemen, if you had a business agent who proposed to do your private business in that way, you would put him into a lunatic asylum or swear that he was a thief or idiot and discharge him.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, at that time Mr. CANNON was an insurgent and led a minority of the Republicans in Congress against a subsidy bill. These insurgent Republicans, led by him, together with the Democrats in that Congress succeeded in defeating the subsidy bill reported by a Republican committee. In the course of the debate Mr. CANNON used the following very significant language:

Commencing in the year 1847 down to the present time (1879) act after act has been passed for a similar purpose (postal subsidies). I hold in my hand the official statements of the Secretary of the Navy and the Postmaster-General which show payments of subsidies to the amount in round numbers of \$14,500,000 to steamship lines during the period from the year 1848 to 1858. I hold in my hand a statement that shows subsidies to the amount of \$7,000,000 in round numbers since that time, making over \$21,000,000 that have been paid out of the Treasury for the purpose of establishing steamship lines—\$7,000,000 would buy all the steamships engaged in commerce that sail under the American flag on every ocean in the world and more than that: The subsidizing of these steamship lines, from the Collins line in 1852 up to the present time, has bankrupted every prominent man that has favored it.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, since the day of the passage of the Payne tariff law there has been a continuous protest against its unjust provisions and oppressive burdens. These protests have not been confined to the Democratic party, but have arisen from the membership of the Republican party as well; they have not been confined to any one section of the country, but have been so universal that they covered the entire country and came from every class of people regardless of political affiliations. They were so strong and numerous within the organization of the Republican party, which is responsible for its enactment, that it has become over its passage an organization of warring factions, so hostile to each other that reconciliation is hopeless and disorganization seems inevitable.

The cry of disapproval arose immediately after its passage and the protests against its injustice have been swelling in volume from that day until this and promise to continue until it is modified in accordance with the promises made by both the party in power and the President when a candidate seeking the suffrage of the American voters. There was by both a promise of revision of the tariff downward, and this promise has been broken by revising it upward, and ignoring the solemn pledges publicly made. These broken covenants with the people constitute the basis of their mistrust in the administration and the foundation for their protest against foisting upon them a measure over their disapproval.

Party infidelity is as reprehensible as individual infidelity and public betrayal merits rebuke as much as private betrayal, and the perpetration of either should not escape adequate punishment at the hands of those whose confidence has been betrayed or who are made to suffer therefrom. To-day the Republican party is receiving at the hands of the people whose confidence it forfeited, by failure to keep its plighted faith, the punishment it has called down upon it by the failure to redeem its promises.

Within a few days after the passage of the Payne bill the opposition to it had become so strong all over the country that the President of the United States, clothed with the influence and prestige of his high office, began a tour of the country at the expense of the public in defense of the measure and proclaimed it the best revenue law ever enacted, and attempted to convert the people to its provisions. He considered the situation so grave, the conditions so critical, the rebellion within his party so pronounced, that he deemed it necessary, in order to retain party supremacy, to advise that party solidarity should be placed above public welfare, in order to secure public indorsement, and further threatened party ostracism if approval was not given and allegiance acknowledged. He proclaimed the doctrine that party expediency required that public good should be subordinated to partisan supremacy—a doctrine which has never been advocated by

any of his illustrious predecessors, and a matter which will return to plague him and his party leaders. But with all these powerful agencies he was unable to reconcile the membership of his party to the measure and secure the approval of the public. The differences existing within the membership of his party over the measure were so great that an ocean could roll between them, and the hostility so pronounced that the President with all his power could not pacify the warring factions or heal the dissensions. Again the distinguished leader of the Republican party on the floor of the House, the author of the measure, Mr. PAYNE, of New York, has deemed it necessary to come to its defense in order to stay the stampede of the opposition, but his effort has also been futile. Again that ardent standpatter, the illustrious gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], has contributed his voice to the defense of the measure and invited out of the party the Republicans who do not advocate its approval. All of these distinguished gentlemen deprecated agitation or discussion of the tariff for the reason it disturbs the business of the country and unsettles industrial conditions.

It is not discussion of it that will disturb the business of the country. Business is already disturbed because of the tariff itself, and has been ever since its passage, and will continue to be disturbed until it is settled in accordance with the desire and the best interests of the American people. Upon this great economic question the people have opinions and convictions of their own, which have been acquired by years of experience and at great cost, and they are determined this great question shall be settled in harmony with the views of a majority of them. No question is ever settled until it is settled right, and the cry of "do not disturb business" will not deter them from settling this question in the interest of the whole country and for the benefit of the American people.

The people know now, if they never did before, that it is neither the intention nor disposition of the advocates of high protective policies to settle it in the interests of the whole people, but only in the interests of the favored beneficiaries, who have thrived and fattened long enough at the expense of the masses. They know now that the tariff is a tax which the consumers pay as unearned profits to the owners of protected industries and which creates and multiplies predatory wealth, without remuneration to the people from whom it is exacted and for which they receive no adequate compensatory return.

They know that its inequality of assessment constitutes a special privilege, a favor to one class at the expense of the great majority of people who are denied equal opportunities, and for this reason it is inimical to the best interests of the Republic.

The optimistic dreams of the Payne bill, so often revealed during its consideration and since, have failed to materialize, and the much-vaunted prosperity for which it was asserted it was an evangel still remains an unrealized prophecy, for which, it seems, the country waits in vain and remains as an empty promise, "a cherished hope long deferred."

The friends of the measure, in their desperation to rescue it from the scrap pile of failures, resort to dual positions, antagonistic to each other, in contradiction of the theory upon which it is based, and by some unknown process of reasoning flatter themselves that in its enactment the Republican doctrine of high protection is fully vindicated and their theory fully sustained, namely, first, that the law is a stand-pat or high-protective measure, and, second, that it is a tariff-reform measure or a revision downward. In support of the first proposition they assert it eliminates the heresy of tariff reform and firmly establishes the principle of high protection, because it raises on an average the duties over any tariff law heretofore enacted; that it maintains inviolate the traditional doctrine of high protection and they repudiate with scorn the fact that the ultimate consumer pays the tax; and on behalf of the second proposition they claim it is a full compliance with public requirements, because it is a long step in the direction of freer and fairer trade; that it is an honest performance of the party's pledge for a downward revision; that it has largely increased the free list and enlarged the opportunities for free trade, a thing they have denounced as the inveterate foe of American labor and arch enemy of prosperity; that in their eulogium of it they denounce a low tariff as hostile to prosperity and a base Democratic doctrine and eloquently praise the Payne law for reducing the tariff and fulfilling the pledge for a downward revision. They likewise point with exultant pride to the fact that there has been a great increase in public revenues from it, and glorify in declaring that it has lightened the burdens of the tax-paying public. By their interpretation of its great accomplishments it is a most remarkable measure. Their inconsistencies summarized are that they denounce a low tariff but claim great

credit for reducing the duties; they denounce free trade as a dangerous heresy, but boast of largely increasing the free list; they approve the Chicago platform because it did not promise a revision downward, and at the same time assure the public they have complied with the platform pledge by giving a downward revision; that it conforms to the desires of the stand-patters because it increases duties on importations; that it satisfies tariff reformers because it reduces the tariff on imported articles; that at one and the same time it both reduces and increases duties on the same articles. They respond to the charge of increasing prices enormously on the necessities of life by replying that the increase of duties has reduced the selling price of the articles on which they are levied.

By this double somersaulting acrobatic performance its apostles adjust it to suit any emergency and justify all conditions. But in the face of all these, the optimistic conditions so often predicted for it have not been realized and its inspiring business qualities remain dormant.

When its unjust provisions are assailed, with much confidence its friends, whenever all other defenses have been exhausted, assert with unflinching confidence that it was enacted for the benefit of the American laborer. This subterfuge is the last stand at which the protectionists capitulate in its defense. They deplore the effect on labor if protection is abolished, and advocate it for the laborer's sole benefit. They fear foreign products made by pauper labor, if the tariff is reduced, will drive American products from our home markets and turn our labor out of employment. This bugaboo no longer constitutes a potential factor; it has run its course and served its purpose, and served its purpose much too long for the good of the laboring man. He has watched the ports of entry to prevent the importation of foreign goods in order to avoid competition with American-made goods, but overlooked the importation of foreign laborers, until he found, instead of foreign goods manufactured by foreign labor displacing our homemade goods in our markets, that the importation of labor into our industrial enterprises has displaced American labor at lower prices and deprived the American citizen of employment at home.

Instead of foreign-made goods being imported and underselling our products and depriving our labor of employment, the owners of protected industries have imported foreign labor for employment at lower wages to make American products here at home, and have by this means driven the American laborer out of employment and reduced his wages in every industrial center in the land. The labor of the mines, quarries, mills, and factories is now performed largely by foreign labor.

If the tariff is levied for the laboring man, he ought to have it; but under the present system he does not get it, but it has been used to reduce his wages to the level of foreign wages or drive him from employment.

For twelve years cheap imported foreign labor has been pouring into this country at the rate of a million a year, driving our American workmen out of employment in every industrial center in the country, and depriving our citizenship of the opportunities of support. It has been draining our country of its wealth; it does not come for citizenship, but for gain only. It hoards its earnings, and on pay day sends back all but a paltry sum to the country from whence it came. It does not expend its wages for living, for homes, for education, for the mental, moral, or social improvement of the communities where employed; it remains but a few years, then returns to its native land, leaving us the poorer because of the experiment. This is what protection does for the American laborer. There is no tariff on labor; it is admitted free of duty; it must compete with all the world—protection for the employer on everything labor produces against the whole world, with labor on the free list in open competition with all the world. The price of labor is regulated by the natural law of supply and demand, aided in some instances by labor organizations, against which the protected monopolies are now waging a relentless warfare for their extermination. So omnipotent protection now feels that it no longer parades behind a mask or with muffled hands, but out in the open boldly proclaims its power and asserts its purpose.

If protection is for the benefit of the laborer, give it to him and do not longer permit his employer to deprive him of it or use it to drive him out of employment, as has been done heretofore.

But, sir, there is another feature of the Payne bill which should forever condemn it in the minds of all fair-minded, justice-loving people. It discriminates in favor of the rich and against the poor. For its inequalities in this respect it deserves severe censure, as an investigation of its schedules will disclose.

On the sparkling diamond of the rich it levies a nominal duty of 10 per cent, but on its imitation, worn as ornaments by the poor, it levies a duty of 20 per cent. On the champagne for the

table of the fastidious it levies a duty of 65 per cent, while on the clothing worn by the laboring man it levies a duty of 86 per cent. On the fine silk costume of the society belle the tax is 50 per cent, while on the woolen or worsted garb worn by the housemaid it is 135 per cent; on the ordinary steel button for the trousers of the toiler the tariff is 127 per cent, while on the fine ivory button used on the clothing of the dude it is 57 per cent; on the plain, coarse blanket of the humble the tariff is 165 per cent, while on the finest and costliest, used by the exclusive, it is 71 per cent; on the gloves worn by the laborer the tax is 66 per cent, while on the finest gloves in use it is only 14 per cent; on the carpets used by the owners of fine palaces the tariff is 50 per cent, while on the cheap carpets used to adorn the modest homes of the workingman it is 127 per cent. Such inequalities are found in every feature of the bill.

Sir, it has always been a cardinal principle in the Democratic faith that in the making of all tariff schedules the duty should be lowest on the necessaries of life and highest on the luxuries, but the Republican party in making the Payne bill reversed this order to the great detriment of a large majority of the American people, and yet its friends declare it was enacted for the benefit of the poor man. The levy of the enormous tax provided for in the schedules of the Payne bill increases the price of every article on which it is levied and thereby makes it an instrument of great oppression to every wage-earner in the land and furnishes the reason for the greatly advanced cost recently of the necessaries of life. Statistics show that in the last four years the cost of plain, simple living the necessaries of life have increased 37 per cent, while the increase in wages has only been 11 per cent. In other words, the cost of living has increased three and one-third times as much as the ability to earn a living. This increase is due largely to it, and the party in power—responsible for its passage—must assume the responsibility.

It can not shift it and escape condemnation. To this greatly enhanced cost of living and want of corresponding increase in wages can be attributed the recent strikes, lockouts, and shut downs occurring since the passage of the measure in nearly every industrial center. They are only the appeals of the employee to the over-protected employer to give him the tariff levied on the products he produces, which it is declared was levied for labor's benefit.

But leading friends of the measure deny that the recent increase in prices are due to it, and assert the tariff has nothing to do with prices, and some have gone so far as to assert that the higher the tariff the lower the price. A strange doctrine, a new rule of economics, is here promulgated. Sir, the Republican party is estopped on this proposition. For many years it has taught as a cardinal principle of its faith that a high tariff produced high prices, and from this doctrine it can not dissent now. It is bound by it, and must assume the responsibility and bear the odium.

If an increase of the tariff does not increase the price, then why did the Republican party declare in its last national platform that—

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

If it does not increase the price, why did nearly every article upon which it was levied increase enormously in price immediately upon its passage?

If it does not increase the price of articles on which it is levied, why did two Republican Members of Congress—Mr. GARNER, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FOELKER, of New York—at this session introduce bills removing the duty on meats, that the starving thousands all over the land might be able to buy this necessity of life? If it does not increase the price of articles on which it is levied, why when the cities of Portland, Me., Boston, Mass., and Chicago, Ill., were destroyed by fire, did the people of these unfortunate cities petition Congress to remove the duty on building materials purchased for their rebuilding, and Congress responded by granting the petitions in order to relieve the distress of the people of these unfortunate places?

If it does not increase the price on articles on which it is levied, why did the Republicans of Indiana this year in state convention assembled adopt a platform declaring that in all tariff duties levied the duty should only equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad and omit that part of the Republican national platform, "together with a reasonable profit to American industries," and denounce the present high protection measure as an imposition on the consumers of the country and a moral wrong?

If it does not increase the price of articles on which it is levied, why have its apostles always declared that it did, and

for that reason asserted it was an evangel of prosperity? If it does not increase the price of articles on which it is levied, then why levy it at all?

To the doctrine of increase of price it is committed beyond opportunity to shift its position in order to escape responsibility and odium for the conditions existing to-day, which seriously affect millions of people all over the land and retard the prosperity of the greatest Nation on earth, blockading its arteries of commerce and anchoring its argosies on every sea in the world.

From the blind adoration of the protective system of legislation, due to the propaganda of protection, have grown the trusts and combinations of trade which control production and dominate prices on nearly every commodity in our markets, machines of oppression directed at the consumers, upon whom these burdens ultimately fall and who are compelled to bear them all.

For the purpose of perpetuating these burdens on the masses and to prevent reform legislation, a political machine within the ranks of the Republican party has been constructed and is operated systematically to steam roll its measures through Congress and crystallize them into laws. It presents a new and vital issue called Cannonism. Cannonism is organized Republicanism, machine-made-to-order kind.

It is called Cannonism because that is the name given to emphasize the issue it presents; it is the word coined to describe enmity to new methods, opposition to progress, obedience to special privilege, surrender to selfish interests, encouraged by long-endured wrongs which are enforced to continue old evils and prevent needed reforms, subordination of human rights to property rights, supremacy of the dollar over the man, extension of monopolistic rights, safeguarding the power of the trusts, enlarging the power of the selfish interests and special privileges.

This issue tendered is national in importance and serious in character, because it involves the constitutional rights of the people to legislate as they desire in their national Congress, and whether the people or the machine dominated by the special interests shall rule in this country, and which shall control the legislative policies of the Republic.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'CONNELL].

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, judging from the present state of mind of the American people, as evidenced each day through the daily press in all parts of the Nation, and bearing in mind the series of elections, starting last fall in Massachusetts and continuing down through the three congressional victories of the Democratic party in Missouri, Massachusetts, and New York, one is forced to the conclusion that there is very little occasion for reminding this House that the American people are very much alive to the question of tariff reform. Two things are apparently generally accepted by everyone, except by the managers of the Republican party in Congress, viz, that the American people elected President Taft and a Republican Congress with an expressed understanding that the tariff was to be reduced, and, secondly, that the tariff has not been reduced. A year ago in the state election in Massachusetts the principal issue in the campaign was the failure of the Republican party to make good its promises to reduce the tariff. The people of Massachusetts recorded their displeasure by reducing a normal Republican majority of 67,000 to 7,000. Later on, in the Fourteenth Congressional District, Massachusetts again emphasized her displeasure in a more marked manner by electing to Congress my colleague [Mr. Foss]. It is quite generally conceded that the reason for this extraordinary victory was the displeasure of the people of that rock-ribbed Republican district against the Republican party because of its failure to perform its promises.

To the student of affairs the victory in New York, where the people chose a successor to Mr. Perkins in the person of a Democrat, the same reason largely prevailed, while shortly before that the increased majority which was given to Mr. Dickinson in the district represented by the late lamented Mr. De Armond carries us logically to the conclusion that just as in Massachusetts, New York, and Missouri the people spoke in disapproval, so too will they speak in November. The American people feel that they have been cheated. They relied on the Republican party's promise to revise the tariff because they believed the tariff could best be reformed by its friends. They realize now that in this they were grossly deceived. President Taft only yesterday, in an article published in one of the big magazines, in an interview given out by himself, said:

I did not secure all the reductions that I believed ought to be made. The woolen schedule should have been lower. It was not reduced

because the combination of the representatives from the manufacturing and wool-growing sections of the East and West had a majority in Congress which was overwhelming. I finally signed the bill, not because it was a perfect tariff; I signed it because it was the best I could secure under the circumstances and because, all things considered, I did not believe myself justified in holding up the business of the country for months longer by vetoing this bill on the chance of getting a better one.

I believe these few lines more correctly describe the situation than any words that have been uttered by either friend or foe of the Payne tariff bill. In these words, uttered by the leader of the Republican party, is found an indictment against the present Republican Congress which can admit of but one verdict on the part of the people when they come to decide next November, and that verdict can only be expressed by a repudiation of the present Republican Congress and the election of a Democratic Congress in their place.

It requires no prophet to understand the signs of the times. On all sides, in the workshop, in the street car, in the railroad train, in the streets, in the factories, in the homes, the American people have already become convinced that they will punish these men who foiled President Taft and who would not pass a tariff bill in accordance with the promises of their party. The rebuke administered to the Republican party in Massachusetts last fall, when it barely escaped defeat, was the forerunner of the three congressional elections that have occurred since then and is to be followed up next fall by a complete overthrow of the Republican party in Massachusetts and the election of the Democratic ticket on all sides, purely and simply because the people of that old Bay State will not permit themselves to be trifled with, either by the Democratic party or the Republican party. When the Republican party has proved itself faithless to its trust the people of Massachusetts, regardless of the fact that they have been followers of the Republican party, will repudiate these men who are false to real Republican principles and will send them to political oblivion.

I have listened here for weeks to the praises sung by the different leaders of the Republican party. I sat for two hours listening to the eloquent defense made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the author of the bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], and a long line of distinguished Republican Members, acting as counsel for the defense, have all extolled the virtues of this bill, which President Taft himself says is not the bill he wanted.

The burden of their tales has been that the Payne bill has been able to produce a great amount of revenue, but the gentlemen should be reminded that the Republican party was not elected to power for the purpose of raising an extraordinary amount of revenue. The people wanted the tariff revised. They did not ask to have the revenues increased. It is, of course, a matter of great skill to raise a revenue of \$345,000,000, but the people were not electing men skilled for that purpose. Senator ALDRICH last winter called attention to the fact that over \$300,000,000 could be saved each year in the running of this Government. Read this in connection with the fact that the present tariff bill has raised that amount of revenue, which occasions great praise from the Republican party, and we realize at once that the apostles of high protection are singing a swan song; that about to die, and on the eve of political death, they still insist on singing the praises of the tariff bill. The Republican party would have recognized its duties to the American people by cutting down the expenditure \$300,000,000, and then passing a tariff bill which would not be confronted with this vast sum to be collected through a revenue imposed by tariff legislation.

The leaders of the Republican party are unquestionably right when they say it is impossible to run this Government without raising large sums of money; but when you are running it at an extravagance of over \$300,000,000 a year, according to the testimony of the leading Republican of the Nation, then has not the hour come to call a halt? Would it not have been a greater monument to Senator ALDRICH to have saved the American people \$300,000,000 a year rather than to have passed a tariff bill by imposing heavy duties on the necessaries of life, in which the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the Republican leaders find occasion to pride themselves on the fact that they were able to raise this amount of money to meet these extravagances?

Robbed of all verbiage, the situation resolves itself into the fact that Republican extravagance imposes on the Nation \$300,000,000 more than are necessary, and this sum must be raised by taxes.

Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that immediately after the passage of the Payne bill last August the

prices of all the necessary articles of life began to rise, to the consternation of the American people.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield two hours to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the first section of the sundry civil bill, that is, the one appropriating \$250,000 per annum to create and support a tariff commission, should be entitled "A motion to postpone the verdict of the people on the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot tariff bill to a more convenient season—more convenient to the stand-pat leaders." [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is another effort, a desperate effort, to once more hoodwink the voters of the land. I believe that every member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Democratic or Republican, has either in public or in private, or in both, expressed an opinion against a tariff commission; for calling it a board does not change its character. It is a commission, and calling it a board is beating about the bush—whipping the devil about the stump. Opposition to a tariff commission was about the only thing on which all the members of the committee were in agreement. If any member has changed base, it devolves upon him to give the reason why. If this tariff commission is established, it will be only another startling illustration of how far the legislative branch of the Government has surrendered its constitutional rights to the executive branch, a process which has gone far in the last quarter of a century.

It is decidedly interesting to observe the swing of the pendulum in that regard in the last forty-odd years. In the days of Andrew Johnson the legislative branch encroached upon the prerogatives of the executive branch until the Executive was reduced to a nullity. In these latter days, through encroachments of the executive branch, the Congress has fallen from the high estate of a coordinate branch of the Government to the despicable position of an animated cash register for the executive branch. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It matters not whether the Executive operates with the big stick or with a smile which will not come off [laughter on the Democratic side], the power of the Congress constantly dwindles, while that of the Executive mounts to imperial, even autocratic, proportions. Some men are so constituted that so soon as they come into the presence of the President their courage oozes out, as did that of Bob Acres. Every new office we create adds to the growing power of the Executive, and yet we go on constantly augmenting the bread and butter brigade.

Day in and day out Members rise in their places and anxiously inquire if such and such a bill has been recommended or indorsed by the head of an executive department. If so, they seem to think it all right. If not so, it is all wrong. They forget that these heads of departments, who are excellent gentlemen no doubt, are the mere appointees of the President—head clerks—and hold office at his pleasure. Some of them could not be elected to House or Senate from any constituency in the land, while we hold our commissions directly from the people for a period of two years, are directly responsible to the people, and are not responsible to the Chief Executive or any of his subordinates. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

At the present rate of growth of executive power it will not be long till an American Cromwell will stalk into this Chamber at the head of his Ironsides, and, pointing to the mace, roar out the command which was heard in the English House of Commons some two hundred and sixty years ago, "Away with that bauble!" and thereby arrogate to himself all the functions of government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The wisest thing the fathers did was to separate the functions of government into the legislative, executive, and judicial; and, mark you, the legislative comes first. The creation of this tariff commission is an indirect effort to mix the legislative and the executive, and against that I protest. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The whole lawful power of the President as to initiating legislation is found in these words of section 3, Article II, of the Constitution:

He shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he may judge necessary and expedient.

Having done that, he has exhausted his constitutional power of initiative, and that means that his recommendations are to be made to the Congress as a whole, in the open, and not to individual Representatives and Senators in private. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is the prerogative of the Congress and not of the President to pass tariff bills. What he can not do himself he can not do by deputy.

Section 8, Article I, which enumerates the powers of the Congress, opens with these words:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

That is the greatest of all the powers granted to the Congress, for the Supreme Court of the United States did not exaggerate when it declared that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Therefore it was eminently proper that the power to tax should stand first in the list.

Section 7, Article I, of the Constitution begins with this sentence:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

Why was the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises granted in express terms to the Congress? Because the fathers had an acute recollection of Charles I and his ship money, and how the English Parliament had time and again wrung from reluctant Kings rights and privileges by making them conditions precedent to voting supplies.

Why did they provide that all bills raising revenue should originate in the House rather than in the Senate? Clearly because Members of the House are elected for a period of two years only, while the Senators hold for six years, so that Representatives must appear at the bar of public opinion to render an account of their words and deeds thrice as often as do the Senators. It was supposed that their earlier and more frequent accounting would quicken the consciences of Representatives and render them more responsive to the public will.

The makers of the Constitution having devolved upon the Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, and having devolved upon the House alone the power of originating all bills for raising revenue, why should we shirk our duty by abdicating our function and by turning it over to the President and his precious commission?

The President may, if he chooses, recommend any sort of a tariff bill; the House may originate any kind it sees fit; the Congress may pass any character of bill it likes; the President may sign it, veto it, or let it become a law without his signature. That is the modus operandi, and the only modus operandi prescribed by the Constitution. By that and for that we should stand firm as a rock. The quicker the Congress raises the standard of revolt against encroachments upon its rights and prerogatives the better the country will be off. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We hear a vast deal of talk about the President's legislative programme and about "the President's policies." It is passing strange how situations change in this world. The fact that Andrew Johnson prated so volubly about "my policies" was one of the chief causes of his impeachment; but the expression "my policies" in the mouth of Theodore Roosevelt became the battle cry of a great and triumphant party. Ever since the 4th day of March, 1837, writers and orators have poked fun at Martin Van Buren for declaring in his inaugural address that he intended to walk in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor, Andrew Jackson, of blessed memory. But the same men and their political successors who had hounded Van Buren for seventy-one years for making that remark yelled themselves black in the face for Judge Taft, though his principal argument for election was that he would carry out the policies of his illustrious predecessor. If the spirits of the mighty dead take any interest in things sublunary, Martin Van Buren and Andrew Johnson must extract a wondrous amount of pleasure from the situation of the present and recent past.

The paragraph appropriating the \$250,000 per annum for the tariff commission begins in this wise: "To enable the President to secure information." If there is a man in the country who needs information on the tariff question it is the present amiable occupant of the White House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is demonstrated by his numerous pronouncements that the present tariff bill is the best ever placed upon the statute books. That being his opinion, the conclusion is not strained or far-fetched that his tariff board would examine the tariff question as certain controversialists examine the Bible—to find texts to justify and bolster up their pre-conceived theories and opinions. I am unwilling to vote to spend \$250,000 per annum, or any part thereof, to prove that the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot tariff bill is the best ever passed when a majority of the American people believe it a bad bill and millions believe it the worst tariff bill ever placed upon our statute books. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Query: If it is the best tariff bill ever passed, as the President asserts, why does he want to spend a quarter of a million of dollars to pick up information looking to amending it? Either his verdict on the present tariff bill is erroneous or his desire for money to change it is absolutely unjustifiable.

Remember that the information secured by this tariff commission to be appointed by the President is to be for his sole and exclusive use in making his recommendations to Congress. "It is so nominated in the bond." Remember also that he can not "originate" a revenue bill; he can not pass it; the House only can "originate" it, and the Congress only can pass it. This being the case, I submit that if we are to send a roving commission out to the ends of the earth after facts, the facts should be submitted to the Congress rather than to the President, for the House may, and in the Sixty-second Congress most probably will, "originate" a revenue bill without any recommendation from the White House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Bless your souls, Democrats do not object to information. We want information correct and unbiased, but we insist that the information should be submitted to Congress, which alone has the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, and not locked up in the secret archives of the White House—put in cold storage, so to speak. Amend this section so that the board shall be elected by the Congress and shall report the information secured to the Congress, which alone can pass revenue bills, and I will support it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In that way the investigation will not be entirely one-sided.

It may be that the President, in making his recommendations to the Congress, would graciously state some of the facts gleaned by his commission, such facts as he deemed proper for the Congress to know and which would not militate against the adoption of his measure, though there is nothing whatever in the language of the section to induce or compel him so to do. On the other hand, he might make his recommendations without stating any facts whatever, and then use the lash to pass them through, for one of the Washington papers recently declared that the President was contemplating applying the lash to certain recalcitrant Republicans. Should he choose to simply recommend tariff measures without stating the facts—all the facts—how can the Congress be benefited or enlightened in its labors by the facts gathered by this commission?

To show that this is a complete waste of public money, we have only to study the history of our tariff legislation. In 1882, when General Arthur was President, a tariff commission was appointed, a majority being protectionists. In due time that commission filed the following report:

The average reduction in rates, including that from the enlargement of the free list and the abolition of the duties on charges and commissions, at which the commission has aimed, is not less on the average than 20 per cent, and it is the opinion of the commission that the reduction will reach 25 per cent.

In the face of this report of the commission recommending a large reduction, the Congress proceeded promptly to pass a bill increasing duties generally, with an average increase of about 10 per cent. The commission proposed and the Congress disposed.

A year or two ago the House raised a special committee to investigate the subject of wood pulp and print paper. You, Mr. Chairman—Hon. JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois—were chairman of that committee, which was composed of as good men as there are in the House. A majority were Republicans. After a most exhaustive investigation your committee made a unanimous report, recommending certain reductions, which were conspicuous in the conference report on the tariff bill only by their absence. So outraged were you that you both spoke and voted against the adoption of the conference report. Had three more Republicans been as wise as you and had voted against that conference report the Republican party would not be today in the hole it is in.

Mr. Chairman, while they are reading insurgents out of the Republican party with such enthusiasm, I have often wondered why they did not turn you out. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I know why they did not; they can not spare you. [Applause.]

Why is this tariff-commission project being pushed with so much vigor and so much enthusiasm? Because of the widespread dissatisfaction with the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, and the equally widespread belief that the Republicans have not redeemed their ante-election promises. This dissatisfaction and this belief are both clearly manifest in the Indiana Republican state platform recently adopted. By appropriating this \$250,000 for a tariff commission the Republicans practically say to the country: "In 1908 we promised to revise the tariff down. That was to get in. Having won, we revised the tariff up in 1909. We were a lot of ignoramuses then. Now we beg of you good people to give us a chance to inform ourselves, and when we are sufficiently informed we will, some time in the sweet by and by, revise the tariff down. [Applause.] 'It may be for years

and it may be forever,' but we will do it some time if you will only give us another lease of power." [Applause.] Of course you will not state your plea in precisely that blunt way, but the meaning will be the same.

I take it that the Washington Star is good Republican authority. In a long article in its issue of May 10, it states that this campaign is to be fought out on the promise that if this \$250,000 appropriation for a tariff commission is made there will be an extra session of Congress in March or October, 1911, to revise the tariff downward, provided the information to be secured by the commission is obtained in time; and if not, then the extra session of Congress is to be called in March, 1913. Can the people be fooled by such a transparent trick as that? If so, it will be a fine illustration of the cynical philosophy of the late lamented Phineas T. Barnum that a sucker is born every minute and that the public really likes to be humbugged. [Laughter.]

I have no doubt that there will be an extra session of Congress—of a Democratic Congress—in March, 1913, called by a Democratic President. [Applause.] So that spending \$250,000 per annum to educate President Taft on the tariff question is wasteful and ridiculous excess. By the time he learns his tariff lesson he will be a private citizen [applause], in which station I wish him all the blessings this world can bestow. [Applause.]

One thing more as to this expensive tariff commission: What has become of the much-vaunted economies which this administration was going to bring about in jig time? Have they gone glimmering, along with Republican promises in the campaign of 1908 of tariff revision downward? Is the finding of new ways to squander the public money by the quarter-million dollars per annum the plan on which Republican economy is to be worked out? Notwithstanding all the high-sounding pronouncements about economy under this administration, the Washington Times in an able editorial recently declared that the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, will exceed the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, by something like \$20,000,000. Every Member should read that startling editorial carefully and prayerfully before he votes in favor of this \$250,000 appropriation for a tariff commission, which somebody has declared is intended as a life-preserver for the Republicans in the impending campaign, and which is really a tariff kindergarten for the President. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

REPLY TO MR. CHAIRMAN PAYNE.

During this debate we have witnessed a spectacle perhaps without parallel in the annals of Congress. First we heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and Republican floor leader, make a vitriolic attack on the speech of the Hon. JONATHAN PRENTISS DOLLIVER, a Republican Senator from the State of Iowa, recently delivered in the city of Des Moines, both speeches being upon the subject of the tariff, a subject which will not down at any man's bidding, and which, like the poor, we have with us always. Nobody appointed me to defend Senator DOLLIVER. This much, however, I will say for him: I have for years regarded him as the greatest orator in the Republican party. Since the debate on the tariff bill in the Senate last year I have rated him as one of the ablest debaters among Republicans. I would travel far to hear a discussion on the stump between him and the gentleman from New York. [Applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. How far would the gentleman travel to witness a tariff debate between the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Bryan? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would not travel 10 miles. I know as much about the tariff as both of those statesmen put together. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SCOTT. I understand, then, that the willingness of the gentleman to travel so far to hear debate between the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is because he might obtain information on the tariff?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, indeed.

Mr. KEIFER. I want to remind the Chair that the speaker ought not to say unpleasant things of a Senator of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not. I will tell you why I would take that long trip to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] discuss the tariff. When they got through the country for a great distance round about would be so thoroughly saturated with oil that you would not dare to strike a match in the neighborhood, and it would not be oil out of the corporosity of the Senator from Iowa, either. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The next day we heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], and I always take off my hat to him. He is the Marshal Ney of the army of protection in the United States. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] If I believed in a high tariff, I would strike hands with Brother FORDNEY. He is the only one of the whole crowd that has nerve enough to stand up and say what he believes, and that is, that where an article can be made in the United States its like shall not be imported in here at all. [Laughter.] A good many of the rest of you believe that, but you have not the gall to say it. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

The next day I heard the Republican gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] make a vicious assault on the Republican boss of Indiana, Senator BEVERIDGE, by reason of a speech that he just made at Indianapolis. A debate on the tariff question on the stump between Brother FORDNEY and Senator BEVERIDGE would double discount any vaudeville show ever pulled off. [Laughter and applause.] That would be what Horace Greeley used to call "very interesting reading."

Mr. NYE. How far would you go to hear that?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A good long distance. And I volunteer an opinion that when they got through with it you would be minus a Senator. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have enough of the esprit du corps about me to stand by the House.

When I heard the Republican gentleman from New York assail the Republican Senator from Iowa, when I heard the Republican Member from Michigan assail the Republican Senator from Indiana, when I read in the newspapers the other day where Mr. Speaker CANNON said that the insurgents did not deserve honorable death by shooting, but that they ought to be hung [laughter and applause on the Democratic side], when I heard the Republican Member from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES] make an attack on my worthy Republican friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and when I heard the Republican gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] assault the Speaker and his household troops, I recalled the words of the psalmist, "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." There also came to my mind the question now ringing through the land, What is a Republican? [Loud applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Not long since, so the story runs, the Devil met an aged preacher and tried to convince him that he was God Almighty. The old man was skeptical. His Satanic Majesty said, "Name three things the hardest to do that you can think of, and I will convince you by doing them right before your face." That seemed fair, and the old man said, "Remove that big oak tree." Instantly the lightning struck it and split it into a thousand fragments. The preacher said, "Remove that mountain." Quick as a flash an earthquake came and the mountain was leveled with the plain. The Devil smiled sardonically and remarked, "That's good—two best out of three!" Then the preacher smiled in turn and said, "Now, Mr. Devil, tell me, What is a Republican?" and the Devil took to the woods and hasn't been seen since.

I am glad of it, as I want nothing to do with "Old Hornie." [Great laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Since Mr. Chairman PAYNE bore down so heavily on Senator DOLLIVER, who, under the rules of the House, can not be heard to reply in this forum, it is only fair to DOLLIVER to quote some of his tersest sentences, and here they are:

The new rates and classifications in the cotton schedule operate to increase duties very materially on most cotton cloths used for women's and children's summer wear, and on all mercerized cottons, figured curtain and upholstery goods, tapes, cords, etc. In fact, the Aldrich revision of this schedule was one of the most daringly iniquitous features of the new tariff.

The refusal of ALDRICH to permit a proper revision of the wool and woolen schedule, with its excessive rates upon the necessities of life, the consumption value of which amounts to over \$700,000,000 per year, was without doubt the worst feature of Payne-Aldrich tariff legislation.

The silk schedule, which advanced rates on goods the value of which was \$106,742,646 and decreased on only \$7,947,568, was defended on the ground that all were "luxuries," and yet they are now commonly used by almost every girl and woman in the land in some form or other, for dresses, shirtwaists, underskirts, and hats, and for men's and boys' neckties and suit linings, and by most people are no longer considered luxuries.

There is the item of bituminous coal, amounting to \$632,344,733, of which we export seven times more than we import, and on which the remarkable reduction of 22 cents per ton was made—for the benefit only of the Atlantic seaboard manufacturers, who may thereby get their coal a little cheaper from Nova Scotia.

The production of agricultural implements is largely in the hands of a trust, and the trifling reduction of 5 per cent on these products was merely for the purpose of attempting to fool the farming community.

They are not such big fools as they are assumed to be.

So far as the public is concerned, the tariff revision in fact carries rates as high, or higher, than the Dingley tariff law on most articles of general use in their finished condition. Most of the reductions were so trivial as to be ridiculous, and were either upon articles which we

do not import to any extent (but, on the contrary, export in enormous quantities) or were for the purpose of further protecting the manufacturers especially, by reducing the duties on raw materials, while most of the rates on finished products were either kept at the Dingley tariff standard or were increased.

In making his speech in defense of his tariff bill Mr. Chairman PAYNE appeared to be performing a disagreeable task. He did not exhibit his usual enthusiasm or his old-time felicity of expression. He seemed to be in about as cheerful a frame of mind as a lawyer appointed by the court to defend without fee a man that he feels certain will be convicted and hanged. [Laughter and applause.] Clearly, it was to him a repulsive job, but it had to be gone through with some way. He appeared to think as did Macbeth when about to murder Duncan: "If it were done, when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman PAYNE was evidently in a very fretful state. He not only assailed Senator DOLLIVER, but he denounced the Chicago Tribune as a free-trade paper, a most preposterous performance, and gave the Saturday Evening Post a short-arm jolt which will not make it love him any better. The trouble with him is that the majority of the papers are against his bill, which he evidently considers a heinous crime. After denouncing everybody who objected to his bill as a liar and a slanderer, he did the very sensible thing of reading several extracts from my speeches and writings. It would add considerably to his stock of general information if he would read them all. Mr. Chairman PAYNE seems to be afflicted with a new disease, "intermittent forgetfulness." He remembered with great vividness the soup houses of 1893 and 1894, but when it came to the soup houses of 1907, a very recent occurrence, and the soup houses of 1873, his memory failed him utterly. It does not need any psychologist or phrenologist to account for this state of mind on his part, the reason being that the soup houses of 1873 and 1907 were under Republican administrations and under tariff laws passed by the Republican party, while the soup houses of 1893, though the outgrowth of a panic caused by a Republican tariff bill, sprang up while a Democratic President was in office. The gentleman complains of what he calls slanders about the McKinley bill and the Dingley bill, but human ingenuity and malice combined never invented a more stupendous slander than the one so often repeated that the panic of 1893 was produced by the Wilson tariff bill, which was not enacted into law until August, 1894.

The gentleman from New York said:

Like all Republican protective tariffs, the present law furnishes a sufficient amount to run the Government without resorting to bonds at a high rate of interest in time of peace.

If that be true, how did it happen that in February, 1893, Mr. Secretary of the Treasury Charles Foster, a Republican appointed by President Benjamin Harrison, went before a committee of Congress and asked for the authority to issue a large quantity of bonds? How did it happen that for the last two years of the life of the Dingley bill there was a large deficiency in the revenues? How did it happen that, in the fall of 1907, the Secretary of the Treasury issued a batch of 3 per cent certificates, there being no difference between a certificate and a bond except in name? All these things were done in a time of profound peace, and yet when the gentleman from New York made that glaring misstatement of facts of history there was applause on the Republican side. Such statements as that of the gentleman from New York may deceive somebody somewhere who does not know the history of our country, but it will not deceive anybody here, and the applause of the Republicans was in the nature of whistling in a graveyard to keep their courage up. The gentleman declared that they put up the tariff on hosiery and as a consequence the price of hosiery has gone down. Then he declared that they put up the tariff on wines, and as a consequence the price of wines had gone up. He seems to have been playing both ends against the middle, for it must be apparent to any sane man that, if putting up the tariff on hosiery made the price of hosiery go down, then by the same token, putting up the tariff on wine would have made the price of wine go down. Consistency, thou art a jewel!

That statement of Mr. Chairman PAYNE about Republican tariff bills always producing abundant revenues is of a piece with the monstrous fable in the Republican platform of 1904 that "a Democratic tariff is always followed by business adversity."

No matter what the papers say, no difference how the people complain, or how prices soar, Mr. Chairman PAYNE continues to assert that his bill is the best of all the tariff bills ever enacted since the pirates of Tarifa gave the word tariff to the lexicons of the world, just as every crow thinks her crow the blackest. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from New York introduced the subject of sugar to illustrate the good effects of his tariff bill. I thank him for doing that. There is no one schedule in that bill that is more outrageous than Schedule E, the sugar schedule. He assumes great credit for himself and his Republican yoke-fellows because they reduced the tariff on refined sugar from \$1.95 a hundred to \$1.90. In the first place, the reduction of 5 cents a hundred is so small that every man with common sense knows that the consumer will never be benefited by it in any degree whatsoever. The duty on raw sugar is \$1.68½ a hundred. Under the Dingley law the differential between the duty on raw sugar and refined was 26½ cents a hundred pounds. Under the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot bill there is a differential of 21½ cents a hundred pounds. Refined sugar is sugar which tests 96 degrees by the polariscope, which is an accurate scientific instrument for ascertaining the quantity of saccharine matter. The gentleman from New York says: "96-degree sugar is only 96 pounds of pure sugar to the hundred and they can not recover all the pure sugar; they lose something besides the 4 pounds." From that sentence it seems that he thinks that they lose 4 pounds because it is 96-degree sugar. They do not lose anything because it is 96-degree sugar, for they sell the 100 pounds as pure sugar. So that he is clearly wrong about that loss of 4 pounds. The truth about it is this: 100 pounds of raw sugar make 93 pounds of refined sugar, a loss of 7 pounds. Theoretically the refiners pay \$1.68½ a hundred tariff on raw sugar, which is not a loss of 14 cents a hundred as he states, but only 11.795 cents per hundred which, when subtracted from 21½ cents, the differential, leaves 9.705 cents profit on the hundred pounds. To this must be added the value of 7 pounds of by-products, which would give the true differential on 100 pounds of refined sugar, which would be in the neighborhood of 12 cents. This is the theory. In practice the sugar trust manages, in one way or another, to beat the producers of raw sugar out of a large part of the tariff of \$1.68½, to which they are entitled under the law.

But this is not the worst part of the sugar gouge. The great gouge in the sugar business is in the color test, stated in the law as "16 Dutch standard." The color of sugar has absolutely nothing to do with the quantity of saccharine matter in it, and yet this Payne bill, as did the Dingley bill, provides the color test. That is, if the sugar is above 16 Dutch standard in whiteness, it must be taxed as refined sugar. That is, instead of coming in at a tariff duty of \$1.68½ per 100 pounds, it must pay the duty of \$1.90 a hundred. Everybody that knows anything about it knows that raw sugar, which we used to call brown sugar, some of which was almost white, is just as good, if not better, for every purpose except table use as refined sugar. So that, if it were not for this color test in the Payne bill, which is a gross outrage on the consumers, at least 70 per cent of all the sugar used in the United States would be raw, or brown sugar. It would be used, in fact it would be preferred, by housewives for making jams, preserves, cakes, pies, and all sorts of sweetmeats. Now remember that the difference between the duty on refined sugar and raw sugar is 21½ cents a hundred pounds. We consume in this country annually about 3,600,000 long tons of sugar, a long ton being 2,240 pounds. That makes 8,064,000,000 pounds of sugar. Of hundredweights it makes 80,640,000; 70 per cent of that is 56,448,000 hundredweights, which, multiplied by 21½ cents, the differential between the tariff on raw sugar and the tariff on refined sugar, amounts to the enormous sum of \$12,136,320 per annum. That is a very low estimate of the amount of money that the people of the United States are gouged out of every year by the trick of the Dutch standard color test, which, I repeat, has absolutely nothing on earth to do with the saccharine quality of the sugar.

The question naturally arises in the mind of every man as to why this color test is put into the sugar schedule. It is put there for the purpose of forcing everybody to use refined sugar instead of raw sugar, to give the Sugar Trust the rake-off of 21½ cents a hundredweight on all the sugar used. In this connection it should be remembered that this color test, which costs the American people about \$12,000,000 every year, does not benefit the producer of raw sugar to any extent whatsoever—not to the extent of a nickel. To demonstrate how complete is the swindle it is only necessary to state that some producers of raw sugar produce an article so white that it is above this 16 Dutch standard in color, and in order not to be compelled to pay on raw sugar the higher duty on refined sugar they actually put molasses or some other coloring matter into it to reduce it below the 16 Dutch standard in color. The tenderness of the makers of the Payne tariff bill for the Sugar Trust is an astounding fact when we consider the history of the sugar trust in its dealings with the United States Govern-

ment, and I repeat that, while this color test costs the consumers about twelve millions a year, it does not profit the producers of raw sugar one cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Nor is the whole of this gouge as to the differential. The 21½ cents differential given the refiner is based on the assumption that all raw sugar imported pays a duty of \$1.68½ per hundredweight, which is not the truth by any manner of means. In 1907 out of 3,980,000,000 pounds of dutiable sugar imported 3,165,000,000 pounds paid \$1.65 per hundredweight or less, leaving but 815,000,000 pounds to pay the full rate of \$1.68½ per hundredweight. It is still further to be noted that more than 2,900,000,000 pounds came in from the Philippines or Cuba with a concession of 20 per cent. Hence more than three-fourths of the import came in at \$1.32 per hundredweight, instead of \$1.68½, which more than doubles the profits to the refiners which I have worked out before. But added to all this is the 1,000,000,000 pounds of sugar from Hawaii which pays no duty whatever, but enures to the advantage of the Sugar Trust by increasing its differential on refined sugar. To this must be added the further rake-off on 300,000 tons of free sugar from the Philippines permitted under the new law.

The gentleman from New York seems to argue that the lower the tariff on an article the higher will be the price to the consumer, and vice versa. That, of course, is utterly preposterous and is fully answered by asking the simple question: If the tariff does not put up the price of an article, what do the proponents of the tariff want with it? To prove his absurd theory he cites the fact that, though the tariff on lumber was reduced from \$2 a thousand to \$1.25 a thousand, the price of lumber has gone up. It is true that before the last of us got out of Washington in August, 1909, the lumber trust marked up the price of lumber \$1 a thousand, and if the Department of Justice had done its duty it would by this time have filled the jails so full of lumber trust magnates that their arms and legs would stick out at the windows and the doors. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It seems to be a pleasant occupation to convict farmers and members of labor unions for violating the antitrust law, but that law appears to be absolutely a dead letter when it is violated by big criminals. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In one breath the gentleman from New York glorifies his bill because it shuts out importations. In the next he glorifies it because it has increased importations. If he does not look out he will be read out of the party, if not prosecuted for lese majeste, for rejoicing about the increase of importations; that is, if the American Economist and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] voice the true Republicanism. The gentleman from New York must take one horn of the dilemma or the other. He can not take both. He can not perform the impossible feat of riding at the same time two horses going in opposite directions. Greater men than he have come to grief by essaying that caper, and he was not built for equestrian stunts, anyway. He must either take the position that a tariff bill is good just in proportion as it shuts out importations, or that it is good precisely in proportion as it permits importations. It is true that in the months of August, September, October, and November, 1909, the importations exceeded the importations for the same months in 1908, but that was because the importers were unwise enough to believe that the Republicans would really reduce the tariff. Consequently they held back their importations in order to secure the lower rates which they expected, but at last they were compelled to bring in their goods, whether the rates were lowered or not, which produced an increased importation in the months named. It is also true that the importations in February and March, 1910, were increased, and that was because the importers were fearful that the Aldrich maximum tariff would go into effect, more or less, on the 31st day of March. So they rushed in their importations.

Every right-thinking American citizen would rather use American-made goods and articles of every kind than to use foreign-made goods and articles of the same kind, provided they can purchase the American articles at a fair price, allowing a reasonable profit to the producers thereof, but they are unwilling to pay exorbitant prices for American goods. The reasons I have stated above fully account for the increase of importations under the Payne bill. Here is a curious fact upon which the gentleman from New York might turn his luminous mind and of which he may be able to give some kind of an explanation.

MR. PAYNE ON STOCKINGS.

To read the gentleman's reasons for the raise on stockings calls for tears and then for smiles. Hear him:

What did we find? In the first place, turning to our book on import duties on stockings, we found that of certain sizes two-thirds of all the

stockings worn by all women and children in the country were made in Germany.

If this were true, a sufficient answer would be to say that our women and children are entitled to wear the stockings of their choice, whether made in Germany, Africa, or the United States.

But with all respect to the gentleman from New York, the statement is not true. The book on import duties referred to by him says nothing whatever about sizes; does not say a word about women's and children's stockings; does not say that two-thirds of all the stockings worn by all of our women and children came from Germany. The book he referred to is as silent as the grave on these questions. In that book we find this heading, "Stockings, Hose, and Half Hose," and there is not a word about sizes, and not a word limiting these articles to women's and children's stockings. This book tabulates the importations of all stockings, hose, and half hose for a number of years, scheduling them according to law by values per dozen pairs.

Now, let us examine the proposition that two-thirds of all the stockings worn by all the women and children of the country were made in Germany, irrespective of where the information came from.

We have about 90,000,000 people in this country, and the women and children in all probability number four-fifths of that number, or about 72,000,000. A moderate estimate would give an average of four pairs a year for each woman and child, or 288,000,000 pairs of stockings consumed in the United States. The gentleman from Michigan lamented that he could not go into the stocking question, and therefore may have some figures bearing on this footing.

Now, what did we import in 1907 of stockings, hose, and half hose? Here is the table as taken from the Book of Imports referred to by the gentleman.

TABLE OF IMPORTS FOR 1907.

The table gives dozens of pairs, which I have converted into pairs—	
	Pairs.
Valued at not more than \$1.00 per dozen	29,391,324
Valued at not more than \$1.50 per dozen	13,868,316
Valued at not more than \$2.00 per dozen	15,963,312
Valued at not more than \$3.00 per dozen	1,577,196
Valued at not more than \$5.00 per dozen	342,936
Valued at more than \$5.00 per dozen	76,548
Total imports	61,219,632

Our total import would not have given one pair of socks or stockings to each of our men, women, and children, nor would it have given one pair of stockings each to all our 72,000,000 women and children.

All our population consumes more than 360,000,000 pairs of hose and stockings per annum, and all our women and children consume more than 288,000,000. Admitting that our imports of 61,000,000 pairs come from Germany—which is not true—it follows that from 220,000,000 to 300,000,000 pairs are made at home. In other words, from three-fourths to five-sixths of all the hose and stockings worn by all our people, or by all our women and children, are made by American manufacturers. Looked at from any angle you please, that two-thirds of all the stockings worn by the women and children of our country is either a joker or a joke.

Now, what was the real reason for the raise on stockings? It will be hard to make the American people believe that it was because "30,000 or 40,000 young women were walking up and down the streets working only half time," as the distinguished gentleman from New York put it. Not a bit of it. Look at the table and you will see that 57,000,000 pairs of cheap stockings were imported—or about one-fourth the consumption—a fact that made it possible for the poorer people to buy three pairs of stockings for a half dollar. Nearly the whole import was of the cheaper grade—the very grades raised by the present law. Why were they raised? To give the young women work? No. The reason was—and the table shows it—that on all stockings valued at more than \$2 per dozen the Dingley rates were prohibitive, and the object of the raise was to make this prohibition good on all stockings. This is the whole stocking question in a nutshell. To give American manufacturers the monopoly on the stocking trade, and not to help young women, was the real reason. The raise was made to help factory owners and not their employees, and in a short time stockings at two pairs for a quarter, or three pairs for a half dollar—the popular stockings of the world—will be a matter of history and not of trade.

The gentleman from New York further says that he only raised these cheaper grades 1.8 cents per pair and that he "would be ashamed to look an honest working woman in the face if he had not stood for that increase." This sounds well as an excuse, but is very misleading. The Book of Imports gave the unit value for the 29,000,000 pairs of the cheapest hose or stockings at 96 cents per dozen pairs, or 8 cents a pair. The

Dingley tariff on these 29,000,000 pairs was 50 cents a dozen pairs and 15 per cent, or 4.78 cents per pair, or 67.11 per cent ad valorem. The raise of 1.8 cents of the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot bill will make these same stockings cost 8 cents plus 4.78 cents plus 1.8 cents or 14.58 cents per pair, or 89.75 per cent. The gentleman from New York boasts that while raising the tariff on hosiery he also raised the tariff on whisky and wines. Oh! yes. You raised whisky and other spirits from 70.69 per cent to 89.15 per cent, while you raised the cheapest stockings from 67.11 per cent to 89.75 per cent, and the next two grades of the cheaper stockings to a still higher per cent.

WOOLEN GOODS.

According to the dulcet song of Mr. Chairman PAYNE the cost of clothing has been reduced by his bill. An eminent writer in a great magazine discourses on the prices of woolen goods as follows:

This summer the wearers of men's ready-made clothing will pay throughout the United States an aggregate of \$120,000,000 more than ever before. Directly after schedule "K" of the Payne-Aldrich bill was settled last August, the woolen manufacturers sent out to the manufacturers of clothing notice of a 30 per cent advance in prices of cloth. The manufacturers of clothing say they can not afford to pay that advance. They pass it on to the consumer, who is compelled to. It has been distributed through every city and village in the United States. By a marking up of prices the \$10 suit has become \$12.50, the \$15 suit \$18, and the \$20 suit \$25. The man that has to have it will still find a \$10 suit. But most of it will be shoddy.

During the tariff debate Congress received a communication from the Cincinnati Clothiers' Association urging a reduction in the tariff on woolen and worsted goods, which was not granted. The Cincinnati association said: "Not in fifty years has the cloth handled in our trade been of so inferior a quality for the price as now. The masses, consisting of laborers, mechanics, and farmers, the real users of ready-made clothing, are receiving practically no value for their money. The qualities and colorings are so poor that in many instances the colorings fade and cockle, and in the manufacture of garments give positively no satisfaction to the wearer."

Not only the suit of clothes, but everything else that the workman uses, has gone up in price. The denim overalls that he formerly purchased for 50 cents are now 75 cents, and his cotton shirt has advanced from 50 cents to 75 cents and \$1. He is still offered a 50-cent shirt, but it is made of a poor flimsy fabric in which he really can not afford to invest if he has the price of better quality.

ESTIMATES.

In the estimate used by me in the article referred to in his speech by the gentleman from New York, I gave the duties which would probably be collected under the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot bill as \$334,758,344. The duties actually collected in 1907 under the Dingley bill were \$329,109,342. This would make the increase over the Dingley duties \$5,649,002, or 1.71 per cent increase, or in round numbers nearly 2 per cent. The distinguished gentleman attempted to ridicule these figures and adduced figures showing, if the newspaper report of his speech is correct, that the present law on an ad valorem basis had reduced rates 7.7 per cent. But let us go back to estimates for a minute.

The Finance Committee issued at least four books of comparative revenues of the House bill, the Senate bill, the conference report, and the Dingley bill. Print No. 2 of this series of books or estimates gave the estimated revenue under the proposed bill at \$339,003,721, or an increase over the Dingley revenues for 1907 of \$9,894,378, or 3.06 per cent. If the Finance Committee, backed by all the mathematical talent of the customs department, made the raise 3.06 per cent, my estimate of 1.71 per cent is the more conservative and accurate of the two.

But in print No. 4 of this series of estimates, after weeks of time had elapsed, a final and revised estimate is presented which gave the estimated duties under the present law at \$332,750,688, or an increase over the Dingley law of \$3,633,247, or 1.10 per cent. There you have it. The admitted estimate of the Republican party, the one upon which they stood and went before the country upon a printed volume called "Estimated Revenues," placed the increase of the new law over the old law at 1.10 per cent; my calculation placed it at 1.71 per cent, while print No. 2 of the "Estimated Revenues" placed it at 3.06 per cent. And as the gentleman from New York admits, the actual low rate as presented by the custom figures for the first eight months of the present fiscal year owes its reduction in large part to the increased prices of the imported articles.

The actual valuation of all imports for the eight months ending February, 1910, as given by the Department of Commerce and Labor, were \$513,351,000, of which something more than one-half were subject to specific rates, and very nearly one-half to either a flat ad valorem rate or a rate compounded of the specific and ad valorem. It is, of course, impossible to show with any degree of accuracy how much the unit value on the imported articles has been increased by high prices. It is certain that the unit value of automobiles imported jumped in 1910 to \$1,900 apiece, while in 1909 it was \$1,800, an increase of nearly 6 per cent; the unit value of other articles has increased much more than this, going as high in some cases as

30 per cent. Assuming a 15 per cent increase of unit value on all the imported articles affected by an ad valorem or a compound rate and making a corresponding decrease of duties, it will be found that the actual increase for the eight months ending February, 1910, over the corresponding eight months ending February, 1909, is approximately 1.81 per cent, and if the comparison be made with the nine months ending February, 1908, the increase will exceed 2 per cent. So much for the estimate of 1.71 per cent increase.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to know if the gentleman argues that because a greater sum is collected under the operation of the Payne law than was collected during a similar time under the operation of the Dingley law, the conclusion to be reached, therefore, is that the average rate in the Payne law is higher than in the Dingley law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would not have taken that as a basis, I will say very frankly, if the Republican arithmeticians of the House and Senate had not taken it in that way.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it not quite likely that a reduction of duty might result in an increase in the revenue?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is entirely true.

Mr. SCOTT. As long as that is true, then the argument I understand the gentleman seeks to make falls to the ground.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am making it on the same identical basis that the calculations of the gentleman from New York were made.

Mr. SCOTT. But the gentleman ought not to give the calculations of the gentleman from New York—

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I did not make it on any such authority.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know the gentleman did not make it at all. Neither did I. Your calculations were made for you by your 22 experts and mine were made for me by my one expert.

Mr. PAYNE. I made it on actual results—what was imported under the old law and what was imported under this.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am taking the figures of these Republican experts that you have.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, the gentleman must remember that these figures were made before there were any imports under this law and before they had figured any imports under this law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That last table was made several weeks after the bill was passed.

Mr. PAYNE. They had no returns under the law then.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know, but the gentleman is bound by his own arithmeticians.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, fiddlesticks!

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are your own witnesses, and you come in here and hop onto me about making improper arithmetical calculations, and I thought I would give you a dose of your own medicine. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. And please remember the 25 per cent additional.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman said that. I know, and every Member of this House knows, that at this very minute there is a row brewing between the United States and Canada on the subject of wood pulp and print paper.

Now, I would like to read from a good Republican witness, when I can find one who is reliable, and I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is reliable. He was interviewed about that the other day, and here is what he said:

In discussing the action of the Treasury Department, Mr. MANN said to-day:

"In view of the Canadian situation and the action of Quebec and several other provinces forbidding exportation of pulp wood cut on public lands, we can adopt one of these different policies."

Now, I want the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to listen; he may get a dose of that maximum yet.

First, pass an act of Congress taking off the duty on paper coming from any province—

Now, is the gentleman willing to do that?

Mr. PAYNE. Take off the duty on paper?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Print paper and wood pulp.

Mr. PAYNE. No, I am not. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly what I wanted you to say, and I knew you would say, if I got you mad enough.

Mr. MANN says:

Pass an act of Congress taking off the duty on paper coming from any province which permits the free exportation of pulp wood, wood pulp, and paper.

Second, negotiate a reciprocity treaty with Canada to the same end.

Are you willing to do that?

Mr. PAYNE. I am perfectly willing for the administration, the Executive, whose duty it is, to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with Canada.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did you put the matter up to him in the extraordinary sessions you have had with him?

Mr. PAYNE. I have told the President the same I am telling you—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now I will ask you another—

Mr. PAYNE. Exactly the same thing; there is no difference between the President and myself on the subject.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; the trouble is you hoodooed him about this bill to start with. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN continued:

Third, continue the present status and ruin one-half of our paper manufacturers and increase the price of print paper to a very great extent, how much no one can tell.

Are you in favor of that?

Mr. PAYNE. No such result will ever follow. We have got plenty of wood suitable for pulp for many years in this country, and we can only ruin the paper mills by taking off the duty and throwing it open to the competition of the world, and no interested newspaper that buys paper can suggest anything to the contrary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, I want to ask you this question: Do you think you know more about wood pulp and print paper than Mr. MANN does? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Now, the gentlemen has asked me a question that takes into consideration the element of modesty or otherwise, and I shall have to decline that question, but I think I know more about the last statement than Mr. MANN does, because the only embargo put upon pulp wood is in the Province of Quebec on the crown lands. There is none anywhere else, and there is no higher rate of duty on paper coming into the country than the minimum, the very minimum of \$3.75 a ton. There is no higher rate on any paper coming from anywhere else in the world except from the Province of Quebec, and if the gentleman will read the official record which has been published since that statement of Mr. MANN he will find I am entirely correct. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, that opens up a field for another debate between Republicans—the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, let us see what you were boasting about the other day.

The tariff on wool in the Payne bill is precisely what it was in the Dingley bill, except on carpet wools, of which we produce none. There are consumed in the United States about 500,000,000 pounds of wool annually, of which we produce 300,000,000 pounds and import 200,000,000, in round numbers. Comparing the first eight months of the fiscal year 1910 with the fiscal year 1908 the importations of wool, first class, jumped from 20,000,000 pounds to 67,000,000; second class, from 10,000,000 to 25,000,000; third class, from 50,000,000 to 92,000,000. Applying the Dingley rates to these the increased duty for the first eight months of 1910 on first-class wool is about \$5,280,000; on second-class wool, \$1,800,000; on third-class wool, about \$2,520,000—in all, \$9,600,000, or more than the entire increase of the entire revenue of the fiscal year 1909 over that of the fiscal year 1908. The customs in the fiscal year 1908 yielded \$286,113,130, and in the fiscal year 1909, \$294,377,000. The boasted revenue producer under which we now operate appears to be old Dingley law operating almost exclusively upon wool for its main reliance for increase.

Now, as the tariff is the same on No. 1 wool and No. 2 wool in the Dingley bill and the Payne bill, surely the gentleman from New York will not have the effrontery to claim that the Payne bill is to be credited with the increased importation of wool. This increase may be accounted for no doubt by the two reasons set forth heretofore; that is, the hope on the part of manufacturers of wool that the tariff on wool would be reduced in the first instance and their fear that it would be increased by a maximum in the second instance. And, while on this subject of the quantity of the imports and exports, it is a matter of great interest to note that our exports of gold to London aggregated thirty-three and a half millions in April and three millions during the same month to South America, and it is universally conceded that the exportation of gold is not a favorable sign of the condition of affairs.

Mr. PAYNE. Against what country?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Against any country, except England and her possessions.

Mr. PAYNE. Against what country exporting wool?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Half the countries in the world; South America, for instance; Australia, which comes in under the English rule, and Turkey and Russia.

Now, here I want to read you an authority that you will not dispute. This is an argumentum ad hominem. You would not dispute the authority of the National City Bank of New York when it makes a statement. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. I would just as soon dispute it as anybody else. You said the statement was true, and I do not know what the statement is. I would not dispute a statement just because somebody made it or would not affirm it because somebody made it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will read it to you, and get the information out of you afterwards.

Mr. PAYNE. I have not the slightest connection with the National City Bank, any more than has the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I really wish you owned it. They send out a circular every month. And, by the way, I read two circulars every month from the city of New York, one issued by this City National Bank, and the other is the circular letter of Henry Clews, and I get a vast amount of information out of the Henry Clews letter, too. I do not know whether he is a Republican or Democrat, and I do not care a straw. He is the father-in-law of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] and maybe that is where Mr. PARSONS gets some of his information. [Laughter.] Here is an extract from this National City Bank circular for May:

The course of receipts and expenditures has an all-important bearing upon the time when the Government will issue bonds. There has been during April a falling off in customs, of no great consequence, it is true, but sufficient to indicate a reaction from the rising receipts preceding the end of March. In all probability the principal reason for the recent increase in customs is to be found in the fact that imports were stimulated by the uncertainties involved in the adjustment of our trade relations with foreign countries. The maximum feature of our new tariff act was to have become effective automatically March 31 last unless the President before that day had declared by proclamation that no undue discrimination existed against the United States on the part of any given country. While in most instances adjustments were made early, negotiations with several important countries, notably, Germany, France, and Canada, were delayed until within a few weeks, and in one case a few days, of the time fixed by law for applying the maximum rates. These delays and consequent uncertainties probably had the effect of stimulating importations to avoid later on the possibility of encountering higher tariffs defined by the maximum rates. A decline in customs is therefore reasonably to be expected at this time.

And, by the way, that suggests a thing I had forgotten. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] stood up here the other day and with great pomposity exclaimed that this tariff bill did what every Republican tariff bill had done—furnished abundant revenues to run the Government. Now, I want to repeat a question which I asked a while ago. If that is true, how did it happen that Secretary Charles Foster, appointed by Benjamin Harrison, went before the Finance Committee in February, 1893, and asked for the authorization of \$50,000,000 of bonds to make up for deficiencies?

Mr. PAYNE. That sounds like one of the old debates with our old friend from Ohio, General Grosvenor.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. He got so he quit denying it.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know why the gentleman from Missouri used to run from it, then.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never ran from it. But General Grosvenor knew more than most of you, anyway.

Now, the truth about it is that the only time this country has ever been out of debt since the First Congress under the Constitution met was in the glorious days of Andrew Jackson [loud applause on the Democratic side], and one year they were clear out of debt except \$7,000 of bonds of which they never could find the owners. I guess they had been destroyed, and the surplus was divided out among the States. That statement of the gentleman is a piece of that monstrous fable that was put in the Republican national platform of 1904, that a Democratic tariff is always followed by days of adversity. During the life of the Walker tariff Charles Dickens, of blessed memory, one of the closest observers of human affairs that ever lived, came over here, and he wrote a letter, afterwards incorporated into a book, discoursing on the wonderful prosperity of this country in that era of a Democratic tariff bill, and he said that the country was so prosperous that a flaming sword suspended from the skies would not create any more surprise than a beggar upon the streets. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That one sentence is a complete answer to every Republican speech that has ever been made on Democrats bringing adversity upon the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Under this Payne tariff bill you can not walk from here to the Treasury building any day, especially after dark, without being solicited by divers and sundry beggars to give them enough money to pay for a place to sleep that night. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Dingley and Payne tariff bills have forced another sort of exportation, which grieves every lover of our country, and

that is the exportation of good American citizens to the British Northwest. Last year 86,000 Americans, chiefly from the Mississippi Valley, expatriated themselves, largely because they can purchase all products, including American farm implements and other articles manufactured in America, more cheaply in the British possessions than they can purchase them at home. These emigrants from the United States are among our best citizens and this departure is a great and serious loss to the Republic, for they are going at the rate of nearly 100,000 per annum. No man can figure out the money value of a good, law-abiding citizen.

Mr. SCOTT. Does not the gentleman think that the fact that they can buy farm lands cheap there has something to do with it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course that has something to do with it; but this outrageous tariff bill has more to do with it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Before the gentleman leaves the wool schedule altogether, will he tell me, because I would like to know it very much for my own information, if he is for free wool?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am coming to that, and will answer it fully. I am going to take up the wool schedule in a minute. I would answer now, but would rather answer then.

The important thing to remember, however, is that all the estimates, whether made by myself or by the four efforts of the Finance Committee of the Senate, all showed an increase of duties upon dutiable merchandise as compared with 1907 and not a decrease. But this is not all. No one can make an accurate estimate of the workings of the present law until a full year shall have passed—a year absolutely disconnected from the operation of the Dingley law—and with import prices normal, or relatively normal. The first eight months of the present fiscal year were affected by both tariff laws; during last July the fear of a change upward—a fear which was abundantly justified—led importers to rush in great stocks of goods, notably spirits. Then the fear of the maximum and minimum clause of that law led in October and November to other large importations of spirits, and throughout the whole period to larger importations of other articles, notably diamonds and wool. The import value of diamonds cut, but not set, in 1908 was \$8,159,000, and in 1910 for a corresponding period of eight months, \$18,468,000. These diamonds were imported from the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, Germany, Netherlands, and other countries. Seventeen million dollars came from Belgium, France, and the Netherlands, three countries likely to be affected by the maximum and minimum clause. The imports of first-class wool jumped in eight months in 1908 from \$3,500,000 to \$10,280,000 in 1910; second-class wool jumped from \$2,881,000 to \$5,787,000, while third-class wool jumped from \$7,463,000 to \$10,771,000. The quantity of raw wool imported in eight months of the fiscal year 1910 was 148,000,000 pounds, while in 1908 it was 71,000,000 pounds, and in 1909, 102,000,000 pounds. The fear of the maximum and minimum clause increased the wool import from about 50,000,000 pounds to more than 75,000,000. These wools came from the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and Europe, South America, the Chinese Empire, Turkey and Asia, and other countries, over 80,000,000 pounds more from other parts of the world than from the United Kingdom, the only country not affected by the maximum and minimum clause of the law. Very little more wool was imported from England or the United Kingdom in 1910 than in 1909, but the increases from all the other countries was enormous. First-class wools from Australia jumped more than 7,000,000 pounds.

THE ACTUAL WORKINGS OF THE PRESENT LAW.

The gentleman from New York is reported in the Washington Star of last Thursday as giving figures to show that on an ad valorem basis the new law had reduced rates 7.7 per cent.

The following figures will show the absurdity of this statement:

Actual dutiable imports for eight months.

Year.	Value.	Duty.	Ad valorem rates.
1908.....	\$470,851,000	\$201,716,000	42.84
1909.....	482,865,000	188,294,000	43.49
1910.....	513,851,000	221,112,000	43.07

This shows the decrease for the first eight months of the fiscal year 1910 over 1909 to have been 0.42 per cent, and an increase for the same period over 1908 of 0.23 per cent. Those values and duties are taken from the February Report of Commerce and Finance from the Department of Commerce and

Labor, while the percentages are a mere matter of arithmetical calculation.

THAT 2 PER CENT RAISE.

The gentleman from New York indulged in some criticism of my estimates of the increase of the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot bill over the Dingley bill.

I said that the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot bill was higher in rates than the Dingley law was in 1907—the highest revenue year of the Dingley law.

I said that, and I was right in saying it.

My statement was as follows:

Actual revenues in 1907, the highest ever known.....	\$320, 109, 342
My estimate for the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot bill.....	\$334, 758, 344
Or an increase of.....	\$5, 649, 002
Or an increase of.....per cent.....	1.71

Now for the figures:

From a statement of the United States Treasury issued at the close of business May 12, 1910, the actual receipts from customs under the present law to that date were \$290,782,002.

In other words you have already collected under this law—and the year not out—a sum greater than was ever collected in any year of our history except the years 1906, 1907, and 1909, and before the present fiscal year shall have expired, at the present rate of collections per day, including Sundays, you will have collected \$335,872,272, or \$6,762,928 more than was collected for net revenue in 1907. My estimate raised the highest Dingley revenue by \$5,649,002, while the actual raise will be \$6,762,928, or 2.05 per cent. My estimate was 1.71 per cent raise, or in round numbers 2 per cent. When the gentleman from New York tackled these figures he tackled a buzz saw.

The Dingley law was high, but the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot bill is higher, as is evidenced from the following tabulation of receipts from customs taken from the Statistical Abstract of the United States. These figures are the gross receipts, and are subject to minor reductions growing out of the operation of law. It will be seen that the receipts in this column are placed at \$332,233,363, while the net receipts were but \$329,109,342, which figures, the final and corrected ones, were used by me and by the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States in all the estimates submitted during the tariff debate.

CUSTOMS RECEIPTS, FROM THE STATISTICAL ABSTRACT.

Year.	Customs.
1800.....	\$9, 080, 933
1810.....	8, 583, 309
1820.....	15, 005, 612
1830.....	21, 922, 391
1840.....	13, 499, 502
1850.....	39, 668, 686
1851.....	49, 017, 568
1852.....	47, 339, 327
1853.....	58, 931, 866
1854.....	64, 224, 190
1855.....	53, 025, 794
1856.....	64, 022, 864
1857.....	63, 875, 905
1858.....	41, 789, 621
1859.....	49, 565, 824
1860.....	53, 187, 512
1861.....	39, 582, 126
1862.....	49, 056, 398
1863.....	69, 059, 642
1864.....	102, 316, 153
1865.....	84, 928, 261
1866.....	179, 046, 652
1867.....	176, 417, 811
1868.....	164, 464, 000
1869.....	180, 048, 427
1870.....	194, 538, 374
1871.....	206, 270, 408
1872.....	216, 370, 287
1873.....	188, 089, 523
1874.....	163, 103, 834
1875.....	157, 167, 722
1876.....	148, 071, 985
1877.....	136, 956, 493
1878.....	130, 170, 680
1879.....	137, 250, 048
1880.....	186, 522, 065
1881.....	198, 159, 676
1882.....	220, 410, 730
1883.....	214, 706, 497
1884.....	195, 067, 490
1885.....	181, 471, 939
1886.....	192, 905, 023
1887.....	217, 286, 893
1888.....	219, 091, 174
1889.....	223, 832, 742
1890.....	229, 668, 585
1891.....	219, 522, 205
1892.....	177, 452, 664
1893.....	203, 355, 017
1894.....	181, 818, 531
1895.....	152, 158, 617
1896.....	160, 021, 752
1897.....	176, 554, 127
1898.....	149, 575, 062
1899.....	206, 128, 482

Year.	Customs.
1890	\$233, 164, 871
1891	238, 585, 456
1902	254, 444, 708
1903	284, 479, 582
1904	261, 274, 565
1905	261, 798, 857
1906	300, 251, 878
1907	332, 233, 363
1908	286, 113, 130
1909	300, 711, 933
1910	^a 290, 782, 022
1910	^b 235, 872, 270

^a To May 12, 1910.

^b Actual and estimated for 49 remaining days of the year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a good many more things I would like to say along these lines, but time presses. I am to be followed in this debate by my friend from Chicago [Mr. BOUTELL], the Prince Rupert of Republican orators in the House, and I do not want to crowd him off too late in the evening.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE TARIFF.

I will now drop the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and go after bigger game, to wit, the President of the United States. He is not only the chief traveler, but is also the principal spokesman of his party. He deserves to be treated with fairness, candor, and respect, but I have a perfect right to discuss his utterances as I would those of any other public man. When he signed the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot tariff bill he was under no sort of compulsion to make any statement whatsoever, but he elected to make a statement, and in that statement, among other things, he said:

The bill is not a perfect bill or a complete compliance with the promises made, strictly interpreted, but a fulfillment free from every criticism in respect to a subject-matter involving many schedules and thousands of articles could not be expected.

I wish to call the attention of all concerned to the fact that the President said, on the 5th of August, 1909, that "the bill is not a perfect bill or a complete compliance with the promises made, strictly interpreted." I submit that that declaration of the President is a flat contradiction of the assertion by the gentleman from New York that his bill is a perfect compliance with the promises made by Republican leaders prior to the election of 1908. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In September, 1909, the President went on an extensive speech-making tour, beginning with an address in Boston, in which he eulogized Senator Aldrich to the skies. That was the first serious wound which the President inflicted upon his own popularity, for, right or wrong, and I think right, the American people hold Senator Aldrich largely responsible for the enormities of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. On the 17th of September, 1909, the President spoke at Winona, Minn., the home of the Hon. James A. Tawney, chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, the only Republican Member from Minnesota who voted for the conference report on the tariff bill. In that speech the President said:

On the whole, however, I am bound to say that I think the Payne tariff bill is the best tariff bill that the Republican party ever passed.

When the American people read that declaration the next morning and remembered the utterance which I have quoted from the President's statement issued on the 5th of August, they wondered what change had come o'er the spirit of his dream. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They could not reconcile the two statements. They knew that the tariff bill had not changed since August 5, 1909, and they marveled as to how a bill which the President declared on that day to be neither a perfect bill nor a complete compliance with the promises made, strictly interpreted, could, on the 17th day of September, be the best tariff bill that the Republican party ever passed. All the perfumes of "Araby the Blest" can not sweeten the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill to please the dainty nostrils of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They believe it the worst tariff bill ever passed by the American Congress. That speech was the serious wound number two which the President inflicted on his own popularity.

The strangest feature of that speech is that he permitted himself to use the preposterous table of figures which the gentleman from New York incorporated in his speech on the conference report. In his Winona speech the President says:

Critics of the bill utterly ignore the very tremendous cuts that have been made in the iron schedule, which heretofore has been subject to criticism in all tariff bills.

If he will read the newspapers or place his ear to the ground and listen to the voice of the American people he will discover, to his sorrow, that the steel and iron schedule is still a subject of criticism. He continues:

From iron ore, which was cut 75 per cent, to all the other items as low as 20 per cent, with an average of something like 40 or 50 per cent, that schedule has been reduced so that the danger of in-

creasing prices through a monopoly of the business is very much lessened, and that was the chief purpose of revising the tariff downward under Republican protection principles.

Surely, the great uprising of the American people in 1908 in favor of a revision of the tariff was not simply against the danger of increasing prices, but was a protest against the then existing prices [applause on the Democratic side], and was a crusade for lower prices of manufactured articles, all of which are sold in foreign countries cheaper than they are sold to our people at home. The President, as well as the gentleman from New York, was unfortunate in taking the reductions in the iron and steel schedule as a sample of the reductions of which they boast. The truth is that the reductions in that schedule have not reduced the price of manufactured articles to the consumer one farthing.

The fight as to the reduction of the tariff on iron ore was really a battle between the Steel trust and the Atlantic seaboard rolling mills—merely that and nothing more. It is true that there were many reductions, on paper, in the iron and steel schedule. For instance, the tariff on steel rails was cut in two, being \$7.84 a ton under the Dingley bill and \$3.92 under the Payne bill. That looks on paper like a large reduction, but the fact remains that steel rails are sold to-day at \$28 a ton to the American consumer under the Payne bill just as they sold for \$28 a ton under the Dingley bill. Of course, they are sold abroad cheaper than they are at home, but that does not benefit the American buyers of steel rails one cent. Consequently those who ride on the railroads and ship freight over them pay as much as under the Dingley bill, for they are the men who pay for the steel rails at last. The same is true of most of the reductions, on paper, in the steel and iron schedules. So, in the language of little Peterkin to Old Caspar, touching the famous victory of Marlborough and Prince Eugene at Blenheim—

What good came of it at last?

If the Steel trust can afford to sell steel rails below \$28 a ton to foreigners, it ought to be compelled to sell to Americans at the same reduced price. Surely we are not levying a tariff tribute on the American people for the benefit of foreign nations. If there is a corporation betwixt the two seas that does not need to be pampered by an unjust tax on our own citizens most assuredly it is the Steel trust. It is stated on so high an authority on steel products as Andrew Carnegie that when the Steel trust was organized almost one-half of its stock was water, represented by the common stock, but so enormous have been the profits that the common stock has become of such value that only recently a quarterly dividend of 1½ per cent was declared on it, which is 6 per cent per annum. And the public press informs us that the workmen in the mills of that trust are compelled to work twelve hours a day seven days in the week.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is the gentleman from Missouri aware of what the market price of steel rails in England is?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is over \$29.

Mr. HAYES. It was \$32 a ton when I was there.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But the gentleman has not been in England for three or four years.

Mr. HAYES. I was there three years ago, and it was \$28 a ton here then.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that steel rails will be selling for \$26 a ton before the gentleman gets this speech printed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Thank the Lord for His divine mercy. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

What I have said about steel rails is applicable to almost all articles of steel and iron.

Still speaking of the iron and steel schedule, the President says:

The severe critics of the bill passed this reduction in the metal schedule with a sneer, and say the cut did not hurt the iron interests of the country. Well, of course, it did not hurt them. It was not expected to hurt them.

It seems to me that a fair construction of that quotation means that the President intended to convey the impression that somewhere within the broad confines of this Republic there is somebody big enough fool, or great enough knave, to desire to hurt the iron interests of the country. I deny it. No American citizen outside of a lunatic asylum, or of a home for idiots, can be found, worthy of American citizenship, who desires to see any legitimate interest of the country whatsoever hurt, either by law or in any other way; but no citizen with good sense desires to see a law enacted which will enable the steel trust, or any other manufacturing concern, to injure him by extortion or imposition. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What the people wanted in the revision was a reduction of prices of manufactured articles to a just basis. That is precisely what they did not get and that is what the present row is about. A reduc-

tion in the rates of the Dingley bill which was not sufficient to drive the manufacturers to lower their prices to a fair basis in practice no reduction at all, but is the merest mockery. This is true of the reductions in the iron and steel schedule, and is also true of many of the so-called reductions in the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill.

In his Winona speech the President said:

With respect to the wool schedule, I agree that it is too high and that it ought to have been reduced, and that it probably represents considerably more than the difference between the cost of production abroad and the cost of production here.

I will now answer the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], who asked me a question a short time ago. If you will take the tariff off from woolen goods, I will vote to take the tariff off of wool.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then, if I understand the gentleman, he is in favor of no duty on any article of wool or its products.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it would be a blessing to the American people if it was all wiped out on that schedule. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We say that the rates in the woolen goods schedule are entirely too high. The President says the same thing. On that one question he and I are agreed. He is a Republican President. The House is Republican by 43 majority and the Senate is Republican by 26 majority.

I have a fair proposition to make to the President and to my Republican friends which will promote harmony and which will bring untold blessings to the consumers of the land. Let the President send a message to Congress, clear, short, and vigorous, which shows that he means business, proposing substantial reductions in the woolen-goods schedule; let Mr. Chairman PAYNE report that bill from his committee and put it on its passage and, without having consulted a single Democrat in the House, I will give bond for the proposition that every Democrat will line up and vote for it. If he would recommend it, it would go through the House and Senate with a whoop, and the people would rise up and call him blessed. It is contended that the reason that no change of the tariff in any manner whatsoever, however meritorious, can be offered is the fear that, if the tariff question is opened up at all, we wicked Democrats will let slip the dogs of war and open up the whole tariff question—to the disarrangement of all business in the land. I am so much interested in seeing the American people have cheaper woolen clothes that, without having consulted a single Democrat, I am certain that every one of them will agree that, if the President will send in a message recommending the bill which I have indicated, and Mr. Chairman PAYNE will report it and put it on its passage, we will not offer an amendment of any sort to it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The whole transaction could be consummated in less than a week and a shout of rejoicing would ascend from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Great Lakes to the seething waters of the sunlit Gulf. It matters not that the President would receive the lion's share of the glory.

I haven't time to discuss the President's speeches further, and you haven't the patience to listen any longer. It is a great pity for him that he was influenced in his opinions on the tariff question by Senator ALDRICH and by Mr. Chairman PAYNE. They were his evil geniuses on that occasion. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It would have been a grand thing for him if he had vetoed the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. It would have added much to his usefulness now and more to his fame in the years which are to come. One of my old college professors was forever saying to his students: "Carpe diem!—seize the day!" And it is to be regretted that the President did not seize the day.

That masterful man, Charles Stewart Parnell, once said:

Opportunity is a horse, bridled and saddled, which stops at each man's threshold once in a lifetime. Be ready, mount, and he carries you on to success and honor. Pause but an instant, he is gone, and the clatter of his iron hoofs echoing down the corridors of time will forever remind you of what you have lost.

The golden opportunity of writing his name among the country's greatest benefactors came to President Taft on the 5th day of August, 1909. He let it go by unimproved, and it will never return to him as long as grass grows or water runs. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman PAYNE says that he and his cohorts will meet us in November. Glory be! glory be! I never looked forward to any day with such joy as I do to the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November except to my wedding day and the days on which my children were born. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My Democratic brethren, at last, after hard trials and great tribulations, thank God we stand here shoulder to shoulder, heart to heart, solid as a stone wall, inspired by the hopes of coming victory. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Democrats are getting together everywhere, while the Republican party presents to the astonished gaze of men the appearance of a dissolving view. Oh, yes, my Republican friends; you will meet us in November, because you can not help yourselves. And when you do meet us in November you will receive the bloodiest licking you have had since 1892. [Applause on the Democratic side.] "Up, guards, and at them!" [Applause and cheers on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two hours to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Mr. BOUTELL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE.

To enable the President to secure information as to the effect of tariff rates or other restrictions, exactions, or any regulations imposed at any time by any foreign country on the importation into, or sale in, any such foreign country of any agricultural, manufactured, or other product of the United States, and to assist the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, as required by the tariff act approved August 5, 1909, including detailed information of the cost, and of each and every element thereof, of producing at the place of production and at the place of consumption of all articles specified in said tariff act, both in this country and in the country from which such articles are imported, so that the cost of all such articles produced abroad may be compared with the cost of like articles produced in this country, the President, in the employment of persons required and authorized for such service, may appoint a tariff board, and he may also employ, under his personal direction, or under the direction and supervision of such tariff board, such competent experts in the business and methods of cost keeping and such clerical and other personal services, including rent of offices in the District of Columbia, traveling and other incidental expenses, as may be necessary in the work of said board and the work of said experts engaged in such investigations; and the compensation of all such persons, whether employed permanently or temporarily, shall be fixed by the President; and to enable the President to have such information classified, tabulated, and arranged for his use in recommending to Congress such changes or modifications in any existing tariff duties as he may deem necessary to prevent undue discrimination in favor of or against any of the products of the United States, \$250,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

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.

HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 19070) to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, for printing under the rules.

The conference report (No. 1382) and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "Eleventh and Twelfth" in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the words "First and Fifteenth;" and the Senate agree to the same.

P. P. CAMPBELL,
GEO. A. FEARRE,
WM. P. BORLAND,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. GALLINGER,
THOS. H. CARTER,
THOMAS S. MARTIN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19070) to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia submit the following

detailed statement of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the conference report.

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, to all of which the House agrees, provide that the inspector of buildings shall pass upon the plans and specifications accompanying any application which was filed in the office of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia prior to the adoption of the present building regulations of said District for the construction of a steel fireproof dome on any buildings in square 345 of said District, and shall make no changes in said plans or specifications unless for the structural safety of the buildings it is necessary to do so.

Amendment No. 7: As proposed by the Senate, buildings could be erected to a height of 160 feet on the north side of Pennsylvania avenue between Eleventh and Twelfth streets NW. As agreed to in conference, a height of 160 feet will be permitted on the north side of said avenue between First and Fifteenth streets NW.; and the House recedes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina, for one week on account of sickness;

To Mr. MORRISON for ten days on account of important business.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD on page 6571, where the wrong sections of the tariff bill were inserted in my remarks, and I ask leave to incorporate sections 10 and 11 of the administrative law instead of sections 9 and 10 of the tariff law.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected in accordance with the statement of the gentleman.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 18162. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. TAWNEY (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, May 23, 1910.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Surgeon-General of the Army, with papers relating to claims of certain employees of the medical supply depot, New York City, for losses by fire (H. Doc. No. 927), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Claims, 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. COUDREY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 148) prohibiting the Washington Gas-Light Company, Georgetown Gas-Light Company, or any other gas-light company in the District of Columbia from issuing any bonds, certificates of indebtedness, or any other evidence of debt, except such as shall actually be required for the payment of necessary betterments and improvements only without the express consent of Congress, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1377), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19049) to fix the price of gas in the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1378), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OLCOTT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18295) to establish and disburse a public-school teachers' retirement fund in the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1379), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21331) for the purchase of land for widening Park road in the District of

Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1380), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COX of Ohio, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6055) authorizing the extension of Barry place NW., and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1381), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 26108) for the relief of Charles W. Cathers, and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 26148) to provide clerks for certain district superintendents in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 26149) to provide for the purchase of ground and the erection of a public building thereon for an immigration station in the city of Seattle, Wash.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MCCALL: A bill (H. R. 26150) to authorize the cities of Boston and Cambridge, Mass., to construct drawless bridges across the Charles River, between the cities of Cambridge and Boston in the State of Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 26151) to provide for the construction of a railroad siding and railroad yard to the United States navy-yard at Washington, D. C., and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPIGHT: A bill (H. R. 26152) to amend the laws relative to American seamen, to prevent undermanning and unskilled manning of American vessels, and to encourage the training of boys in the American merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 26153) to modify and amend the mining laws of the United States in relation to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 26154) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a miners' rescue station thereon at Evansville, in the State of Indiana, and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 709) providing for pay for the assistant clerk to the Committee on Invalid Pensions by detail from the Pension Bureau—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Resolution (H. Res. 710) directing the Attorney-General to furnish certain information to the House—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. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 26155) granting an increase of pension to William H. Fought—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 26156) granting an increase of pension to Jacob M. Beecher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 26157) granting a pension to Marina A. Lucero—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26158) granting an increase of pension to Placido Salazar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26159) donating 200,000 acres of land to St. Michael's College, Santa Fe, N. Mex.—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26160) authorizing the Territory of New Mexico to sell and transfer certain lands to the town of Dexter, N. Mex., for cemetery purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 26161) to pay to the city of Leavenworth, Kans., taxes with interest assessed against the

lots on which is located the federal building for street improvements adjacent thereto—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARCLAY: A bill (H. R. 26162) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Ghearthart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNARD: A bill (H. R. 26163) granting a pension to Rebecca Roszell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26164) granting a pension to Jermimah Carland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 26165) granting a pension to John William Willbrandt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 26166) granting an increase of pension to James H. Upthegrove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 26167) for the relief of Henry W. Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: A bill (H. R. 26168) granting an increase of pension to James Hickman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 26169) granting an increase of pension to John Holverson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 26170) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 26171) to correct the military record of James M. Sweat—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 26172) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas P. Mitchell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 26173) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of John M. Wilson, administrator of Joseph Wilson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 26174) granting an increase of pension to Edwin E. Valder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 26175) for the relief of John Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 26176) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 26177) for the relief of certain members of the Twenty-sixth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 26178) for the relief of Robert T. Hill, James B. Hill, Thomas Spencer, and Ellis Spencer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26179) for the relief of Joshua Webb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26180) for the relief of Henry C. Pratt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26181) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 26182) granting an increase of pension to James J. Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26183) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Laughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 26184) for the relief of Mary Eliza Mastin, administratrix of the estate of C. H. Mastin, deceased, surviving partner of the firm of Levert & Mastin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 26185) granting an increase of pension to James A. Smiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 26186) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wagoner—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 the SPEAKER: Petition of Pakagon Tribe of the Pottawattomie Indians, against interference with certain treaties and guaranties—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Southern Baptist convention, for legislation to put interstate shipments of liquor under the police power of the State—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Peoria (Ill.) Board of Trade, praying for the establishment of the World's Panama Exposition at the city of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of Columbia Heights Citizens' Association, praying for legislation to establish at Washington, D. C., an exposition in commemoration of the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of J. C. Johnson and six other laborers in street cleaning in the unimproved streets in Washington, praying for an increase in their compensation—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of East Washington Citizens' Association, praying for the erection of a suitable monument to the memory of Commodore Joshua Barney—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Ira P. Hutchinson and other members of Antrim Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the extension of the Public Roads Bureau in the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 841 of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, praying for the establishment of the rights of the citizens of San Francisco in the drainage basin of Tuolumne River, California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of New York Monthly Meeting Committee on Philanthropic Work, praying for legislation to prohibit the importation of cocoa when it is ascertained that it is the product of slave labor—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Madison County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Eaton, N. Y., praying for such immigration legislation as will encourage the distribution of farm labor—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Edmund C. Little and 11 other members of the Pilgrim Congregational Church, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against an appropriation for the Georgetown University, a private institution, and against a division of public educational funds for such private institutions—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Louise C. Currie and other members of the Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, of Riddick, Ill.; Adelaide S. MacDowell and other members of the Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, of Chenango, Ill., praying for legislation which shall liberalize the postal laws in relation to fraternal publications—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Guthrie, Okla., praying for legislation to provide for the sale of the segregated lands of the eastern part of Oklahoma—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Union League Club of the city of New York, praying for legislation to foster the American merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Bishop L. H. Holsey and four other representatives of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, praying for legislation to reimburse the depositors of the Freedman's Saving and Trust Company—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Joseph Greenwood, of Decatur, Ill., praying for a constitutional amendment to give to women the right of suffrage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal Church South, praying for legislation to prevent the shipping of liquor into prohibition territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Union League Club of New York, praying for an increase in the salaries of the judges of the various courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, protesting against the enactment of legislation which would permit the maintenance of a line of railroad track opposite the Lucy Webb Hayes National Training School and the Sibley Hospital, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDERSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Peter Bear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolution of the Trades Council, Coshocton, Ohio, favoring the removal of the present tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of New Portland (Me.) Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, against any change in oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Nicholin Grange, No. 389, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hancock County, Me., 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. DAWSON: Petition of F. Bernick and other members of Riverside Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Buffalo, Iowa, for Senate bill 6931, for an appropriation of \$500,000 for ex-

tension of work of the Office of Public Roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Muscatine County Medical Society of Iowa, for Senate bill 6049, to create a department of public health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIEKEMA: Petition of Local Union No. 1802, of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring the passage of bill for eight-hour day on government work (H. R. 15441)—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ELLIS: Petition of Agnes Curran and 12 other members of Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, of The Dalles, Oreg., 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. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Halverson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Holstein Friesian Breeders' Association, of Marshfield, Wis., against any change in oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, for House bill 1491, for samples as baggage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Marine Firemen, Oilers, and Watertenders' Association for House bill 11193 and Senate bill 6155, for amendment of the marine laws of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of W. N. Upham and others, favoring House bill 15441, for an eight-hour day on all government contract or subcontract work—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Wisconsin Bankers' Association, for House bill 17267—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Rockford Grocers' Association, of Rockford, Ill., in favor of the reduction of the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Joseph Steckler, of New Orleans, La., in favor of holding the Panama Exposition at New Orleans—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of citizens of New Britain, Conn., against certain stated House bills proposing establishment of a board of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Florence E. McGraw and others, of Danbury, Conn., against passage of some so-called "medical bills"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Branch No. 32, National Association of Letter Carriers, against the Gillett bill, to retire employees of the civil service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Grange No. 86, Patrons of Husbandry, of Amenia Union, N. Y., 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.

Also, petition of Woman's Club of Norwalk, Conn., favoring legislation to eradicate evils appertaining to pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GORDON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Samuel Mosby—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Thomas Nolan, in favor of the boiler-inspection bills, House bill 22066 and Senate bill 6702—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of L. A. King, of New York City, for a national bureau of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Kohler Campbell, of New York City, favoring New Orleans for the Panama Exposition—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, memorial of assembly and senate of New York State, for an appropriation for the Watervliet Arsenal—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of Commercial Club of Carrington, N. Dak., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCREDIE: Petition of Dot Grange, No. 252, Patrons of Husbandry, asking that Senate bill 6049 be enacted into law, and favoring a national health bureau—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, 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.

Also, petition of Ellensburg Grange, No. 209, 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.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of Pathology Club of Lincoln, Nebr., favoring the establishment of the proposed department of public health, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: Petition of John J. Lacey, pastor, and Edwin Starkey, secretary, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Greeley, Colo., praying for the submission of an amendment to the United States Constitution providing for the acknowledging of Almighty God as the source of all authority, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Lilly M. Moorhead, secretary of Wheat Ride Grange, No. 155, Patrons of Husbandry, of Edgewater, Colo.; the Woman's Club of La Junta, Colo., signed by a number of ladies; Mrs. Rose L. Essex, secretary Fortnightly Club, of Pueblo, Colo.; the Progressive Club, of Golden, Colo., signed by Harriet H. Smith, president, Effie B. Arasmith, secretary, and others, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 6049, providing for the establishment of a bureau of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of W. E. Connell and 17 other citizens of Watkins, Colo., praying for the passage of Senate bill 6931, making an appropriation for the extension of the work of the Office of Public Roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. J. Wertman, master, and O. M. Loudon, secretary, of Clear Creek Valley Grange, No. 4, Patrons of Husbandry, of Arvada, Colo., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 6931, making an appropriation of \$500,000 for the extension of the work of the Office of Public Roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Idonian Grange, No. 170, Patrons of Husbandry, of Kirk, Colo., signed by O. E. Boone, Miss Rhoda Elsey, Mrs. Alice Spurling, committee, and Mrs. Tucker, secretary, favoring the establishment of a national bureau of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Idonian Grange, No. 170, Patrons of Husbandry, of Kirk, Colo., signed by O. E. Boone, Miss Rhoda Elsey, Mrs. Alice Spurling, committee, and Mrs. Tucker, secretary, favoring the passage of a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: Petition of Measup Valley Grange, No. 26, Patrons of Husbandry, of Greene, R. I., favoring Senate bill 4676, for agricultural extension work—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of A. A. McKellop and 54 other citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan, for the parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Mrs. E. L. Dale and others, of Norwalk, Ohio, against House bill 24879, proposed railroad near Sibley Hospital—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the Woman's Club of Norwalk, Conn., in relation to dairy supplies—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the National Irrigation Congress, for an appropriation of \$50,000—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, against House bill 24879 and Senate bill 7936, relative to construction of railways in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Keefe-Davidson Company, favoring House bill 18402—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Kohler & Campbell and J. G. Landers, favoring New Orleans as city for the Panama Exposition in 1915—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of Davis & Davis, counselors at law, of Petersburg, Va., relative to the postal-bank bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorials of the common council of Watervliet, N. Y., and the assembly of the State of New York, urging an appropriation for the Watervliet Arsenal—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SWASEY: Petition of Thorne's Corner Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lewiston, Me., against repeal of the present law on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Vinal Haven, Me., 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.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of C. H. Mastin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of Woman's Pleasure Club, of Longmont, Colo., and Empire Grange, No. 148, Patrons of Husbandry, of Fort Collins, Colo., for a national bureau of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, of Sherman, N. Y., praying for certain amendments to House bill 21321—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

MONDAY, May 23, 1910.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

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

TIMBER-LAND SELECTIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to the resolution of January 27, 1910, certain information relative to contracts in force at the time of the approval of the act prohibiting the selection of timber lands in lieu of lands in forest reserves, etc., which, on motion of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, was, with the accompanying papers and illustrations, referred to the Committee on Printing.

CLAIM OF HARVEY R. McRAVEN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Harvey R. McRaven, heir of Tranquilla McRaven, deceased, v. United States, etc. (S. Doc. No. 562), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 18162) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of El Paso, Tex., praying for the establishment of a national bureau of mines and mining, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Pokagon tribe of Potawatomi Indians of Michigan and Indiana, remonstrating against the Government interfering in any way with the laws of the United States relative to treaties made by authority of the United States or interfering with the covenants and guaranties in the Greenville treaty of peace August 3, 1795, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the compilation and publication of the military and naval record of the Revolutionary war, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Central Labor Union of Nashua, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the hours of employment of post-office clerks, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Merchant Marine Committee of One Hundred, praying for the passage of the so-called "ship-subsidy bill," which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Columbia Historical Society of the City of Washington, praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of a monument to Commodore Joshua Barney in that city, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Griggsville, Ill., praying for the establishment of a national bureau of health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of the Grocers' Association of Rockford, Ill., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, praying for the passage of the so-called "boiler-inspection bill," which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill," which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. FRYE presented a letter in the nature of a petition from C. S. Stetson, of Alta, Me., master of the Maine State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the establishment of a national bureau of health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented letters, in the nature of memorials, from Caleb H. Cushing, Wainwright Cushing, and O. H. Bragg, of Foxcroft, Me.; of Edith Hunt Smith, of Gardiner, Me.; of Emma Ellis, of Nashua, N. H.; and of Guy Parkhurst Estes, of Winsted, Conn., remonstrating against the establishment of a national bureau of health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented the memorials of W. E. Swift and sundry other citizens of Augusta, Me., remonstrating against the establishment of a national bureau of health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a memorial of Thorne's Corner Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lewiston, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Kennebec Valley Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Madison, Me., and a petition of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Woolwich, Me., praying that an appropriation be made for the extension of the work of the Office of Public Roads, Department of Agriculture, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DICK presented petitions of sundry members of the Ladies of the Maccabees of the World of Vermillion, Clinton, Defiance, Minerva, and St. Marys, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First United Presbyterian Church of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution recognizing the Deity, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ohio, praying that an appropriation be made for the extension of the work of the Office of Public Roads, Department of Agriculture, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called "boiler-inspection bill," which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. JONES presented a petition of Pomona Grange, No. 12, Patrons of Husbandry, of Snohomish, Wash., remonstrating against the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, No. 12, Patrons of Husbandry, of Snohomish, Wash., praying for the removal of the duty on the soy bean in its original state, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Chehalis Aerie, No. 1550, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Chehalis, Wash., and a memorial of Aberdeen Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Aberdeen, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the wearing of the uniform or other insignia of the United States Army except by authorized persons, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Madrona Council, No. 1425, Royal Arcanum, of Seattle; of Cascade Council, No. 1798, Royal Arcanum, of Everett; and of sundry members of the Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, of Buckley, Burlington, Walla Walla, and Olympia, all of the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mails as second-class matter, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Independence Grange, No. 207, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rochester; of Local Grange No. 154, of Alpha, Patrons of Husbandry; of the Anti-Tuberculosis League of King County; of sundry commercial and medical organizations of Tacoma; and of the Ladies' Literary and Musical Club of Buckley, all of the State of Washington, praying for the establishment of a national bureau of health, which were