

ested in the pending reciprocity agreement than in the old one. A great many egregious misstatements have been sent broadcast in the country and scattered particularly among the farmers. I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate on Monday next, after the routine morning business has been disposed of, to address the Senate for a short time, in the hope of being able to correct some of the misstatements of fact which certain people have been so busy in spreading broadcast over the country.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 1, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28, 1911.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Samuel Adams to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Elliot Marshal to be surveyor of customs at St. Joseph, Mo.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Adolphus E. Watson to be lieutenant commander.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists:

Herbert E. Fish and

Barnett B. Bowie.

Machinist Bernhard Christensen to be chief machinist.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters:

Charles J. Kerr and

Ernest L. Bass.

POSTMASTERS.

MONTANA.

William Cowgill, Chouteau.

NEW JERSEY.

George E. Schenck, Haddon Heights.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John G. Brown, Red Springs.

Moses L. Buchanan, Concord.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Horace S. Carpenter, East Downingtown.

Samuel J. Gundry, Lattimer Mines.

Frank Merle Altland, Dillsburg.

Charles Seger, Emporium.

W. A. Terrill, Clairton.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Edward O. Harwood, Moorefield.

Albert S. Winter, Moundsville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 28, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for all the seasons of the year, since each contributes its share to the wants and necessities of mankind; but when the winter is over and gone and the life currents are freed from its icy fingers, the grass springs beneath our feet; the trees take on their garments of green; the flowers bud, blossom, and exhale their fragrance; the birds sing; and the heart of man rejoices in the beauty and promise of it all, and our faith is enlarged in Thy goodness and Thy promises unto Thy children.

It is written, "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and blossom that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth; it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." So may we be faithful and profitable servants unto Thee, O God, our Father. Amen.

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

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. ESCH, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in

the case of Charles O. Baker, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. PETERS, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Mary A. Fearing, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BERGER, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for one week on account of important business.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, to put agricultural implements and other articles on the free list.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SIMS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask what time has been used on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has used 4 hours and 53 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania 5 hours and 11 minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Alabama that I would like to yield 15 minutes at this time, as the gentleman desires to go away.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE].

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, on April 4, 1911, page 7 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the distinguished Speaker of the House made use of these words:

After 16 years of exclusion from power in the House and 14 years of exclusion from power in every department of government, we are restored to power in the House of Representatives and in that alone. We are this day put upon trial, and the duty devolves upon us to demonstrate, not so much by fine phrases as by good works, that we are worthy of the confidence imposed in us by the voters of the land, and that we are also worthy of their wider confidence. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We could not if we would, and we would not if we could, escape this severe test. We will not shirk our duty. We shrink not from the responsibility.

What has this Democratic House done up to this time? It passed a bill to authorize the election of Senators by direct vote of the people. A Republican House passed that bill on more than one occasion. The Democratic Party of this House, true to its history, is trailing along after the Republican Party. The Republican Party passed a bill—

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order. The House is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the House will be in order.

Mr. PRINCE. The next bill passed was one that refers to campaign expenses. A similar bill was passed by a Republican Congress. The bill that was passed here did not go to the root of the evil, which was the primary election. We tried to amend it. That was denied to us, and the bill in a very improper and ineffective form passed this House. Much flourish of trumpets was made about the economy of this House. How many have been discharged; how many positions have been discontinued? Who can tell? One hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars of salaries and useless expenses on the part of this House to be put aside and saved to the country, and yet what gentleman in the House can tell what saving has been done thus far? I pause for answer. I heard my distinguished colleague [Mr. MANN] show that you are seeking to have committee clerks and janitors and messengers appointed for committees that you said you had discontinued.

By the report of committee assignments those committees have been discontinued, and yet you are asking for clerks. What condition are we in to-day? Resolution after resolution of investigation is offered. This Congress ought not to be called an extra session of Congress, but ought to be called a Congress for special resolutions to investigate somebody. Commissions are to be appointed to investigate commissions, circling around one after another, and for what purpose? To increase the force of your employees, to seek to obtain some

information that you have in all of the reports that have been given to you by the different departments. Unless you do more legislation for the good of the people you will be driven from the seat of power.

So much for that. Now, you have reached another bill—the Canadian reciprocity measure. That has passed this House. For the life of me I do not know what kind of a measure it is. Gentlemen on the other side say that it is a Democratic measure. The majority of the Republicans who voted on this side—78 against and 64 for—said it was not a Republican measure, and I was one of those that so voted. Nowhere do I find in the history of my party, in the speeches that I have made for 20 years or more to the farmers, nowhere do I find anywhere, from platform or speech, anything which says that the farmers shall be stricken down for the benefit of some other country, for the benefit of some other people who do not pay our taxes, who do not defend our flag, who do not care for the interests of this country as our own citizens have to care for them. Let us take the reciprocity bill that was passed. Why was it passed? I do not know. Is it a good bill? Some say yes. The President of the United States only last night said this:

We tendered to the Canadian commissioners absolute free trade in all products of either country, manufactured or natural, but the Canadian commissioners did not feel justified in going so far.

Why? Why did they not? They made a bargain with us—the most unconscionable bargain that was ever entered into by this country with any other country, the most one-sided. What do we get? Free products of the Canadian farmer; all that he raises and produces in the form of natural products are made free. What benefit does the American farmer get in exchange? None. What is the expression of the President of the United States last night in that same speech?

The effect is not going, in my judgment, to lower the specific prices of agricultural products in our country.

To lower the specific prices! The word "specific" is used, pointing out definitely that it will not lower the prices in this country. How can he square that with the statement that this measure is passed to relieve the ultimate consumer in his high cost of living in this country? If this bill does not reduce the prices to the farmer, why are we seeking to pass it? What is the purpose of this extra session if this measure gives no relief? Does it leave the price of the farmer's product exactly as it is? Oh, no; it does not. The Canadian commissioners knew it did not. They declined to let in manufactured products on the free list, and why? Because it was not to their interests to do so. What have we done? We have given to Canada the free market of the United States, with its over \$20,000,000,000 of trade within its own limits. The combined trades of all of the waters of the world outside of the United States are not equal to the free trade that exists between our States. We invite them to come into our market. We say to the farmer, "You shall not have any protection—this protection that we have preached all of our life, that the farm and the factory should be side by side, the one producing and the other consuming, thus making the home market." Yet with one fell swoop we have destroyed the arguments of a lifetime and said there is nothing in it for the farmer, that his competitor's products must come in free. What does the manufacturer get in exchange for all this? Let us see.

If he happens to be a maker of biscuits, cakes, combined with chocolate, under the present law he pays 35 per cent, and under the new proposed law he will pay 32½ per cent. In other words, the farmer is sold out to give the candy fellow 2½ per cent of reduction. What else? Plows, farm wagons, under the present law 25 per cent, reduced 2½ per cent. There is a reduction of 2½ per cent in favor of the manufacturer on one side and free trade to the farmer on the other—to 9,000,000 of men who are just beginning to get some profits. You take from them the profits of their farms, you take from them the products of their labor and give it over to the other fellow, if you please, in the face of his getting 2½ per cent. Take plows, 20 per cent under the present law, 15 per cent under the proposed agreement. I say to you, read this bill from start to finish and you will see it is the most unconscionable, the most unwise and one-sided bargain that was ever driven by any nation with another. There is nothing like it. Read it, and I challenge any man in favor of it to read it and see how he will make it out. Oh, but you say, it does not affect the farmer. What do you want the bill for? It does not help the ultimate consumer. What do you want the bill for? If you read it carefully you will see there is a little kinky-headed fellow in the bill. The real purpose of the bill is to enlarge the field of exploitation in favor of the trusts, in favor of the combinations, in favor of the manufac-

turing interests of this country at the expense of the farmer, at the expense of the ultimate consumer. [Applause on the Republican side.] So much for that. Now, let us go a little further with this other bill you are now presenting to the people. You call it a farmers' free-list bill. We are calling it the farmers' "fake" bill. That is what it is. You have stricken him down, you have cut off both of his legs, and there he is bleeding, and then you say, "Here, I will let you buy plows a little cheaper somewhere else." Where can he buy them? Can you tell me?

My distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] put in the RECORD from the International Harvester Co. that they were selling reapers, mowers, binders, and different kinds of implements cheaper in this country than in any country in the world. Where are you going to get these cheaper products for the farmer? Where are they? Nowhere. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, let us go a little further. Your theory, my Democratic friends, is that when the tariff is added to the cost of an article the consumer pays it, and to that extent it is a burden. According to the statement of Mr. UNDERWOOD, agricultural implements pay a tariff of \$12,189. Twelve thousand one hundred and eighty-nine dollars is the tariff tax added to the farmer of this country for buying agricultural implements! Now you propose to give him free trade with all the world. Oh, but you do take care of your own friends, you do, my Democratic friends on the other side, and most of them are south of Mason and Dixon line. You are in the saddle politically, you are dominating the policies of your party, and you ought to; you have been loyal and devoted to the party and you believe in its principles; why should not you? When it comes to your side you find cotton bagging, sacks, and burlap amount to \$6,877,077. In other words, it is a sectional bill. Ten millions of dollars to be taken away from the Treasury and \$8,000,000 given to the Southern States as a result of that, and yet we are all receiving petitions and communications from your cotton interests asking us and begging us to stand up against it. But we find there is a loss of revenue. Mr. UNDERWOOD stated that the loss by reason of Canadian reciprocity was \$5,000,000 from the Treasury. The President says it means no damage to the producer; that the producer loses nothing and the consumer loses nothing. It is all beautiful and altruistic, and yet it loses to the Treasury of the United States \$5,000,000 on account of Canadian reciprocity and \$10,000,000 by this fake bill; in all, \$15,000,000 taken out of the Treasury. What is the condition to-day? April 26, 1911, statement of the Treasury—and here is the dark shadow of Democratic tariff agitation, the shadow that will grow to the gloom it did under the Wilson-Gorman bill, and it may be that the Treasury will be depleted and the time may be, if you get in complete control, that you will have to issue bonds to pay the running expenses of the Government. Here is the statement of April 26, 1911. The excess of expenditures over receipts was \$5,658,015.26. Read the statements in the public press, and you will find the receipts are going off in internal revenue and customs receipts. Men are working upon part time.

They are beginning to curtail and reduce their forces, and you are starting out with the conditions along the line of free trade. But, to your credit, you are honest in your views—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

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

Mr. PRINCE. I have not the time to yield in five minutes. The President in his speech—and I am most kindly disposed toward him, and I only differ with him on this proposition—states that in the other countries they are talking about annexation. What is the history of the American people? We might as well be frank and honest. Americans went into Texas, Americanized it, and it was annexed as a part of this great Union. Americans went into Hawaii, Americanized it, and annexed it. And if these bright young men that the President speaks of in his speech—these clever, active, virile, vigorous young men from the farms of Illinois and northern States, the thousands and hundreds of thousands of them—go up into that northland, 92 or 100 and more on this side, as against 7 on the other, what do you think will be the effect of it? Have I not a right to say that is the first step toward annexation? Have they not a right to believe it? Why have they not? The present Speaker of this House in the last session of Congress said that he was in favor of taking Canada as a part of the United States. And this was the first step toward annexation. He is a plain, blunt, honest man, whom I admire for his frankness. [Applause.] He has never denied that statement. I say to my neighbors on the north: Be not deceived. When we

go into a country and get control of it, we take it. It is our history and it is right we should take it if we want it, and you might as well understand it. The Speaker has so said; the party back of him has so said. You are in control. You have never denied it on the floor of this House, and you can not deny it.

Now, let us see if they believe it in the other country. Let us see if the people of Canada believe in reciprocity and annexation.

That reciprocity involves a national menace is the widespread opinion in Canada. A procession of McGill students, on the occasion of a vast antireciprocity mass meeting, carried mottoes reading: "This is a time of national peril"; "No bartering of our birthright"; "First step, reciprocity; second step, commercial union; third step, annexation"; "Keep off the annexation wolves."

That is their view of us, and it is idle to say it is not being discussed.

I want to say to you, my countrymen, in my judgment the reciprocity bill is the worst bill that was ever presented to this House, next to this fake bill which we are now considering. You now have a worse one.

I am a Republican. While I felt keenly the fact that a great body of my party, 64 of them, representing manufacturing interests, should assault the interests of my district, and strike them down so that they could get cheaper raw material in order to deal with somebody else, yet I now rise above little petty prejudice. I remember, in the language of a distinguished former Speaker of this House, that I am a representative of 92,000,000 people; that I am standing here for the best interests of all the people, and so I will vote on this occasion. I voted because I thought it was for the interest of the manufacturer, for the interest of the laborer, for the interest of the professional man, for the interest of the farmer, that the Canadian pact be defeated, and likewise I will vote against this measure, because I believe it to be the interest of all of our people that this "farmers' fake bill" be defeated. And if you pass it, as pass it you will, the people will discriminate next November, and they will read the ticket from top to bottom, and they will say: "This is reciprocity; this is a ratification of your views," and in my judgment you can not afford to strike down or offer false allurements to 9,000,000 of the intelligent people in this country and think that they will believe in any such doctrine. For that reason I hope this measure will fail to pass. But, if it does pass, I hope it will fail in another branch. And I will continue to pray that our President will right up and go no further along this line of free trade and will veto this bill if it ever comes to him. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP]. [Applause.]

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, the House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, a large latitude is granted in debate, and for this reason I wish to avail myself of the opportunity to discuss a question which is to-day of vast importance not only to the National Congress, but to the entire people of the United States.

On the 21st day of December, 1910, the Senate adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 312):

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to furnish to the Senate for its use, if he does not deem it incompatible with public interest, the following information, with departmental classifications of the same:

First. The total number of appointments which are made by the President upon nomination to and confirmation by the Senate.

Second. The total number of appointments which are made by the President, but which do not require nomination to and confirmation by the Senate.

Third. The total number of officers and employees of the Government subject to civil-service regulations, specifying classification and number of postmasters.

Fourth. The total number of officers and employees subject to removal by the President without action on the part of Congress.

Fifth. Total number of officers and employees of the United States Government, exclusive of enlisted men and officers of the Army and Navy.

To this resolution the President responded on the 24th day of February, 1911, a summary of which is hereto appended.

Appointments made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Department:	
State	441
Treasury	736
War (exclusive of Army)	6
Justice	353
Post Office	7,953
Navy (exclusive of naval officers)	11
Interior	272
Agriculture	3
Commerce and Labor (exclusive of Census)	28
Civil Service Commission	4
Government Printing Office	1
Interstate Commerce Commission	7
Library of Congress	1
Total	9,846

Appointments made by the President without confirmation by the Senate.

Department:	
State	94
Treasury	0
War	0
Justice (approximately)	846
Post Office	0
Navy	0
Interior	44
Agriculture	0
Commerce and Labor	8
Civil Service Commission	1
Total (approximately)	993

Officers and employees under civil-service regulations.

Department:	
State	177
Treasury	27,093
War	12,939
Justice	625
Post Office	147,727
Navy (approximately)	29,000
Interior	13,938
Agriculture	11,438
Commerce and Labor	14,797
Civil Service Commission	204
Government Printing Office	3,610
Interstate Commerce Commission (approximately)	586
Smithsonian Institution	424
Total	262,608

Officers and employees of the United States Government, exclusive of enlisted men and officers of the Army and Navy.

Department:	
State	712
Treasury	27,829
War	17,102
Additional under War Department estimated—	
Engineer Department	9,000
Quartermaster's Department	2,000
Justice	11,000
Post Office	5,700
Navy (approximately)	272,813
Interior	29,000
Interior	14,262
Agriculture	12,519
Commerce and Labor	14,883
Government Printing Office	3,925
Interstate Commerce Commission	614
Civil Service Commission	209
Smithsonian Institution	424
Library of Congress	330
Total	411,322

It will be observed that exclusive of the enlisted men and officers of the Army and Navy the patronage under the control of the President amounts to 411,322 persons. This power is too enormous to be given any man in a free country where "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," a power which, if exercised for selfish and ambitious purposes, would be sufficient to perpetuate an administration or dictate its succession; a power greater than the founders of the Government contemplated would be vested in the hands of any man. We have grown beyond the optimistic dreams of the most ardent of the architects who drafted the plans of our Government, and are now occupying a station where this power may become a menace to the growth and development of our liberties. It is a power too dangerous to be confided to any one man. Ambition is not prone to relinquish power, and selfishness always craves it as an asset to win greater position and to retain all that has been won.

It is not only the 411,322 persons, but employees and appointments made by them and directly under their control, which almost doubles the number. This great appointive power once under the command of an ambitious, selfish, and designing man, would be a menace to the perpetuity of the Republic. This power would be ample to perpetuate a line of succession in office holding that might turn the purposes of our Government from what its original founders intended and divert them from republican to monarchical tendencies. It could mold legislation to suit the whims and caprices of a selfish Executive and special interests, if in favor with the appointing power, could secure such legislative favors as their greed might prompt.

How potential would be this power vested in the Chief Executive if he should attempt to secure legislation by the National Congress by withholding from the Members of that body the patronage to which the members of the party in power are entitled? It might transfer legislation from the National Congress to the Executive and result in the overthrow of constitutional requirements.

This vast office-holding army is in complete control of the President, their tenure of office is due to him, and he is vested with the power to promote, demote, and dismiss as he desires. He is Commander in Chief of the Federal office-holding force, and no power can revoke his orders. They are supreme. Does any man doubt the magnitude of this power and how its abuse might do serious and irreparable injury to the Republic? Of

all the vast army of officeholders in this country the people elect but 391, the membership of this House. No other Federal officeholders are elected by a direct vote of the people. Each voter of the United States votes for only one Federal officeholder, the Member of Congress from his district. The voter, therefore, has but little to say about who shall hold the Federal offices. Does anyone doubt the intelligence and ability of the people to elect the officeholders of this country? If he does, he admits the incapacity of the people for self-government, and if this admission be true, then the end of the Republic must be conceded to be at hand. But upon what basis is such an admission predicated? Are not the great majority of the people in private life as intelligent, honest, and capable as those in public life, as well fitted for the responsibilities of citizenship? If not, why not? Is it true that by accident the people, not qualified for office, elect the qualified persons to administer the offices? The people are abundantly able to elect every man who holds a public office. They know what they want and know how to get it; know better than anyone else.

The civil-service law was enacted to prevent the abuse of the appointing power and worked well for years, but has now fallen victim to political abuse and is the "Trojan horse" for political knavery. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Under it 262,608 persons hold office, secure from removal, ready when their political services are required, a reserve for every political emergency. Every man knows that this vast army is not immune from party service, is not idle in party campaigns, and not independent on party questions. Freedom from political and pernicious activity under civil service as administered to-day is a mockery and a sham. If it was desired to make it an office-holding class of nonpartisan or bipartisan character, why not amend the law so that the appointees under it shall be prorated according to the respective strength of the leading political parties in the locality, State, or Union? This would make it of bipartisan character and secure fair partisan representation. Its administration is and for years has been a slander on political independence and bipartisanship in office holding. This is true from the lowest to the highest in the civil-service class. It serves as a mask behind which party service is rendered and deserves the severest condemnation.

The most aggravated and offensive partisanship exercised in any of the departments is in the Post Office Department. This department is a political machine and is openly administered as such. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Its membership is 272,813 strong, reaching to every neighborhood and coming into direct personal contact with all the people. Of this vast army, 147,727 are under the civil-service control, but as a rule their pernicious political activity goes bravely and constantly on. They are daily on their jobs, both in and out of campaigns. It is the greatest political machine ever constructed in this or any other country.

The Postmaster General is to-day the commanding general of the Republican Party; he is at the head of the national organization. If not the real head, he is the quasi head of the same. Too much of his time is given to politics and not enough to public service. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If more time of the Postmaster General was devoted to looking after the public business and less after politics, complaints against the public service would not be so numerous from every quarter of the Republic. [Applause.] It is a notorious fact that rumors are in circulation in many quarters of the Union that officials under the civil-service branches of the Government, and more especially in the postal service, are assessed every campaign for the Republican campaign fund from the highest to the lowest position; even the rural-route man in the country, with his paltry wage, and the letter carrier on the streets of the cities, who can barely subsist on his meager pay, does not escape the gatherer of campaign funds.

All must pay campaign assessments, or off go their official heads. If not for this, the real reason, ostensibly for some other. Such a flagrant abuse of the law, it is charged, exists all over the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In this connection it would be interesting to know how many, if any, of these officials are assessed, and for what amount, for the Republican campaign fund at each national election. It would be interesting to know how many, if any, in every campaign are reminded that it would be to their advantage to make a contribution to the Republican campaign fund. It would be interesting to know how many, if any, lose their jobs or are demoted because of their failure to pay the assessment or make a liberal contribution to the Republican campaign fund. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It would be interesting to know how many, if any, have their positions abolished and are thus let out of the public service, and new places are created in lieu of the ones abolished, with a new man in charge, for failure to

pay campaign contributions to the Republican campaign fund and render political services. [Applause on Democratic side.] It would be interesting to know how many, if any, are transferred from lucrative positions to others not so remunerative for failure or refusal to organize and do political work for the Republican Party in campaigns. It would be interesting to know what orders, directions, or requests, if any, in the last decade have been made by the heads of departments to their subordinates over the country to secure delegations or instructions for any candidate to any convention or conventions and the consequences resulting for failure to respond. Last, but not least, it would be interesting to know how many, if any, Members of either branch of Congress in the last 10 years have been called upon by the dispensers of public patronage to support measures pending in Congress, and a failure to comply would cost them the disposal of the patronage to which they were entitled. [Applause on Democratic side.]

In the answers to these inquiries the people of the entire country are deeply interested and should be correctly informed. It would also be interesting to know how many, if any, in the last few years, of the public positions, high or low, have been given, or what legislation enacted, if any, as a consideration because of liberal contributions to the Republican campaign fund. [Applause on Democratic side.]

What a "slush fund" this creates. If the 411,322 appointees under the President were assessed only \$10 each annually for campaign purposes, it would raise yearly a sum of \$4,113,220, and this would create for the national campaign fund every four years the enormous sum of \$16,452,880. Does any man doubt the danger of this organized political machine with such a fund? Is it not too dangerous to be permitted to exist? [Applause on Democratic side.] Again, it is a reasonable estimate to say that the average pay of this vast army of public servants amounts to \$1,000 per year each, aggregating \$411,322,000 as the annual value of the patronage at the disposal of one man. Is this not too much power to be vested in any man, however good, great, and patriotic? Is not the temptation too great? It is time the temptation should be removed, the opportunity eliminated, and the power restored to the people where it properly belongs. [Applause on Democratic side.]

The Constitution provides in reference to the appointing power of the President as follows:

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

The power to appoint Federal officials by this provision of the Constitution is vested in the President, and as to all superior officers such appointments are to be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, but as to subordinate officers Congress by law may vest the appointment in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments. The Constitution, therefore, points out a way whereby the President may be divested in part of this enormous and dangerous power of patronage. He could issue an Executive order calling upon the patrons of various Federal offices to select by ballot at the quadrennial national elections the officials for the Federal positions and nominate for confirmation such as by law were required to be confirmed, and appoint and commission all who were not so required. This procedure would enable the people of the respective localities to advise properly the President of their choice for such places and enable him to act intelligently and wisely in his appointments. Against such a procedure as this there is no constitutional inhibition, and no precedent will be found which declares it an innovation of Executive authority. Such an order by any Chief Executive would meet with the commendation of the people everywhere and inspire confidence among the entire people, irrespective of class or condition.

Why should not the President issue an Executive order for the selection by ballot at every presidential election of the Federal marshals, the clerks of Federal courts, collectors of internal revenues, surveyors of customs, and postmasters? Such a plan is not only feasible, but is practical, and would assure a proper and equitable distribution of the patronage and would inspire a higher standard of public service.

If the people are qualified to elect the appointing power they are equally qualified to select the subordinate officials. It would be a wise and prudent method and one which would be satisfactory to the people.

In the Post Office Department alone there are 272,813 appointees who should be elected in order to break down a great

Federal machine and give the people an efficient service. It costs the people of the country about \$245,000,000 annually to run it, and yet the service is deplorable. It is the only \$245,000,000 business in the world run at a loss every year. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why so? Too little attention to business and too much to politics. It manifests more interest in Republican politics than it does in public business. If managed properly in the interest of public welfare, employing good business methods, it would be a great revenue producer instead of a great revenue loser, as it now is and has been for years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is the great Republican incubator operated on all occasions from the ward primary to the national conventions and at all Federal elections. Its cohorts, booted and spurred, are in the forefront of every political contest, both in season and out, every day in the year. In fact, it is the great Republican clearing house, through which all party debts are paid, from the ward heelers up to the operators of the steam roller. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What tenable objection can be urged against the plan for the people electing their postmaster? Can any sound, logical reason be given? If so, we would like to hear it. Formerly by spoliemen this doctrine was assailed as a "populistic heresy." What if it was advocated by some Populist, that does not prove it is without merit. That is no argument against it. Denunciation is not argument, and it will not frighten intelligent people from advocating this reform, from adopting and carrying it into effect.

We are a progressive people, and our legislation should be such. The reactionary should no longer be permitted to restrain the wheels of progress or retard the onward march of 90,000,000 people in the solution of the great problems with which they daily come in contact. The election of these subordinate officials will destroy the Federal political machine, eliminate all scandals concerning the barter and sale of these Federal positions, restore confidence among the people in official conduct, inspire greater faith in our institutions, and curtail the power which now menaces the liberties of the mightiest people of all the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A life tenure of office, high or low, great or small, is inimical to the welfare of the people and the perpetuity of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It creates despotic tendencies in the administration, carelessness in the execution of duty, and tyrannical conduct in the officeholder. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No man should be selected for any official position for life, because he feels no longer responsive to the people he is to serve and will not keep step with the progress of the times. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

All positions should be selected for a term of years, so that the officeholder will bear in mind that he is but a temporary servant and must answer to the people for his official conduct. Ambition for power throughout all the ages of the world has been the inveterate foe of human liberty and independence. It has been the exponent of extravagance and the opponent of economy, the handmaiden of corruption, the subordinator of pure and honest administration, and the arch enemy of liberty. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The pathway of civilization is strewn with the wrecks of liberty, which avarice for power has created.

When our Constitution was constructed its framers recognized on account of existing conditions the necessity for a strong Executive and so builded, yet when their work was completed many of them were astonished at the extensive powers vested in that office. In spite of the checks, restraints, and limitations which were placed upon the Executive it was openly asserted by some that a monarchy, in fact, if not in name, had been created. Both opponents of the system and its warmest advocates recurred to this again and again, and its defenders found it difficult to refute the charge. In our day it is difficult to frame a definition for monarchy that excludes the President of a Republic more powerful than most of the monarchs of the world.

What monarchs of the world to-day have the appointment in the civil list, either directly or indirectly, of more than 400,000 officials, and through their appointment of subordinates as many more, amounting to nearly a million men? Add to this the power of appointment of the military force of the Government, and you have a President clothed with more power than is bestowed on any monarch in the world; a force so powerful that it could direct the course of legislation, perpetuate administration after administration, formulate and enact policies, and mold and shape the destinies of the Republic.

When John Randolph said "The people would behold in the President the form, at least, of a little monarch," he expressed a witticism which under present conditions is changed so that the people may behold in the power of the President, if he so

desired, not only the form but the substance of not a little but one of the greatest monarchs of the world. The power is present; it is vested; all it needs is ambition to make it real, to call it into execution. Grant that the ambition is dormant, yet it is true that power will intoxicate the best hearts and strongest minds. The power vested in the President is almost unlimited, and no man, it matters not how wise, patriotic, or good and great, is wise enough, good enough, and great enough to be intrusted with such unlimited and extensive power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Officials clothed with extensive powers become impatient under restraint, is the experience of all the world, as recorded history conclusively shows.

Power takes precedence over talent, subservience over qualification, pollutes whatever it touches, brooks no opposition, and tolerates no rival. Sooner or later ambition, the concomitant of power, will rise and, like a mighty torrent, rush forward to autocracy, never looking back, but ever forward to greater conquests. Ambition is but the avaricious product of power, the evil shadow of aspiration.

The French Parliament possessed rights which restrained kings for a time, but with the advent of Louis XIV, the greatest of French tyrants, the power of Parliament was suspended, and with it died the liberty of the French people. Charles V of Spain could never have become the heartless tyrant he was had it not been for the power lodged in his more conscientious and humane predecessors by a confiding and trustful people. For centuries the advocates of freedom throughout the world pointed with exultant pride to the liberties of the Roman people; the glories of their rule were exploited throughout the confines of civilization; but ambition coveted power, and power was confided by the many to the few, and the Roman Senate Chamber, the ancient arena of freedom, became the battle ground of contending tyrants in their conflict for power.

History may repeat itself, and it is safer to eliminate the evil than to permit its presence, encourage its growth, and take the chances of escaping its ever-present dangers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This power as it is now lodged in the hands of the Executive is too great to be confided to any man; the security of government is endangered, the freedom of legislation is imperiled, the economy of administration jeopardized, and the liberties of the people menaced.

Transfer to the people the patronage now vested in the President and posterity to the remotest generation, as it basks in the beneficence and wisdom of a never-dying Republic, will shout our praise and acclaim our deed. Then will the Republic be in truth a government for the people, of the people, and by the people, and the petty men who do now bestride our paths as appointees of power will be known no more forever. The power of the people must expand and grow, as the power of rulers must dwindle and die, for the voice of the people is the voice of God. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, the minority of this House has, very early in the action, assumed the rôle of critic. Of course, we expect your criticism. I believe the distinguished ex-Speaker of the House stated that it was the function of the minority to criticize the majority. It is the function of the minority, if possible, to prevent the passage of bad legislation by the majority, but in all legislative bodies, where each and every man is endeavoring to do his full duty, criticism should be just, criticism should be fair, and the criticism should be wise and should be made with a full and complete knowledge of the subject criticized. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Prince] in his criticism of the statement of the Democrats that they had reduced the expenses of this House, said that, as a matter of fact, the names were still upon the roll. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that if he will bide his time and be patient the people who are now, and have been for sometime, filling these places created by his own party, will be removed, and when the committee comes to make its final report with full knowledge of the facts the Democratic Party of this House will carry out to the letter what it said it would do and reduce the expenses \$182,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] stated, and I am glad he is now in the Chamber, in a speech which he made on April 25, that these expenses have been reduced only in the Democratic caucus and not on the pay rolls of the House. The gentleman, I think, spoke then a little too early. It is utterly impossible for a new administration at once, without serious injury to the efficiency of the House, to immediately carry into effect a complete change in the employees of the House. And even if we did not intend to cut off any useless employee or

in any way reform the service of the House, it would be impossible absolutely to change every employee of the House in one day or in one week or in one month.

If the Members of that side of the House will only be patient for awhile we will show them whether or not we will make good our pledges. If we do not, then we ought to be criticized, and I will help do it; but if we do make our promises good, then that side of the House should be fair enough to give us credit for what we have done. When I first came to Congress I made a fight on this very question. I fought the extra month's pay for employees of the House and Senate, and I am pleased with the action of my party when it cuts off these useless employees and this extra month's pay. Both are petty graft and a useless squandering of the people's money.

Mr. Chairman, the rôle of critic has been the chief part played by the Republican minority since this special session was called. They have not only criticized the Democratic majority of the House when it acted on its own initiative, but they have even criticized it for passing a bill proposed by a Republican President. What sort of a party have you gentlemen, anyway? There is a little bunch of you over there under the control of the distinguished ex-Speaker, who are as bitter toward the other little bunch who voted with the Democrats and the Republican President as you are toward the Democrats. What has become of the insurgents? Absolutely gone over to Mr. CANNON. When he was Speaker, you abused him and his policies. Now you are following wherever he leads. He has become in fact your leader. The man you elected minority leader is not your leader except in name.

Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of the House and the country to the character of leadership the minority would have if he were really the leader in fact as he is in name. From the very first he began to use such adjectives as "silly" and "foolish," "idiotic," and such phrases as "stupid ignorance" and "I did not expect any better from that side of the House." He at the very beginning seemed to think that great leadership could be accomplished by such denunciation and by the use of adjectives and not by argument and ideas. He at once assumed the rôle of critic and of Sir Oracle of the House. He should investigate more and talk less.

Let us now examine some of his criticisms of the Democratic free-list bill and see whether his criticism was just or unjust.

On April 26 the elected leader of the Republican minority made a speech in which, as shown on page 603 of the Record, he used this language:

What are agricultural implements? I await the answer of any of the distinguished gentlemen in this House who claim to be the farmer's friend. What are agricultural implements? [Applause on the Republican side.] The bill says "All other agricultural implements, of any kind or description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts."

What are agricultural implements? Do they include horticultural implements? Do they include market-garden implements? I suppose every one believes that a mowing machine is an agricultural implement; but is a wheelbarrow?

Then again he says:

I can not run my farm without an ax. Can you? Are axes agricultural implements? Are they to come free?

Then this colloquy occurs:

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. I will yield to the gentleman for information.

Mr. STANLEY. I am not surprised that the agriculturist from Chicago is pining to know what an agricultural implement is.

Mr. MANN. I am.

Mr. STANLEY. I do not think it a matter of satire. I think it is a demonstration of candid ignorance.

Mr. MANN. That is right. Why does not the gentleman give me the information?

Mr. STANLEY. An agricultural implement, generally speaking, is an implement used in tilling the soil, whether you are raising a potato or raising an ear of corn. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, if this criticism is just and wise, then the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] should have indulged in it. If it is a fact, as he states, that this is loose language and will let in vastly more than was intended, then the Democratic Ways and Means Committee have made an error in using such language, because it may impair the revenue of the Government and bring about a condition not contemplated by the Ways and Means Committee. If such is the case, then the gentleman is a wise legislator. If such is not the case, then the gentleman from Illinois, to use his own expression, is "unwise" and "does not know what he is talking about"; and as stated by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] "it is a demonstration of candid ignorance." This is a charitable construction to place upon the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois, for if he knew better and then took such a position, he is, to say the least of it, very unfair.

The gentleman from Illinois shows a complete ignorance of the authorities in the construction of tariff statutes. A little

investigation on his part would have saved him from such error. Pope, in his essay on criticism, says:

'Tis hard to say, if greater want of skill
Appear in writing or in judging ill,
But of the two, less dangerous is the offense
To weary our patience than mislead our sense.

It is pardonable for the gentleman from Illinois, as he often does, to weary our patience, but how can we pardon him for attempting to mislead our sense. He seems to have misled his own party, for they applauded his criticism very loudly.

This is the language which he so harshly criticizes:

And all other agricultural implements, of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned or not.

This language seems very broad in terms, and a careless critic like the gentleman from Illinois is likely to be misled into the belief that saws, pumps, chains, wheelbarrows, and so forth, ad infinitum, might come in free of duty. I will say that I would like to see all of these implements free, but let us examine the decisions a moment to see whether this is true or not.

I call the attention of the committee to a cardinal rule of construction. It was laid down for the first time by Judge Marshall, when he was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, for the construction of statutes generally, and the courts, following this rule in construing statutes of this character, have construed them against the contention of the gentleman from Illinois. The general rule laid down by Judge Marshall was that where two statutes were apparently in conflict the statute that mentions a matter *eo nomine* should prevail over a statute that refers to the same matter in general terms, although broad enough to cover the matter in the statute which mentions the matter *eo nomine*. The gentleman from Illinois, in his criticism of this bill, certainly had not investigated the decisions of the Supreme Court and the late decisions of the other courts. If he had, he could not have made this statement. He asks this question:

What are agricultural implements? I await the answer of any distinguished gentlemen in this House who claim to be the farmers' friends. What are agricultural implements?

And then he says:

Every day the Customs Court is now deciding questions of great importance with reference to the meaning of a law which endeavors to be very technical and very particular, but under the provisions of this bill, if it becomes a law, there will be an army of lawyers and importers and agents endeavoring to ascertain what it means.

I thought at first that perhaps the Ways and Means Committee had made a mistake in writing in this bill the language:

Of any kind and description.

But in investigating the question, I find that my confidence in the ability of the gentleman from Illinois is greatly on the wane. He was simply talking, and, to use an expression of the late Judge De Armond, of Missouri, he was "simply ranting, and not reasoning."

Now, we are all familiar with the fact that the general rule is laid down that in the importation of articles the statute is always construed favorably for the importer and against the Government. But the first well-considered case directly in point, to which I want to call your attention, is *Movius v. Arthur* (95 U. S., p. 154). The court, in discussing the construction of revenue statutes apparently in conflict, held that the general term shall yield to the specific, and this is the language of the court:

It is a general rule in the construction of revenue statutes that specific provisions for duties on a particular article are not repealed or affected by the general words of subsequent statutes, although the language is sufficiently broad to cover the article.

That is a cardinal rule of construction, namely, that though the general provisions of the statute may be broad enough to cover the article, if the article is mentioned by name anywhere else in the tariff bill, the succeeding statute does not affect that article by name, although the subsequent provisions might be broad enough to cover it.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], if he had been aware of these decisions, could not have made that statement unless he was willing to willfully deceive the House, and I do not intend to say that the gentleman would willfully deceive anybody. So we must attribute it to the fact that it was ignorance on his part of the law and not the fact that he intended to willfully mislead us.

Now, let us see what else he says about it. In speaking of saws, he wanted to know if a saw was an agricultural implement. Why, gentlemen of the committee, it is immaterial whether it is or whether it is not. It can not come in under this farmers' free-list bill, even though one of its uses might be that of an agricultural implement. As a matter of fact, if saws were not mentioned *eo nomine* in the Payne bill, but a general clause for carpenters' tools instead had been adopted placing a duty upon them, saws would be classified as carpenters' tools, because this is their principal use.

But it is not material to this discussion to determine to which class a saw properly belongs, because in another section in the Payne-Aldrich bill saws of all kinds are mentioned by name, and under all the decisions this fixes the status of saws. You can not repeal a clause of the Payne-Aldrich bill or change the status of an article mentioned therein unless you mention it by name or mention in the amendment the article whose status is to be changed; so the criticism of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is not a just one against the Ways and Means Committee, because the law and the decisions of the courts, without a single dissenting opinion, are at variance with the statement of the gentleman from Illinois. [Applause on the Democratic side.] His quarrel, then, is with the Supreme Court and with the other courts of the country, and is not with the Democratic Ways and Means Committee.

Why, he wanted to know about trace chains and wheelbarrows and various and sundry other articles, and asked whether they were agricultural implements or not. He wanted to know whether a pruning knife was an agricultural implement, and he wanted to know whether horticultural tools were agricultural implements or not. It is immaterial whether they are classed as agricultural implements or not because in other sections of the Payne-Aldrich bill all of these articles are mentioned by name, and it is utterly impossible for any man to reach the conclusion that he reaches, under the decisions of the courts that they might come in free, unless for the purpose of deliberately trying to deceive the country and place the Democratic Party in a false light.

I am not going to read all of these decisions, but this is a general rule laid down in Morgan's Digest of the United States Tariff and Customs Laws, published in 1895, eighth edition, on page 326:

It is a well-settled rule that general legislation must give way to special legislation on the same subject, whether the provisions are found in the same statute or in different statutes; and general provisions must be interpreted so as to embrace only cases to which the special provisions are not applicable, although the general provisions may be sufficiently broad to comprehend articles under the special provisions. And the rule applies as well to statutes reducing duties as to those increasing them.

Now, in support of that proposition of law I want to invite the attention of the committee briefly to the case of *Arthur v. Labey* (96 U. S., p. 112), where the court construes a clause similar to this—a clause exactly like this. This is the rule laid down by the court in that decision:

The rule, that for the purpose of the tariff laws, the commercial designation of an article among traders and importers when clearly established fixes its character and that when Congress has designated an article by a specific name and imposed a duty upon it, general terms in a subsequent act or a later part of the same act, although sufficiently broad to comprehend such article, are not applicable to it and are not deprived of their application by the expression "not otherwise provided for." * * * A specific designation *eo nomine* must prevail over the general words and a commercial designation is the standard by which the dutiable character of the article is fixed.

And on page 117 of this case the court specifically affirms the doctrine in *Movius v. Arthur*.

Every article that the gentleman from Illinois criticizes the bill for is mentioned by name in some other clause in the Payne-Aldrich bill and can not be affected by this farmers' free-list bill. And yet he would have the country believe that it was carelessly prepared.

Then you may ask, Why should you put it in? It is necessary, as you will conclude if you read the decisions of the court on this question. It is necessary that you have some sort of a shotgun clause, because in the rapidly developing inventions in machinery for certain specific purposes frequently a machine that is doing a certain work to-day will be completely replaced by a different one to-morrow. Therefore, in order that the revenues of the Government may not be impaired they have put these clauses in for the purpose of embracing articles of a certain specific kind that do a specific thing.

In addition to that, if you intend to put on the free list articles to be used by a certain class of people, and if some invention or some great addition to an agricultural implement should be made it would be necessary, if it might be classed as belonging in some other schedule in the bill, and if you desire to be sure to include it in the free-list bill, that you have a general clause in order that the agricultural implements may be sure to come in free—that is to say, every agricultural implement not specifically mentioned in some other clause in the Payne-Aldrich bill—would fall under this general provision of the farmers' free-list bill and not under any other general provision of some other clause of the Payne-Aldrich bill, although broad enough to cover it. This is the reason for this general clause in this free-list bill, and is the reason why the Democratic Ways and Means Committee put it in.

Now, without reading them, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a few decisions of the Supreme Court on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, without reading them, certain decisions of the court. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The decisions referred to are as follows:

The rule that an article, dutiable by its specific designation, will not be affected by the general words of the same or another statute, which would otherwise embrace it, applies as well to statutes reducing duties as to those increasing them. This rule applies both to statutes reducing and to statutes increasing duties. (*Arthur v. Rheims*, 96 U. S., 143.)

When an article is designated in a tariff act by a specific name, and a duty imposed upon it by such name, general terms in a later part of the same act, although sufficiently broad to comprehend such article, are not applicable to it. (*Robertson v. Glendenning*, 132 U. S., 153, Chief Justice Fuller delivering the opinion.)

Under the principles laid down in *Arthur v. Morrison*, *Arthur v. Labey*, and *Arthur v. Unkart*, the specific designation should prevail, and the judgment in favor of the plaintiff for the excess of duties paid by him was right and must be affirmed. (*Arthur v. Zimmerman*, 93 U. S., 124.)

In cases of doubt in the construction of a customs act courts resolve the doubt in favor of the importer. * * * Where a customs act imposes a duty upon an article by a specific name, general terms in the act, though sufficiently broad to cover it, are not applicable to it. * * * The article will be classified by its specific designation rather than under a general description. (*American Net & Twine Co. v. Worthington*, 141 U. S., 468; *Brown, Justice*.)

The settled rule of statutory construction is that general legislation must give way to special legislation on the same subject whether the provisions are found in the same statute or in different statutes, and general provisions must be interpreted so as to embrace only cases to which special provisions are not applicable.

Where a duty is imposed upon an article by a specific name this will determine its classification, although the article may be included in other words of general description in another part of the same act. (*Arnold v. U. S.*, p. 495, vol. 147, 51 Fed. Rep.; *Magone, collector, v. King et al.*, p. 525.)

The case falls within the general rule that, where a tariff act imposes a duty on an article by a specific name or description, general terms in the act, though embracing it broadly, are not applicable to it; the general must give way to the particular. (*Brister et al. v. U. S.*, 59 Fed. Rep., 452.)

Mr. SISSON. All of these decisions are perfectly clear, and there is a line of decisions too numerous to quote or to even cite, which are at complete variance with the position, argument, and conclusions of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] states that this bill is sectional. I regret that anybody should say anything in this country about sections. I do not believe that the people of this country are thinking now so much about the sections from which people come as about an effort to serve the whole people regardless of section. [Applause.] The gentleman was not fair in his statement to this committee when he said that the southern cotton farmer was benefited to the amount of \$6,877,667, whereas the people of the North got practically nothing.

Why did not my friend state that only about one-third, or a little less than one-third of the farmers of the United States live in the South? Does he understand that only about one-third of the corn and grain is produced in the South? Did he not know that all of the sacks in which corn and wheat are sacked go into the great Middle West and the mighty West beyond? Did he not know that burlaps and sackings and articles of that kind and character were put on the free list in order that the northern and western farmer might be compensated for the fact that some of his articles were placed upon the free list? Why did not the gentleman state that in his speech? Because I presume he expects to make some political capital out of it without stating the truth in it. Why did not the gentleman tell the whole truth when he was making his speech, and why did he not tell you that the Treasury Department's statement shows—he claimed to be reading from a statement of the Treasury Department—that cotton bagging only paid duties amounting to \$99,033, while on sacks the duty was \$970,715.

Now, as to burlaps, I want to tell you that very little, if indeed any, cotton bagging is made out of burlap of the kind and character mentioned here; but burlaps, which are used by the western farmers and by the farmers of the Middle West, paid duties to the amount of \$5,807,919, and we gave up that amount to the western and middle western farmers and the farmers of the North. Why did he not state that when he was stating the facts to you? [Applause on the Democratic side.] If he wanted to be fair, why did he not tell you that the smallest item, less than \$100,000, was the item on bagging and ties. Yet he was unfair enough to state that the Ways and Means Committee was bringing in a sectional bill. If I were disposed to be of the kind that my distinguished friend is, I could in turn say that it is a sectional bill, because you are giving the

northern and the western farmers the largest proportion and the biggest end of the proposition. I would not mention Mason and Dixon's line if my friend from Illinois had not done so, but two-thirds of the farmers of the country live north of Mason and Dixon's line, and they get seven or eight times as much of the benefit of this \$6,000,000 as the farmers of the South do. So, I say, there is no sectionalism in the bill favorable to the South. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is evident that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE], if he intended to be truthful and fair, did not know what he was talking about. He confuses "jute bagging" with "burlap." Everyone will concede that free "bagging" will be to the advantage of the southern cotton farmer. But free admission of "burlap" will not only be of no help to the southern cotton farmer, but if anything will be to his disadvantage.

Burlap is not used by the cotton farmer. It is used for making burlap bags and for baling manufactured fabrics. Jute "bagging," used for baling cotton, is a much coarser article than "burlap." Burlap is used for sacking cement and grain and by manufacturers to cover different kinds of bales of cloth. Nearly all of this is used in the North by northern manufacturers and by northern and western farmers. None is used or manufactured in the South. Therefore, the South is not interested in "burlap," but in "jute bagging."

I may say to the gentleman, however, that if the South were disposed to complain, that this would be a just ground for complaint. It is estimated that about 350,000 bales of cotton are made up in this country into a very coarse cotton goods known as osnaburgs. One of the principal uses of osnaburg is for sacking grain and cement, so free burlap is brought into direct competition with osnaburg, a southern product. This will not help the southern farmer. It will not hurt him, but it will tend to hurt our southern cotton mills that are making osnaburgs.

In sacking cement osnaburg is now chiefly used, but free burlap means that cement will be sacked in burlap. This is only one of many ways in which burlap may take the place of cotton.

If this bill had been prepared with a view to southern interests, it would not have made burlaps free. If you want to benefit the South, put the duty so high on burlap that no American can afford to import burlap, and we will force the price of osnaburg up and at the same time increase the price of cotton. An examination of the figures showing the importations will show how utterly the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] is in error. In 1910 there was imported into the United States \$699,940 worth of jute bagging for covering cotton.

In 1910 there was imported into the United States \$20,351,810.46 worth of burlap for sacking grain, corn, wheat, oats, flour, salt, coal, cement, and for oilcloth, upholstery, and other purposes. Twenty millions for the North and West and less than \$700,000 for the South, and yet the gentleman says it is sectional.

The tariff tax paid on bagging for covering cotton in 1910 was \$99,033.28. The tariff tax on burlap for the same year for sacking corn, wheat, oats, coal, and so forth, was \$5,371,427.80. The North and West get about 50 times as much out of this item in this bill as the South gets. Brother PRINCE, how is this for sectionalism? The South gets one dollar and you get fifty, and yet you complain about the amount the South gets out of the bill. You are hard to please; you are too selfish. It was not intended to be a sectional bill. It was intended to give the western farmer cheap sacks and cheap binding twine. It was intended to give to the farmer of the South cheap bagging and cheap ties and to deal with the farmers all over this country exactly alike; and it would have been a sectional bill if the Ways and Means Committee had not done exactly what they did do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It has also been stated that these articles are produced or manufactured, the majority of them, in the North. That is true. I do not believe I overstate the case when I say that four-fifths of all our manufactured articles come from the North. You of the North are a manufacturing people. You are peculiarly fortunate in that sense; but in this instance it just happens, gentlemen of the committee, that there are a number of bagging factories in the South. There are manufactories engaged in the business of making cotton ties. They make over \$1,000,000 worth of bagging, and I am not able to state the exact number of ties, but a great many ties are manufactured in the South by southern manufacturers. As a matter of fact, the greater portion of bagging and ties are manufactured in the North, and so is the greater portion of nearly all the manufactures that enter into every southern home manufactured in the North. We are your patrons and your customers; but this bill, in giving to the southern cotton farmer free bagging and ties, is only doing that simple justice that ought to be done if you

give free sacks and free binding twine and free wire for the farmers out West.

For over 100 years the southern people have been engaged in raising cotton. Cotton is the one commodity produced in the United States which always brings into our banks and into our Treasury pure gold. It has been the enormous production of the cotton fields of the South that has made the balance of trade in our favor for over 50 years.

If you take away from our international trade that vast crop which this last year with the seed amounted to something like a billion dollars—over \$800,000,000 worth of raw cotton, and of that \$800,000,000 over \$400,000,000 of it was sold to one country alone—if you were to take out of the business of the United States this great gold producer for the Treasury and banks of this country, it would be a terrible calamity on the American people.

Notwithstanding this fact, these toiling and patient farmers in the South without complaint have had no protection from any source. They have not asked any protection; they only ask a fair, square deal at the hands of the Government, and thank God the time is coming when the people of Maine, of New Hampshire, of Vermont, of Rhode Island, of Connecticut, of Illinois, and all the great States will be willing to deal with these questions irrespective of what State is affected, whatever may be the temper of some of the northern and southern politicians. The business interests of this country have got tired of this talk of sectionalism, and we ought to begin to legislate irrespective of congressional districts. [Applause.]

But it is also said, and was said on the floor of the House, that the southern cotton farmer got pay for his bagging and ties, that the cotton was weighed on the scales, and that the farmer was paid for the gross weight. That was formerly true, that the cotton was weighed and they would deduct the tare; but it created so much trouble before the war that the result was that the business men throughout the country figured a certain amount of tare on a bale of cotton, and then made the quotations less the tare.

I shall not discuss the history of the matter nor how it came to be adopted, but state as a fact that the Liverpool Exchange, the New York Exchange, and the Cotton Exchange in New Orleans, which makes the price of all cotton, deducts 6 per cent, or 30 pounds, from the gross weight of every bale of cotton, a standard bale being 500 pounds. Every cotton producer will tell you that the bagging and ties on a bale of cotton will only weigh from 19 to 22 pounds. Therefore when you take the tare off you will defraud the farmer, if he has a 500-pound bale, of 9 to 11 pounds of cotton.

Now, it may be curious to some people to know how it is done. In making up the quotation they send out for cotton they figure about 60 points for tare; for example, if cotton was worth 12.60 the quotations for cotton would be 12 cents, because net cotton only is paid for. A net price is given for the cotton so that the bagging and the ties are not included. It is only necessary for gentlemen who doubt this statement to look at the rules of the cotton exchanges, and they will find that they specifically provide for the 6 per cent tare. It is perfectly apparent that the tare is figured out and the farmer himself loses the weight of the bagging and ties and does not receive pay for them. So, if gentlemen understand thoroughly the proposition, the statement would not be made here that the southern farmer gets pay for his bagging and ties when he sells his cotton and therefore makes a profit, and that for this reason he did not pay the tariff and the duty should remain.

There was a learned Senator in the other Chamber last year who asserted the proposition on the floor of the Senate, and it took a great deal of discussion to convince him that it was not true. It is just like this tariff business. The farmer pays it without knowing when or how.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a good deal said about the source of revenue, if you lost practically \$10,000,000 by this farmers' free-list bill. Of course the first thing that every government ought to do, or that those connected with the Government and having charge of legislation ought to do, is to run the Government at the very lowest figure possible to obtain efficient government. They ought to destroy every useless office. They ought to get the Government down as nearly as possible to a business basis, and then, when that is done, raise only just enough revenue to run the Government on this basis.

The present condition is a peculiar one because, to a large extent, the expenses of this Government have been fixed by a party that has gone out of power. It was fixed by a House—and that is one of the evils of the Federal Constitution which ought to be remedied—that was repudiated at the polls last November and which came back here in December and for three months legislated for a constituency that has repudiated it.

This is said in no partisan sense, because as the political wheels of fortune turn it may roll around that this side of the House may be repudiated; but it would be equally wrong for this side of the House to legislate after they had been repudiated at the polls. However, the last House, or a large part of them, having no responsibility to a constituency, were permitted and did vote on these bills and did fix the expenses of the Government, so that it is almost impossible for this Democratic House to reduce the expenses of the Government, because so many fixed charges have been created by the last Republican House and Senate which must be paid out of the Treasury. It is now incumbent on the majority in the House to be sure that in dealing with the tariff and the revenues it gets enough money to run the Government. That is our highest duty, because as Democrats we believe in levying a tariff only for revenue, but we believe in levying enough tariff to get enough revenue. The Government must meet promptly her every obligation. Therefore it is necessary that a good deal of care be used in changing these schedules. I say this not because I have any sort of patience with this infamous doctrine of protection, which is so hateful to me, but with the necessities of the Government as they are to-day the Democrats must raise enough revenue, though they are compelled to permit an evil which has done more to corrupt public men and done more to send vicious men to this Capitol looking to their special interests, and more to induce capital to buy voters to send men to Congress, than all of the other influences combined. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If a man has built up his business behind certain protection, he says that he must have his protection or his business is destroyed, and Republicans levy tribute then upon his business, stating that he may have it protected and cared for through them.

You need not endeavor to frighten me by calling me a free trader. I am not frightened with the term, but I am dealing with a condition and not with a theory. If I had the making of the law, I certainly would not write the Constitution as it is now written with reference to revenue, but the fathers who made this Republic were afraid that they would not get Members to come to Congress; they were afraid it would not be ratified and held together, and they devised this iniquitous system of raising revenue, so that the people would not know when they paid it. I would not be so much opposed to this tariff if, as a matter of fact, the increased price, because of the duties on articles on the dutiable list, went into the Treasury. I would not say a word, because the Government would then get the benefit of it, but the thing that is so iniquitous is that during the Dingley tariff—and I have not had the opportunity to investigate the question so far as the Payne bill is concerned, but it is even worse under it—I found that the tax was small compared to the enormous tribute which we pay the protected industries. When during the debate on the Payne bill I stated the amount of tribute, some of my Democratic colleagues said that I had overstated it. However, a distinguished Senator at the other end of the Capitol, the late lamented Senator Dolliver, in one of the best tariff speeches that I heard during the last session of Congress, arrived at the same conclusion. I do not think that the distinguished Senator ever saw the speech that I made on the question, but I was very much gratified to see that I was confirmed by one so learned as the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Let me state the facts again for your consideration in order that you may see how wicked and iniquitous this present tariff system is. We got, in 1905, the last official statistics that I have examined, about three hundred and odd millions of dollars from impost or tariff taxes. During that year the total consumption was something like \$14,000,000,000. The average duty was about 45 cents and a fraction, so that if the Dingley tariff was a scientific bill, if the Dingley tariff was a tariff which was made in accordance with scientific rules and gave the protection which its friends say was needed, and if the men on this side of the tariff wall took advantage of that protection, the people paid over and above what they ought to have paid to the manufacturers who are engaged in producing the four thousand and odd articles on the dutiable list the enormous sum of something like \$4,000,000,000 over and above the world's price for these articles as a net profit. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When I made this statement here my friends said I was mistaken, and yet Senator Dolliver made that statement on the floor of the Senate, that it amounted to about \$4,000,000,000 more than the 90,000,000 American people ought to pay. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This is the enormous profit which you put into private hands through the arm of the Government. To that we object seriously. Mr. Gladstone, when he made an assault upon the protected interests of England, at first had a terrible struggle, because the protected industries in England claimed

that a low duty or free trade would destroy them; that there would be smokeless factories; that there would be men out of employment; and that all of the English people would be put in a condition of dire distress. Yet he went before the people with the simple statement:

I will not with my vote and with my consent give one Englishman an advantage over another Englishman. I will not permit one Englishman by right of a special privilege from the Government to extract from the pockets of another Englishman a tribute not for the Government, but as a private profit.

Therefore he advocated a tariff which would only tax the noncompetitive articles, so that the increased price would go into the treasury of England. It was only a short time after this policy went into effect until the English fleet was in every sea, until the mighty leviathans of the deep bore the products of the English factories to all the world and brought back the raw materials which has made England to-day the strong and powerful nation that she is, and terrorizes the Republicans when they begin to think about being put in competition with her. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But since we have a condition and not a theory to deal with, it is absolutely necessary that we raise the revenue to run this Government. The Republicans want to know where we are going to get the revenue. Under the present régime you tax beer, whisky, and playing cards. I introduced a bill in the last session of Congress, but for a reason which I will not state now that bill did not get out of the Committee on Ways and Means. I have introduced the same bill this session. It is a bill to put an internal-revenue tax upon the manufacture and sale of all pistols, dirk knives, sword canes, and cartridges of all kinds and character. Now, you tax whisky and playing cards. Do not pistols, cards, and whisky go together? Ought not they to be dealt with in the same manner? [Applause on the Democratic side.] The number of pistols sold in the United States is something like 500,000 annually. I would like to ask this question: Why should we not place a tax upon these articles? Will some gentleman rise in his seat and tell for what good purpose a pistol is made?

Why should not the men engaged in the infamous business of manufacturing deadly weapons and inducing our boys to purchase them pay some of the expense of running the Government? The man who manufactures liquor is denounced in pulpit and press because of the business he is engaged in. The retailer of intoxicating liquors is denounced as an outcast. They are both required to pay an internal-revenue tax because their business tends to evil and not good. When men buy liquor they are buying that which causes them harm, not good. Yet a saloon would rarely be stained with human blood if the man drinking intoxicating liquor did not have in his pocket a concealed weapon. The liquor, in the absence of the deadly weapon, might cause men to get into broils and fistcuffs, but rarely would there be blood shed. But the liquor fires up men's blood and causes the quarrel, and then, armed with a deadly weapon, the quarrel ends in a tragedy.

If all the tears that these manufacturers of deadly weapons have been directly the cause of could be collected together, they would produce a mighty river of sorrow. If all the groans they have caused could be concentrated into one sound, it would shake the universe with agony. If the blood they have caused to be shed could be seen together, it would make a crimson ocean. If the widows and orphans which they have made could be gathered together, it would make an army that no man could number. If all the felons that they have caused could be gathered into one place of confinement, it would convert the earth into one vast prison. If every gallows they have caused to be erected could be seen together, it would make a mighty monument of horror. If all they have cost the people of the earth could be converted into food and clothing, there would be no more want, hunger, or poverty.

These men engaged in the manufacture of these deadly weapons ought to be looked upon with more disrespect than men engaged in almost any other business. Why should it be legalized? This is a civilized country. No savage red man now roams our fields nor lurks in the alleys of our cities. No wild beasts infest our fair country. There is no reason why this business should be fostered. They supply the means which cause murderous men of civilization to be more dreaded than the savage red man or wild beast. These manufacturers of pistols, dirks, and stiletos are exercising their ingenuity to make customers for their deadly wares. They fill our newspapers and magazines with attractive advertisements to induce our boys to buy pistols that produce murderers.

Why not tax them? What good reason can we give why they should not be taxed? Whisky, cards, and pistols go together. Why not tax them together? Whisky and cards would be less

harmful if there were no concealed weapons. Whisky now bears its burden of internal revenue; playing cards are also taxed. Whisky can be put to good uses. Cards may be used in innocent social amusements, but to what good use can a pistol or a dirk or a stiletto be put? They are made to kill human beings; not in the open, not to give a fair chance and equal opportunity, but to cowardly take your fellow man unawares and deprive him of his life. Why should men carry them except for this reason? There can be no other.

Let us tax pistols, not plows. [Applause.]

Let us tax dirk knives, not disk harrows. [Applause.]

Let us tax pistol cartridges, not corn planters. [Applause.]

If men will engage in manufacturing pistols, dirks, stilettos, and other such weapons for sale, let them be compelled to pay the Government something when they do it. It is not the province of the United States Government to prevent their manufacture, but it is her right to levy a tax upon them to help pay the expenses of the Government, and it should be exercised at this time. Our Treasury needs the revenue. Let us get at least \$2,000,000 by taxing this evil. It can not produce any evil, but a great good.

Too many of the great daily newspapers are owned and supported by the protected interests of the country, and they discourage any movement to raise revenue except through the tariff, which enables their masters to support them, to rob the people of more than \$10 where the Government gets \$1 in taxes. So to raise \$2,000,000 by a tax upon deadly weapons and cartridges would cost the protected manufacturer \$10,000,000 in profits, because you could then put a few necessities on the free list. They would rather let these men who manufacture deadly weapons and put them into the hands of the lawless for the express purpose of murdering American citizens continue in their aiding and abetting in all the homicides in the country than to give up the protection afforded by the collection of \$2,000,000 of import duties. That is, when Congress assumes this attitude, it seems that they would make it cheap for men engaged in manufacturing deadly weapons by leaving the burden upon honest consumers, the men, women, children, widows, and orphans who toil, rather than tax these men who are engaged in manufacturing these deadly weapons.

The only people who are consulted, the only advice that comes to Congress, is from the rich. Congress is too far away from the people and too close to the interests. If all the good men in America who believe in placing a tax upon deadly weapons would write to their Congressmen and Senators the mail would be loaded down. Let every minister of the Gospel, of whatever faith or persuasion, every college professor, every school-teacher, every banker, merchant, farmer, and all law-abiding people who love life and not death, who would dispense sunshine and not shadow, who would have the wine of joy and not the blood of sorrow to flow in our land, who would remove from the human eye a tear and from the heart a pang of pain be heard from in this land in the matter of taxing these deadly weapons manufactured and sold by these men engaged in this hellish business and there will be a unanimous voice in favor of it.

My own people are sometimes charged with being "pistol toters." [Applause and laughter.] We are also charged with putting too cheap a valuation on human life. Well, why do you make these things and sell them to us? Either stop making them or stop lecturing us. [Laughter.] If you are going to continue to manufacture them, then tax them along with cards and whisky and compel those who indulge the luxury to pay for it. You can get \$2,500,000 or \$3,000,000 of revenue from this source.

My distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] suggests another remedy. There is now a tax of 2 cents a pack on playing cards. Why not make it 10 cents? This would tax another business to an extent that the Government would derive some real benefit from.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. What would be the effect of your tax on pistols on marksmanship? Would that tend to discourage the practice of the noble art?

Mr. SISSON. I think so; and if the mark was a human being it would be well to stop the training. Our boys shoot too true now.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I hope the gentleman is not going to put me in the position of opposing his effort to tax pistols. There is a great deal being said in the various civilized countries of the world as to making the citizen soldiery capable of handling firearms and hitting the marks at which they aim. Would it have a tendency to discourage that?

Mr. SISSON. I am glad to know that my good friend is not opposed to my bill. Let us furnish them with rifles and not with pistols. Battles are won with rifles, not pistols.

Mr. SIMS. And if you are dealing with deadly weapons, do you not think you ought to do something with automobiles in the way of tax?

Mr. SISSON. I am glad my distinguished friend suggests automobiles in connection with deadly weapons. I am a country boy, and am now living in a small town, and I have done more dodging and ducking to keep out of the way of those things than all other dangers combined since I have been in Washington. I think the gentleman from Tennessee properly classes them as deadly weapons. They, too, would be a splendid subject for an internal-revenue tax.

AGRICULTURE.

Now, gentlemen, I shall not detain the committee longer. I want to say, in concluding my remarks, that whatever injures or tends to injure agriculture, whatever tends to destroy the prosperity of the farm, will absolutely destroy the prosperity of this country. No man questions that statement. This is why I am supporting this bill. Let us give farmers free tools to work with.

The great cities can not thrive, they can not live a single month, without the produce of the farm that is carried there to feed them. The great factories can not run without that produce. There is one business that always adds to the wealth of the world, and it is the only business that adds absolutely to the wealth of the world something that did not exist before. You may take, if you please, the iron in the bowels of the earth, and you may convert it into different shapes and into usable forms, but you have produced no more iron. You may go into the gold mines and into the silver mines and you can dig out the last ounce, but there is one business that men engage in by which they always, every year, add something to the wealth of the world without taking anything from it. You plant and you reap ten, twenty, yea one hundred fold of new wealth, wealth that did not exist before, and the world is richer thereby and no wealth has been used up. The farmer is the basis of all our civilization. Upon his broad shoulders rest all the balance of the human family. It is the duty of Congress to remove from these shoulders every burden that it can. Whether we live in the country or in the city our general prosperity will be advanced by advancing the interest of agriculture.

The farmer needs more education and training than any other class of people. It requires the highest degree of intellectual development to make a successful farmer. It is necessary that he understand how to improve his land by building it up with proper cultivation. To do this requires some scientific knowledge. Farm management, to be successful, requires good business training.

In order to bring about this result the Government should furnish him with all available information that it can secure from experiment and observation. Every effort should be made to make country life desirable. People have been deserting their farms because life has not been attractive to their boys and girls. They long for better social opportunities and more lucrative avocations. To prevent our farms being deserted we must bring about a condition different from the past. The country boy and girl must be given equal opportunities with those of the towns and cities. This can only be done by giving them good roads, good schools, and good churches. This will enable the farmer not only to get the products of his farm quickly and with less cost to market, but it will enable his family to enjoy the better opportunities to worship and his children better schools to attend. The successful management of the farm, the improvement of the farm, making country life desirable, filling the country with good schools and good churches, building good roads, so that the farmers may not only get their produce cheaply to market, but that they may also enjoy the opportunities of worship, that their children may attend school, and that they may come in larger numbers and increase the efficiency of the schools—in order that you may maintain this strong foundation of all life it is absolutely essential that every acre of land be made to produce the greatest amount during each given year. In addition to this, you must remove from his shoulders every unfair and unnecessary burden, so that farm life may be made as profitable as possible.

But under the system that has been in vogue under the system of taxation which has prevailed for 50 years the farmer has been the one man who has received no benefit, but all the burden from the system of taxation which you have put in operation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is utterly impossible to devise a plan—human ingenuity can not devise a plan—where you may enable men to get enormous prices for food products unless you make somebody else suffer. I believe the farmer is entitled to a fair and full remuneration for every day's labor that he puts on the farm. But he does not get that, for under this system of protection which you have instituted, under the special privileges which have grown up under your protective system, a few men have been able to get together and control the great food markets and fix the price to the farmer and then fix the price to the consumer, and thus hurt both.

Who is there that does not believe that the price of both cattle and meat to-day in the great cities is not absolutely fixed by the Beef Trust? Who does not know that in the fixing of the price of nearly all the necessities of life they are fixed either by monopolies or by trade agreements? I have sometimes had my doubts whether the Sherman Antitrust Act was a blessing. It has proven a complete failure, because it has not been enforced. It has been a mockery. Illegal combinations have gone merrily along with full knowledge of those who should prevent it. Even Presidents have condoned its violation. Law officers and courts stand dumb and silent before their masters and decline to prosecute. If the Federal courts of the country had been in hearty sympathy with the law, if the administrations had been heartily in sympathy with the prosecutions at the very beginning of the illegal combination of capital, they might have prevented that condition which to-day confronts us and which is gradually growing to be world-wide. In other words, they have so much power to-day by the vast combination of capital that it is extremely doubtful whether, if any party that comes into power should endeavor to lay a restraining hand upon their methods, it could prevent them by a single meeting of a single board of directors of one institution from deciding to close down an industry for the sole purpose of bringing about a condition that will place the laboring man out of employment; and then, when he is helpless, appeal to his hunger and to his wants, and by this method he is coerced and forced to go with the party which will restore trust control. Whether it be a Republican Party that endeavors to deal with the situation, or whether it be the Democratic Party that deals with the situation, whatever may be the party that may attempt to regulate and control them in that business, the question is whether the trusts will not be able to drive any party out of power that will endeavor to regulate them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is one of the great problems which the people of this age have to solve. It must be solved, of course, and I believe it will be. But it is no boy's task, it is no small day's work, that has to be done. We must not invade property rights. I do not believe, however, that property rights should prevail over the rights of man. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But we must have a safe preservation of property rights, because, as Mr. Calhoun has said, men who have the acquisitive desire will exercise that desire so long as they are safe in their property under the law. Therefore we must preserve property rights, but money should yield to man, and property should yield to the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Because property, business, machinery, all the marvelous and mighty mechanism of the industrial world, if properly used and conducted, and if their products are not controlled by selfish men, are a great and everlasting blessing to mankind; but there are many of these great institutions whose titanic power is equal to the ceaseless labor of a million slaves; and if the owners of these mighty machines, the owners of the great factories and industrial enterprises, the owners of the great transportation companies, if they are selfish and are unwilling to give to labor that opportunity, that right, that fair and just division of earnings, then it is absolutely necessary to the preservation of free government and to the happiness of mankind that the strong arm of the law be laid upon these great engines of oppression and that they be compelled to do right. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is not a particle of socialism in my make-up. I am just as far from socialism as I am from anarchy, but when these people with all their power are capable of producing so much misery and woe some means must be devised for their control, and whatever that may be, whatever the wisdom of man may devise to that end, I pledge my hand and my heart to the support of that measure. [Applause.] I hope this bill will pass the House. I hope it will pass the Senate. I trust it will be but the beginning of the solution of this great problem. I do not want to wait until the power of these oppressors becomes so strong and world-wide that one nation can not deal with them. If it gets to be an international affair, then God help the people! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, when I was a boy I read the story of the Riddle of the Sphinx. The King of Thebes had been annoyed for a long time by the sphinx that lived in the rocks near one of the roads through a mountain pass that his subjects were compelled to travel in getting into and out of his kingdom. The sphinx would ask each passer-by a riddle, and if he failed to answer it the sphinx would devour him. This caused great terror to the people and great distress to the king. At last the King of Thebes heard of Oedipus, a wise and good man, and he sent for him and asked him, "Can you deliver us from the terrible sphinx?" Oedipus said he would try. So he went out, and as usual the sphinx came and asked him a question. Those of you who are familiar with the story will recall the question:

What is it that in the morning walks on four legs, at noon walks on two, and in the evening walks on three?

Oedipus very promptly replied:

Man; when he is a child he walks on all fours, when he is a man he stands upright and walks on two legs, and when he is old and decrepit with age he walks with a stick, which makes the three legs.

With a terrible cry of agony, the sphinx threw herself over the precipice on the rocks beneath, and so the Thebans were relieved of the scourge.

Now, the sphinx in this country that has been feeding upon the American people is this gigantic Republican organization. For 50 years they have been juggling with the American farmer and the American laboring man, and at the elections the farmer and the laboring man have failed to answer the question aright, because you gentlemen on the other side have been able to deceive them. But education, training, and learning on the part of the people will finally enable them through their Representatives to answer correctly this riddle of the tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When they do that, the mighty sphinx, the Republican Party, will cry aloud as it is cast from the precipice of power down upon the rocks of destruction below. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.] My friend from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] has just given a perfect description of how this sphinx is organized and how dangerous it is to the liberty and welfare of the American people. I commend his remarks to all patriotic Americans who do not believe in the growing despotism of this trust-controlled Republican sphinx. May the Lord deliver us from this terrible monster. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, when the Canadian reciprocity bill made its appearance at the last session of Congress I believed it to be an entering wedge for the destruction of the policy of protection to American industry and voted against it. When it returned to the present session of Congress, under Democratic auspices, my original estimate of its ultimate effect was not changed, and I again voted against it. While its purpose appeared to have been benevolent, I believed it to be wrong in policy and calculated to harm both the farmer and the industrialist of this country. If annexation were coupled with reciprocity, the situation would be different, but without annexation reciprocity with Canada means a defection of the population of the United States, unnecessary concessions to Canada and Europe, and a reduction in the wage-earning power in the United States. That undue concessions are being made to Canada would appear from the failure of anyone advocating reciprocity to propose similar terms to Mexico, which, being along our southern border, would seem to be entitled to as much consideration at our generous hands as "the fair sister to the north." While we are throwing bouquets at Canada and are preaching the uplift, it is well to remember that we are maintaining an entirely different and wholly unaltruistic attitude to a sister country along the southern border.

GIVING SOMETHING FOR NOTHING.

In the reciprocity bill we have actually given away in an exchange of revenue approximately \$5,000,000 per annum, which would be just as serviceable to industry in the United States as it will be to Canada or to England, with which Canada is in sympathetic touch. And there is no apparent reason upon the Republican side for this outburst of generosity save that of altruism and the possible desire to obtain free wood pulp for the United States, a desideratum which the Canadian ministers in their letter to the Secretary of State, expressly if not emphatically, reserved to the Canadian Provinces.

Assuming the reciprocity bill passes, carrying with it the loss of trade and Federal revenue, the Democratic Party now proposes to further reduce the revenue and yet run the Government by giving effect to reciprocity in a free-trade bill presumed to be in the interest of the farmer, but especially and directly designed to benefit cotton planters, since more than half the \$10,000,000 of revenue which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr.

UNDERWOOD] says is to be saved the farmer in duty upon imports, is levied against bagging for cotton, sacks, burlaps, and so forth, and cotton ties. I can not agree that either measure is in the interest of the farmer or the cotton planter, or the industrialist, and I shall vote against this properly labeled free-trade wedge with the same sincerity and earnestness that I voted against the entering wedge of reciprocity.

MAKING A CAT'S-PAW OF THE FARMER.

Throughout this whole discussion it has been apparent that the American farmer was to be made the cat's-paw of the Democratic propaganda. He has been held aloof from his co-worker in the mill and his best customer in the city, and has been made to believe he would be the sole victim of reciprocity, as the attempt is now being made to have him believe he will be a beneficiary of the so-called farmers' free list. The oft-heard cry of monopoly and exorbitant profits in the mills has been repeated in this discussion to a fulsome degree, and nowhere have our Democratic orators taken into account the wages involved in the recent wonderful progress of the Nation under the protective system, which it now seems to be the business of every competitive nation, aided by the Democratic Party, to destroy.

Democrats have taken the reins in this House and they tell us they propose to improve upon the protective system, not by razing customhouses as of old, nor even by taxing incomes quite so vigorously as hitherto proposed, but by "going gently," keeping the customhouses, cutting down the expenses as well as the revenues, and placing a reduced tax upon incomes. And all of this is to be done in the interest of the American farmer, who is expected to continue as prosperous as ever and to secure the same high prices from wage earners out of work, as he was able to obtain from wage earners employed under a protective system. Well, we have had two instances of Democratic effort to run the Government. The first was under James Buchanan, when they bonded the Government for \$40,000,000, and the second and crucial test was under Grover Cleveland, when, subsequent to 1894, they were forced to issue bonds to the extent of \$262,000,000 to pull the country out of the financial hole into which they had plunged it. They may be wiser now than they were then. The proof of the pudding lies in the eating of it.

REMINDER OF DEMOCRATIC TIMES.

If the American farmer would be as wise to his true interests, as I believe he will be after reciprocity and free trade have been imposed upon him by a Democratic House, he will make a few comparisons now, as those of us who have good memories and are not over-educated in populistic theories are making them in the great cities, as between that interesting former period of Democratic control and the interesting period which is now promised under the new system for which the Democratic Party will be responsible.

There is no essential difference in the problems and pretenses of the Democratic Party of 1893 and those of the present, so that it is fair to recall some of the disasters that were wrought upon the entire country—business man, farmer, and workingman alike—by the experiments put into effect in 1894. I have before me now, prepared by one of the great mercantile agencies of the country—Dun & Co.—a comparative list of mercantile and banking failures and of railroad receiverships for a long period of years. In 1893, when the Democrats in their last attempt to materialize their professions, were changing from a protective to a partial free-trade policy, the mercantile failures in the United States aggregated \$346,779,889. There has been no such record in all the years before or since, and even in the financial flurry of 1907 the failures of this class did not equal one-third of the amount of that disastrous Democratic year. In the same Democratic year the banking failures in the United States amounted to \$210,998,809, which was more than all the failures in the eight years from 1895 to 1902, inclusive, and was never approached by any one year, save that of 1907, a "bank-panic year," having nothing to do with the tariff, when the liabilities of failing institutions exceeded those of the Cleveland year by twenty-three millions. But the climax was capped in the railroad receiverships in 1893, when the total amount of capital involved was in excess of \$1,781,000,000, an amount equal to the total involved in all railroad receiverships for the 14 subsequent years from 1894 to 1907, inclusive. In the light of these staggering figures, carrying with them a story of idleness and distress in city and country such as we never want to see again, it is fair to presume that the American farmer, who has listened complacently to stories of monopoly and outrage, will realize the meaning of that true reciprocity which some of us upon the Republican side have been preaching—the

reciprocity that begins at home in a square deal between the tiller of the soil and the worker in the mill, without the interference of any foreign nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

ALTRUISM AND BREADWINNING.

Since reciprocity, as it has been communicated to us by the Democratic leaders, is now synonymous with free trade, what will it profit us as a people? Are we so prosperous that we can give away our substance without inviting the shadow? Are we not pursuing the course of him who "is worse than an infidel" if he provideth not for his own house? Or have we become so powerful, so benevolent and so altruistic, that we can take all nations to our bosom and still retain our industrial strength and fiber? And if we dared to do this, what assurance have we that any one of the great nations would do unto us as we seem willing to do unto them? Out of the Treasury of the country we spent hundreds of millions upon Cuba and the Philippines, and we are still spending lavishly for the uplift of the civilized and half-savage natives of the latter. Surely it will not be denied that we are taking of our substance for this benevolent purpose and that we are not receiving any return, either in profit or appreciation, such as we might derive if we were to put our own money amongst our own people, where it would strengthen the American fireside and give less cause for complaint as to the increase in the cost of living.

It is estimated that we shall spend four hundred millions upon the Panama Canal, and that we shall spend from forty to fifty millions per year fortifying it against the possibility of some other nation refusing to reciprocate with us in that spirit of good fellowship we now profess to entertain for other nations. Would it not seem from this mere incident, to say nothing of our precautionary measures along the border of Mexico, that although we have been generous in constructing the canal for the benefit of the world, we have not yet full faith in the amiability of one or any of the other nations that might find the canal worth taking from us?

CAN NOT DISASSOCIATE THE FARMER.

From no point of view, Mr. Chairman, have I been able to disassociate the farmer from the mechanic, or the clerk, or the industrialist of the city, so far as they will be affected by either the reciprocity or the free-trade bills. Many of those who have spoken for the farmer endeavored to make it appear that the man in the city was doing him great wrong. The truth is to the contrary, since man for man, the American farmer of to-day has every advantage in health, in domestic comfort, and in financial returns over the average urbanite. He has more of life's real comforts and by all odds is surer of his daily bread; he gets his food, whether he gets his wages or not. I have deeply regretted the efforts to show that either of these bills would mean an advantage to the dweller in the city over the dweller upon the farm, or vice versa. I am the Representative of a great industrial and mercantile district, and deem it a duty to deny that the workingman or the working woman of the city desires a reduction of the farmers' wage, and I confidently express the belief that the farmer does not desire a reduction in the wage of the workingman. We have been taught in the cities, as you have been taught in the country, that protection to a nation against unfair foreign labor and its product, is as natural as the protection of the individual or the family against the storm or the intruder. It is only when we prosper in the cities that we are enabled to buy from the farmer and pay him a fair price, and if the farmer prospers we look for a fair interchange of the commodities which we manufacture and sell to him. We understand the interests of these two great bread-winning factors of our country to be identical. That the farmer would knowingly strike down the industrialist who buys his products, or that the industrialist would knowingly strike down the farmer who buys his manufactures, is a preposterous proposition. Even though abuses may have crept into the protective system, it is equally unlikable that because of an occasional fungus growth upon the giant oak of prosperity, we should abandon the law of our country which affords us a pruning knife and invoke the baneful aid of foreign competition to debase our home labor and lower our standard of life. [Applause on the Republican side.]

FARMERS RESPONSIBLE FOR CITIES GROWTH.

If the effect of all this legislation be to cheapen commodities, and incidentally labor, carrying with it uncertainty and distress in the business world, wherein does it advantage the industrialist more than the farmer or the farmer more than the industrialist? We were all farmers originally, but we strove for better conditions than prevailed in the hostile fields and log cabins of our forefathers. It was the farmer's boy striving to

improve upon "Dad's" way that built up the cities and turned his industry and ingenuity to profit. What fault is to be found with him if he labored in new fields of industry and made labor profitable so that more money might be put into the pocket of the farmer to give him a chance to come out of the backwoods? It was the farmer's boy, for there was none other to do it, who improved the old earthen roads and made transportation possible. He saw the advantages of reaching out beyond the narrow limits of the eastern settlements, and it was he who penetrated the West with railroads that now make the farmer and the city dweller akin. He created the intermediate occupations engaged in the carrying trade between the farm and the city. It was through him that new industries, new factories, and new forges were established, and it was he, who, from the first act of the American Congress, insisted upon protection—not tariff for revenue—but protection for the industries of this country against the superior advantages in material prices, and labor conditions, in foreign lands. The farmer of the United States to-day is indebted to the farmer's boy of yesterday for the Department of Agriculture; for the advantages which have made rough farming scientific; for the advantages of this very tariff system which has relieved the farmer and the city dweller alike of direct taxes, while it has given us an opportunity to install telephones and build automobiles, which are now more in proportion a convenience to the dweller upon the farm than they are to the dweller in the city. It is due to the brains and industry of this farmer's boy who came to the city that we have been able to advance the standard of living, and it is that standard we want to see maintained.

FARM WAGES LOWER IN CANADA.

During this discussion I have been amazed at the willingness of our Democratic friends to accept Canada and her products on equal terms with those of the United States. It has been admitted that the wage of the farm laborer in Canada is less than that of the farm laborer in the United States, and it follows, if that be true, that the wages of the Canadian farmer, with cheaper lands, must be advanced to our standard, or ours must be reduced to his. I have had an inquiry made as to the building trades—which are all skilled labor—and find in nearly every instance that the hours of labor are longer and the scale of wages is lower in Canada than in the United States. Is this to the advantage of the American laborer or producer? Will the dweller in the city, brought into competition with a lower foreign wage scale, be enabled to reduce the cost of living if his own purchasing power be reduced?

Statistics furnished in the President's message of February 28, last, giving a comparison of farm wages paid in Canadian Provinces and States of the United States, along the border, become extremely interesting now in view of the Democratic proposition to follow up reciprocity with free trade. On page 85 of the President's message on "Reciprocity with Canada" the average wages of the farm laborer in the United States along the border in 1909 were \$29 per month. The average Canadian wages along the border were \$22.50 per month.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman.

CONGESTION AND ACREAGE.

Mr. SIMS. In view of the small number of laborers in Canada compared with the number in the United States, does not the gentleman think that wages in Canada will increase rather than bring ours down to the present Canadian scale?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have observed that many of our farmers are going to Canada, and if enough of them go there they may induce higher wages, but that, the gentleman should understand, would be sapping our own life and strength, and taking away the rich blood of this country and giving it to a country that refuses to come under our banner.

Mr. SIMS. But if we congest our country with labor, it must go somewhere.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no fear of congestion in our country except in the large cities. I have no fear of the prophecies of Malthus here, for we have plenty of room. Within a radius of 25 miles of my home city of Philadelphia you can secure plenty of good land with good buildings upon it, if you want to engage in farming, for as low as \$60 per acre. Why should our people go to Canada, increasing in transportation rates the cost of what they would produce for the United States, when that cost must be charged up to the consumers of this country?

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMS. If the Canadians can buy as great a quantity of the necessities of life for \$22 in Canada as ours can for \$29, how is he hurt?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is proposing to transfer the pure red blood of the American farmer into a foreign country and depopulate his own country. That is what I object to. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If the gentleman wants to ask a question concerning the manufacturer, because there is a bone of contention, I will say that the fear I have is that the bill which the gentleman advocates means that men who have capital, who have enterprise, who can find more favorable conditions of manufacture in foreign countries where the labor is cheaper, will leave the United States and thus deprive the American farmer of the market he now acquires from the wage earner who gets his wage in the existing American factory.

THE MANUFACTURER AND HIS MONEY.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman not think that it is the highest evidence of an avaricious, dollar-loving spirit to live in this country and make money out of high protection, and then the very moment the manufacturer gets the money that he wants, to go off and use it in a country where money is worth more than it is here? The manufacturer has been made rich by protection, and yet he deserts the country the moment that he has the money to go with.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the gentleman has asked that, because I am a protectionist, and I want to keep American money here. I would far rather the people in the little town the gentleman represents in Tennessee and the large farming constituency thereabouts were able to make \$3 a day in a factory than to make \$1 a day upon the farm. [Applause on Republican side.] I believe their standard of living would be improved, and I believe the gentleman would find that by reason of the increasing industry and activity of his own people, his duties here would be so increased that he would find little time for debate in the House.

Mr. SIMS. That does not answer my question as to why your protected manufacturer deserts this country after he has made his millions from protection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say to the gentleman that this country was sought out by our forefathers. They came here and lived for a long time in the back woods. I listened to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] a short time ago, and observed he spoke of the splendid conditions that prevailed in the days of the Washingtons and the Jeffersons.

I would say to the gentleman that in those days the men who did the labor in this country were not the aristocrats; they wore the apron as a badge of servility. There were aristocrats in those days, but popular education and the incoming of capital and the encouragement of enterprise and the incentive and genius of the American spirit have induced us to go on and become a world power. We have come out of the backwoods and the swamps where some of our forefathers lived. But since the gentleman desires an answer as to the manufacturer who makes his money and leaves the country, I will say to him that I have no sympathy with such a practice and would not encourage it by the passage of a free-trade measure. The gentleman can not go further than I do in condemning the man who makes his money here and then distributes it to the detriment of our own people, but he may find this necessary under a free-trade system.

LOSING OUT TO CANADA.

The difference in favor of the Canadian employer over the American employer of farm labor, as shown by the President's message, is, on the average, about one-fourth of the entire wage. Wherein would this reduction benefit anyone in the United States? That it is an inducement for employing farmers and of great advantage to Canada is shown in the announcement from Ottawa, immediately after the passage of the reciprocity bill by the House, that 45,000 American farmers were preparing to cross the Canadian border to get cheap land and, incidentally, cheap labor, thus depressing land and labor in the United States and transferring to Canadian Provinces no less than \$30,000,000. The dispatch relating to this is taken from the Philadelphia Record, the leading Democratic newspaper of Pennsylvania, and is so significant that I present it here in full:

AMERICANS RUSH TO CANADA—45,000 FARMERS, WITH \$30,000,000, CROSS BORDER.

[Special to the Record.]

Ottawa, April 22.—Reports from the Canadian west, received at the immigration department here, indicate that the prairie Provinces are now experiencing the greatest rush of immigration in western history. Figures compiled by the immigration authorities show that the daily average of new arrivals for four weeks show that 50,000 newcomers have entered western Canada as settlers within that time. At least 280 new towns will be put on the map of the Canadian west this year.

Information supplied the passenger department of the Canadian Pacific Railway is that already upward of 45,000 American farmers are preparing to cross over the border and settle in the Canadian west. It is estimated that they will bring in at least \$30,000,000 in property and cash. The rush is nearly as great on other lines, while almost a stampede of settlers, principally Scots, has set in from the mother country.

Was it good policy to let these farmers go, and will it be good policy to send American manufacturers after them, as suggested by the inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows how many men of the best in this country and how much money has gone to Canada during the last 20 or 25 years to aid and encourage the industries of that country—if he has any statistics upon that subject?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have some data that I will put in the Record. I wrote this part of my address so that I would not have to deal with statistics offhand, but I will say to the gentleman, if he is interested, that I do know of certain concerns that have left the United States and have gone into Canada, taking over money to build enterprises there as they did to get cheap labor in England, and who did it because they could not get over the tariff barriers reared by Canada, which Canada still maintains.

Mr. BOWMAN. I would also like to ask the gentleman—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, I have only an hour.

CANADA WILL NOT YIELD.

Mr. BOWMAN. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Go ahead.

Mr. BOWMAN. Is it not better, in view of the fact that some of the best have gone over that lane of darkness, that a wall which is being built between these countries be taken down, so that they will be a part of this country rather than foreigners and strangers and enemies to this country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will answer the gentleman, who, I think, has some interests in Canada.

Mr. BOWMAN. Not a dollar.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think he has some customers in Canada.

Mr. BOWMAN. I have some of the best friends, and I desire them to be better.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are the friends of the gentleman, who are now in Canada, prepared to say that they will connect with this country and do business under our laws? Or do they still say they want the barrier reared as against certain American products, while they want our barriers lowered in order that their goods may come into the United States free?

Mr. BOWMAN. My friends in that country will make as good Americans as any that live in this country.

"MISS CANADA" AND MEXICO.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will agree with the gentleman that the Canadian is a fair brother, and that the pictures we see in the newspapers of "Miss Canada" are fair pictures, but I point out to the gentleman the country below us, where the bayonets of the United States are supplanting the bouquets we are throwing at Canada. I point to Mexico, which may be just as fair as Canada, to whom we will give no concessions and against whom we shut the door.

Mr. BOWMAN. And I would ask the gentleman if he desires the bayonets to be turned from that country toward this country, as they surely will, if you continue building this wall.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I had time, I would be glad to go on with the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say just one word, from my personal knowledge, that I know of men and women who have left this country and gone to the Canadian Northwest, and who have taken hundreds of millions of dollars with them for investment into that country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for that statement, which confirms what I have said. My information goes much further than the Canadian country, and I will say something about it a little later on. My information goes back to the days when under a Democratic tariff capital left the United States, mills were constructed in England, and we got their goods and they got our money; but I recall, too, that after we had put into effect a Republican tariff the investors came back to the United States, built mills, spent their money, and while we got their goods we also got their money. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, the reciprocity bill will drive away annually five millions of revenue and assist in depopulating our western

country. The farmers' free-list bill will depress the wages of those who manufacture the articles that are used by the farmer, and must necessarily decrease the farmer's profit. It should be remembered, even by the farmer himself, that the wage earner in the streets and alleys of the great cities can not purchase at fair prices, the eggs and the butter and the beef and the potatoes that come from the farm, unless a fair price is obtained for the harrows and the plows and the textiles and the bagging and the cotton ties that go from the cities. Whether a manufacturer makes too much or too little, is a small part of the question. The manufacturer is only one man. The workers in the mills are thousands. What the manufacturer eats is trifling. It is what the workman eats and what the workman has to pay for what he eats that most concerns us. The farmer buys from the city occasionally, but the dweller in the city must buy from the farmer day by day, and the wage must be in hand to pay or the worker will go hungry.

WHEN THE FARMER COMES TO TOWN.

I would like to stop, if I had the time, and tell you how much the farmer buys when he comes to town. How much does he take away from one of my textile factories where you propose to reduce the wages of the men and women who are making hosiery? How many pairs of hosiery will he buy in a year? Six, a dozen, fifteen? Well, the whole bill could be settled for \$2 or \$3; maybe \$1.50. He can get socks to-day for 10 cents. He can get two pairs for 15 cents, and they will last him for months. We have to spend vast sums of money in overhead charges, we have to rear great plants, we have to pay for rentals and advertising, we have to pay labor in order to make these socks at that price. Not even a Democrat would want them cheaper; and yet we have to pay for our eggs and potatoes and meat every day in the year. We have to go to the farmer every day. Sometimes the farmer does not visit us for six months.

How can the farmer expect to maintain the standard he now holds or to secure a continuance of fair prices if he declines to pay to the American wage-earner a fair price for manufactured articles? If he buys them from Europe on a free-list basis he puts out of employment the American worker in the mill and in the factory, and thus puts himself beyond the power of the mill worker to buy. The farmer's best market is not in Europe, but in the United States. He can not depress the wage-earning power in the city and still expect a profit upon the farm. Far better for the man in the city that the farmer should prosper, and far better for the man upon the farm that the man in the city should prosper.

NO WEALTH WITHOUT LABOR.

There are no articles upon the so-called farmers' free list which did not originally spring from the soil—metals or textiles or manufactured products. They all originated in the ground, and in their original condition were worth nothing. It was the hand of the laborer and the artificer that gave them value. Once, a long time back, in my own great State of Pennsylvania, the farms were ripe with grain, but it fell worthless in the field. The farmer had no market, except in his own environment. No protective system had aided him in building up industries and means of transportation. It cost him \$10 a hundred pounds to send his products from Pittsburg to Philadelphia. The farmer was charged from 15 to 20 cents a pound for metal; he paid \$5 for a bushel of salt. His grain was all he had, and the only value he could get out of it was by converting it into whisky.

He needed a market; he needed a railroad or a waterway to get to the market. He needed the city consumer to make his labor worth something. He began to get it when the engineer and the mechanic came. What thoughtful farmer will deny the value of the architect and the laborer and the textile worker who build for him and who buy from him? The story of our wonderful Western development centers in the spread of the industrial influence. Until it came there was no money value to the wealth of the farm nor to the labor employed in farm production. If we are to pay well for the products of the farm it follows that we must earn well in the cities, and if we are to continue to profitably interchange as between the cities and the farm, we must not withdraw from each other, nor permit ourselves to be alienated.

DEMOCRATS MUST RECKON WITH LABOR.

In my judgment the Democrats who are now menacing the business of the country by their insistence upon free trade, will have to account to the mechanic and wage earner of the land as well as to the farmer. They can not put him upon the plane of his competitor in England, in Germany, in France, or in Italy without hearing from him in no uncertain way.

Table 2 in the President's message gives the "Average wages of agricultural labor, with board, in specified States, eastern Canada, and British Columbia," for 1909, as follows:

	By the month.		In harvest.
	Hiring by the season.	Hiring by the year.	
United States:			
Maine.....	\$27.60	\$23.17	\$1.63
New York.....	26.00	22.08	1.77
Michigan.....	25.10	21.57	1.75
Minnesota.....	29.25	23.98	2.23
Wisconsin.....	28.57	24.39	1.79
North Dakota.....	33.34	27.01	2.58
Iowa.....	28.93	25.63	2.08
Ohio.....	22.11	19.19	1.67
Vermont.....	26.86	24.03	1.73
Montana.....	39.29	35.00	2.23
Washington.....	36.39	31.32	2.34
Missouri.....	21.10	18.85	1.50
Canada:			
Prince Edward Island.....	17.25	10.87	.40
Nova Scotia.....	21.20	15.90	.50
New Brunswick.....	22.59	9.96	.30
Quebec.....	23.33	17.58	.35
Ontario.....	21.52	17.63	.35
British Columbia.....	30.50	20.69	.50

WAGE COMPETITION WITH EUROPE.

If these differences in the wages of farm labor are calculated to stir the interest of the farmer, what shall we say of the mill workers whom the free-trade bill proposes to put in competition with the factory labor of Europe? In the textile industry the wages in Great Britain are one-half those paid in the United States. You Democrats propose to put their goods against ours and their wage scale against ours. The wages in the textile industries in Germany and in France are little more than one-third the wages in the United States. You propose to put our working men and women on a par with the workers of those countries. When you had control of this Government in 1894 you compelled American capital to leave the United States and rear factories in Germany and in England and in Canada. You propose now to enact a measure that will bring like results, and this, upon the pretense that you will reduce the cost of living. But stop a while! I want you to look before you leap. It has profited certain manufacturers to conduct establishments on both sides of the water to meet conditions arising from frequent tariff changes. They go to Europe to get cheap labor and they build here to keep within the tariff wall. They would prefer to stay here if you would let them, because the market is here. Hosiery, in particular, is manufactured in Germany for the American trade.

Against what do our American wage earners have to compete in this trade? Here is a statement now officially before the Ways and Means Committee which invites our sympathetic consideration:

The average rate of wages paid to skilled women sewing-machine operators in the United States varies from \$1.50 to \$2 per day. The same class of labor in France, Germany, and Switzerland receives from 30 cents to 50 cents per day.

Wages paid winders or spoolers in the United States varies from \$1.50 to \$1.75 per day. The same class of labor in the countries named receives from 35 cents to 40 cents per day.

Wages paid knitters in the United States varies from \$1.25 to \$2 per day. The same class of labor in the countries named receives from 35 cents to 75 cents per day.

The items of labor entering into the manufacture of cotton knitted underwear, over and above the actual cost of the staple, represents fully 75 per cent of the total.

In lieu of lengthy and confirmatory statistics showing the cheapness of wages in Europe as compared with better conditions in the United States I submit a letter recently published in the Protectionist. There is so much of human interest and such food for thought in this statement that a reading of it may help to a better understanding of the value of a fair American wage.

COST OF LIVING HERE AND THERE.

Intended for circulation in the British elections, this illuminating letter of Mr. Harrison Benn, of England and America, must be of intense interest to the American tariff tinker of free-trade proclivities. The statement, dated Becksides Mills, Great Norton, Bradford, follows:

In order to put before the public a correct statement of the comparative cost of living, together with the wages paid in England and America, it is advisable to have as near as possible the same conditions both as to locality and the quality of work. As chairman of a company

with mills in Clayton and Bradford and president of a corporation with mills in Greystone, near Providence, R. I., America, I am in a practical position to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of free trade and protection.

The English and American mills comb, spin, and weave exactly the same classes of wool, alpaca, and mohair, and the same qualities of yarns and cloth are interchangeable. The machinery in all the mills are identically the same. Many of the work people at Greystone worked in our Bradford mills. At Clayton and Greystone are cooperative stores managed entirely by the workmen, and it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to obtain fairer conditions for comparing the cost of living in the two countries.

A great amount of discussion is now being carried on regarding the prices of the "food of the people," and in order that every family can ascertain the difference in the cost of living between free-trade England and protectionist America, I give below a list of prices of some "everyday necessary articles of food." The Greystone price list is dated December 10, 1909, and signed by the secretary of the cooperative stores, and the Clayton price list is of a more recent date. For convenience and simplicity I have translated the American "cent" as being equal to one halfpenny.

	Clayton cooperative prices.	Greystone cooperative prices.
Best flour, per stone of 14 pounds.....	s. d. 2 1	s. d. 2 3
Best butter, per pound (Danish).....	1 5	1 4
Best lard, per pound.....	0 9	0 7½
Best cheese, per pound.....	0 10	0 10
Sugar.....	0 2½	0 2½
Currants.....	0 5	0 6½
Raisins.....	0 7	0 7½
Ceylon tea.....	1 11	1 10
Coffee.....	1 8	1 2
Onions.....	0 1½	0 2½
Ham.....	1 1	1 ½
Bacon (Irish).....	1 0	0 10
Apples.....	0 2½	0 1½
Rice.....	0 3½	0 4½
Milk, per quart.....	0 3	0 3
Vinegar, per quart.....	0 4	0 3½
Nestle's Swiss milk, per tin.....	0 5½	0 3½
Potatoes, per stone of 14 pounds.....	0 8	12 5
Bananas, per dozen.....	0 8	0 6½

¹ American.

ENGLAND AND RHODE ISLAND COMPARED.

A Bradford butcher employed by the Greystone cooperative states the joints are not cut the same, but the prices realized for the whole animal are just about the same as in England.

Although coal is dearer, I question if the fuel cost per family for 12 months is as much as in England, owing to the general use of slow-combustion stoves.

I have ascertained the quantities of the above-named "everyday necessary articles of food" consumed by families, ranging from 2 to 13 persons, and find the average cost to each Greystonian is 3½d. per week more than the Claytonian. A family of 5 persons will jointly have to earn 1s. 6½d. more per week to be equal to a Claytonian.

Having arrived at the cost of living as shown above, I give below the wages paid at Clayton and Bradford for 55½ hours per week and at Greystone for 56 hours:

	Clayton and Bradford.	Greystone.
Woolsorters (day work), per week.....	s. d. 32 0	s. d. 66 8
Men box minders.....	17 6	33 4
Noble comb minders.....	20 0	39 7
Can gl minders.....	12 6	29 2
Drawers.....	12 6	29 2
Rovers.....	11 0	29 2
Spinning overlookers.....	30 0	62 6
Girl spinners (according to number of spindles).....	11 3	25 6
Doffers.....	9 0	18 9
Girl twisters.....	11 0	29 2
Girl warpers.....	13 0	33 4
Weavers.....	15 10	46 9
Weaving overlookers.....	36 0	66 8
Joiners.....	31 10	62 6
Mechanics.....	30 0	62 6
Stokers.....	25 0	50 0

WHICH IS BEST FOR THE TOILER?

When the extra cost of living is taken into consideration with the high wages received can the Greystone workmen's oft-repeated assertions be questioned, viz, that they "can save more in America than they could earn in England"? The "dear-loaf" boggy does not frighten the American workman. I ask the British workman whether he would not rather pay a trifle more for "everyday necessary articles of food," as the Greystonian does, and have a substantial sum to put away at the end of every week, or have a "cheap loaf," low wages, and irregular work, and, as one Yorkshire housewife put it, "a scratin' on."

I know it is most difficult for anyone who has not visited the States to realize how well off the working classes are out there. A family who lived in very straitened circumstances in Bradford went to America and at Greystone Mills earned £17 9s. 4d. per week. I have never known a workman return to live in England, excepting for family reasons, poor health, homesickness, or through being a wastrel. Even then I doubt if 2 per cent return. The statements I have made are not based on conclusions drawn from reading either free-trade or protectionist literature. They are based on actual daily practical experience.

I say to the electors, think for yourselves, and if you desire to improve your position, receive higher wages, and have more constant employment, like hundreds who have emigrated from the Bradford district to the United States of America, then vote for the tariff-reform candidate.

I am, etc.,

HARRISON BENN.

AGRICULTURE IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. Chairman, so often is Pennsylvania referred to as a beneficiary of the tariff that I feel it due to the misinformed farmers of the country to say a word about that State. It is true that Pennsylvania has profited by protection, but it is equally true that every other State in this Union has advanced in proportion. Witness the energetic and hustling West and the hopeful and rapidly developing South. We do not envy you, nor do we believe you can go back upon your own industries. You of the South, especially, because of your climate and resources, will some day be rivals in the great American market for manufactures. And for one I hope the day will come speedily, for I believe it will mean the regeneration of the South and a removal of those alleged barriers that sometimes seem to prevail as between us.

But Pennsylvania—she has had certain natural advantages, being the greatest anthracite coal producer of the country; she has fought her way to her present prominence by industry and thrift, so commendable and conspicuous as to make mockery of the political assaults that are often directed against her. She is small in area, one of the smallest of all the States of the Union, yet her population is equal to that of the great Canadian country about which we have given ourselves so much concern. Pennsylvania came into the Union second in population and importance, and, while yielding then to Virginia and yielding now to New York, she has maintained second place from the beginning of American history. She held first place in the production of coal, iron, steel, petroleum, and textiles, and in the output of these has contributed to the wealth and happiness of the world. She has more than that to commend her. Pennsylvania is out of debt. She spends thirty-four millions annually upon public education.

GOOD FARMS IN THE KEYSTONE STATE.

But it is to the Pennsylvania farmer that I direct your attention. We have 19,000,000 acres of farm land in Pennsylvania, and according to the census of 1900—that of 1910 not being sufficiently advanced to give complete statistics for the State—68.2 per cent of that land was improved. And I will state that very much of the unimproved land has gone into a great forest reserve of nearly a million acres, which the State maintains without regard to the Government's generosity in supporting State forest reserves in other sections of the country, where now and then the unthinking inveigh against the "great corporations" and the "grasping tendencies of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman permit a question? I understood the gentleman to say the land was worth \$60 an acre.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I said you could get land at \$60 an acre within 25 miles of the city of Philadelphia, just as fertile and much nearer the market than some of that for which our friends are going to Canada.

Mr. SIMS. It is good land?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very good land. There has been an extraordinary development in the western country, that great Middle West the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon] so frequently and so proudly speaks about, but during the past 10 years that country has grown so rapidly that perhaps the average prosperous farmer has overlooked a little the staid and steady Quakers, who are still going on with their business enterprises and their agricultural pursuits in Pennsylvania and the East. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We wish them well. We have always wished them well. They have taken from us much of the best bone and fiber of our Commonwealth. They represent the native Americanism, and we rejoice in their prosperity. But sometimes it seems a question whether they remember all, and whether, in their youth and in their earnestness and their ability to do things, they do not forget that we are still in existence, doing the best we can and contributing our share to the progress of this Nation and to its fame throughout the world.

DESERVE WELL OF THE COUNTRY.

Think of this, my friends of the Middle West and the South! Pennsylvania, an industrial State, rich in coal and iron and steel, was tenth in the production of wheat, about which you have been telling us so much in your disputes as to whether the price was fixed at Liverpool, or Winnipeg, or Halifax. We have hardly thought of wheat in Pennsylvania, except as we have wanted to see you protected in your industry in raising wheat. We have paid the same old price per loaf of bread through all your fluctuations in the price of wheat from 60 cents to \$1.25 per bushel. We have had other things to do in

that State, and so many of them that wheat has been incidental, except as we have been buying it from you and feeding it to our people, proud of the knowledge that we were able to spend the money that we were making, in building you up in the Middle West and South, and taking your product rather than to have you ship it into foreign markets. [Applause.]

Our farm property in 1900 was valued at more than \$1,051,000,000. That figure was exceeded then only by Illinois, Iowa, Ohio, and New York in the order named, and it represented one-twentieth of all the farm property of the country. Owing to the growth of the Middle West in the last 10 years, we may not hold that position now. But in 1909 we produced 48,000,000 bushels of corn. We were fifth in 1909 in the production of hay. The State turned out more than 3,742,000 tons, and was exceeded only by Iowa, New York, Illinois, and Ohio. The Tennessee tobacco crop for 1909 was 53,000,000 pounds. Pennsylvania produced 30,000,000 pounds. Surely we have some interest in agricultural development if we can approach so closely the output of Tennessee in her great staple. But even here I am reminded, when you talk of monopolies in the manufacturing world and shake your fists at "hydra-headed trusts and combinations," that you do not hesitate even from the agrarian point of view to limit your output of tobacco so that good prices may be obtained; nor do you hesitate farther South to pass resolutions limiting the area in which cotton shall be grown, for no other purpose in the world than to obtain not cheaper but higher prices. [Applause on the Republican side.]

GOOD PRICES VERSUS CHEAPNESS.

But I believe in fair prices for all American commodities that are the product of our labor, including cotton. Potatoes are imported through the port of Philadelphia from foreign countries. They are produced abroad in certain seasons cheaper than they are produced here. I am glad a duty is levied on these potatoes sufficient to bring the foreign price up to the American price. If we are able to make the wages to pay the American price, we would rather pay well than to grind down the grower. This question comes home to every section of the country, as it does to Pennsylvania, for in that State in 1909 we produced 24,000,000 bushels, the crop being exceeded only by those of New York, Michigan, Maine, and Wisconsin. There is another product of Pennsylvania worth mentioning. I have not the most recent census figures as to dairy products and butter and cheese, but in 1900 we produced 74,000,000 pounds of butter and cheese, yielding only to the supremacy of Ohio and New York. In fact, Pennsylvania produced about one-fourteenth of all the butter and cheese made in the United States in 1900, and during the same year only six States exceeded Pennsylvania in the production of eggs and poultry.

Now, it would seem, Mr. Chairman, that these figures would entitle any Representative of the State to speak out for Pennsylvania as an agricultural State.

WEALTH IN MANUFACTURES.

We are certainly able to discuss agriculture with the best of the Middle West or Southern States, and have no reason to be ashamed of our progress as tillers of the soil; but much of this State's substantial growth has been overlooked because of our prominent position in the industrial world. And what is our industrial status? In 1905 the census showed a wealth production in manufactures for the Nation of \$15,000,000,000. In Pennsylvania alone we produced about \$2,000,000,000 of that wealth, or one-seventh of the entire wealth production of this great country.

And it is this great wealth production in the factory, on the farm, and from the mine that has gone out to enrich the country through the wages and earnings we were able to make for the purchase of the products of the soil. It is idle under these circumstances to attempt to array the farmer against the industrialist in Pennsylvania, as it would be futile to attempt to line up class against class or trade against trade throughout the country. There may be evils in Pennsylvania, as there are in every other State, but we do not seek destruction of our wealth and property to remedy our defects. You and I are sent into this great House to enact laws for the government of the people and the control of lawlessness, whether it appears in the individual or in the corporate form, and we are ourselves lax if we fail to provide for the correction of abuses by law, as is the administrative arm of the Government if enacted law falls of enforcement.

KEEP THE WAGE EARNER EMPLOYED.

Oh, it is most important, Mr. Chairman, if we are to have social and domestic peace and progress, that we keep the wage earner profitably employed. Good wages and an ability to buy free and generously is far more to be preferred than cheapness and stagnation. But before we leave the farmer I want to remind him again of his duty to himself with regard to this free-trade measure. No matter what his feeling may be con-

cerning reciprocity, no matter what the differences, aggravated by demagogy and unwisdom, may have been in the past, the farmer can not now afford, even if he would, to be inconsiderate of the industrialist, lest he "spite his own face." We have heard so much of wheat and the effect of Canadian reciprocity upon this product that I am impelled to submit a simple statement, compiled from Bradstreet's Journal, giving the average prices of bread and wheat for a period of years:

	New York.	
	Bread per loaf.	Wheat per bushel.
	Cents.	
July 1, 1896.....	4	\$0.64 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 1, 1900.....	4	.64 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 1, 1907.....	4	.83
Nov. 1, 1908.....	4	1.08 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 1, 1909.....	4	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 1, 1910.....	4	.96

By this simple statement is the dependence of the farmer upon the city dweller clearly shown. Wheat went up, and wheat went down; but the price of bread was just the same. It mattered not to us in the cities whether you were getting 64 cents or \$1.25 a bushel for wheat, we had to have the loaf and we had to pay the bill. It is beside the question to complain of the cost of transportation or the profits of the middleman. They may have been justly or unjustly earned; we had to have our daily bread, and we had to pay the same old price. I have never known the industrialist to be unreasonable when he knew the truth, and I do not believe the farmer will be. Why should he rail against the man in the city? He is better off to-day than he was yesterday; there are fewer mortgages on the farms and greater comforts and conveniences abound. Surely the farmer has been getting his share along with the man in town, but lest there be some doubting Thomas still, let me draw upon the statistics of the Bureau of Labor for a few concrete examples of the manner in which we mutually progress.

OBJECT LESSONS IN VALUES.

In 1896, 10 bushels of corn would buy 59 pounds of granulated sugar. In 1910 that same 10 bushels of corn would buy 131 pounds of granulated sugar, or more than twice as much.

In 1896, 20 bushels of rye would buy 142 yards of gingham. In 1910 that same 20 bushels of rye would buy 226 yards of gingham.

We make gingham in my city, and the question is whether we are getting as much for our gingham as we ought to get. The moment the duty is lowered, either upon gingham or hosiery, there is an influx of foreign manufactures, made at a lower wage abroad, and in the case of hosiery it has happened that, notwithstanding we obtained some additional protection in the last tariff bill, the price of production in Germany has been reduced to such an extent that they are still able to send over here large invoices of foreign-made hosiery, thus preventing the American workingman and manufacturer from getting the full measure of the protection it was intended he should have.

But here is another illustration that should have weight: In 1896, according to these same statistics of the Bureau of Labor, one hog weighing 1,300 pounds would buy 180 yards of cotton flannel. In 1910 that same hog would buy 353 yards of cotton flannel, or about twice as much. It is evident that the price of cotton flannel has gone down, due to a protective tariff, or that the price of the American hog has gone up. That the tariff is in any way responsible for the increase in prices is a proposition that will not bear scrutiny.

"THATCHED-COTTAGE" SPEECHES AND COLD FACTS.

I trust the farmer who has been listening to the "thatched-cottage" speeches of some of our Democratic friends will note from these examples, the interdependence of the two great wealth-producing factors of our country—the farmer and the man who feeds upon the products of the farm. No specious argument nor any quibbling upon constitutional questions can appease these two breadwinners when it comes to the potato bin, the smokehouse, or the family market basket. And if the actual producer in either direction permits himself to be deceived it will not take long for him to realize his error.

But some one says "What about tea and coffee and sugar and oil which the farmer uses?" Well, let us discuss them all for a moment.

We impose no duty upon tea or coffee. Wherein, therefore, is the tariff responsible for the high price of tea and coffee? Coffee comes into the United States at about 8 cents a pound.

What do you pay for it? Tea comes in as low as 11 cents a pound. How much do you pay for tea? There is no tariff upon either article.

Or let us take sugar and oil, which are supposed to be controlled by the very worst kind of trusts. There is a duty upon sugar and it produces a great deal of revenue, but notwithstanding the great sums of money that have gone into the construction of sugar and oil refineries, necessitating the employment of hundreds of thousands of men and women, the making of machinery, and the construction of ships, the price of both these commodities has been enormously reduced.

When I was a boy we bought brown sugar, in brown bags, and went after it ourselves, for 13 and 14 cents a pound. Much of it was refined through the bare feet of the natives of Jamaica and the West Indies. To-day, notwithstanding the existence of large corporations, the average housewife can order sugar from the grocer over the telephone, have it sent in a highly ornamented delivery wagon, refined and purified by the most scientific processes, all wrapped up in white paper and tied with a string of white and gold, for 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound.

SOMETHING ABOUT SUGAR AND OIL.

Would you go back to the old method of obtaining sugar at the old price, merely to get even with the refiners who have systematized the sugar business? I guess not. And if we were to take the duty off sugar, who would be benefited? Do you think for a moment the farmer pays the \$60,000,000 revenue when he buys sugar for 5 and 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound? If you do, be assured that the sugar importer is your best friend and the great middlemen of New York are with you in the desire to give you relief? In common with other Members of the House I have received the most pitiful appeals "in behalf of the American farmer" from the great importing warehouses, and I am persuaded that if the duty is removed there will be no reduction in the price of sugar to the consumer, but \$60,000,000, which is now taken from the importer, will be transplanted from the Treasury of the United States into the capacious pockets of the combination which is now appealing so valiantly in the farmers' behalf. Would you rather the importer should pay the \$60,000,000, or would you rather have it made up in some other way, yet to be devised by the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means?

But let us not forget oil. Petroleum was an unknown commodity in this country until discovered in Pennsylvania. Of what value to the owner or the tiller of the soil was the oil underneath, until the mechanic came with his drills and his pumps? And of what value was the gritty, dirty product, until the refiner came with his hundreds of thousands and millions of capital to refine and purify and market it? Oil became valuable only as it was treated by those who were not the original owners of the soil.

But the owner participated in the development, and profits and royalties followed, and farmers' sons were lifted from mediocrity and drudgery to new and laudable ambitions and occupations, which aided in our common expansion.

Punish the great corporation that violates the law, or that plays unfair in its dealings with the public, but bear in mind our modest beginnings, and the need we had for the man of genius and broad ideas to fashion the crude material into a finished product, and make it serviceable to a world in which it had hitherto been useless.

Merely for information, and to bring us back to a reasonable basis of discussion upon the question of oil, I refer to this simple incident:

Some time ago, in Troy, Pa., I met a gentleman who told me he started in business in that town 44 years ago that day. I asked him what line he pursued. He said he started to sell oil. I asked him what he got for oil 44 years ago, for that was close to the sperm-oil days. He answered that he put the oil upon the station platform and the farmer came and got it for 60 cents a gallon. That oil was not purified and refined and delivered as it is to-day, and yet that oil, under existing conditions, can be had now for 12 cents a gallon retail. Evidently our friends who are charging the tariff with the responsibility for high prices, have slipped a cog in the matter of sugar and oil and tea and coffee.

RAILROAD MONEY IN CIRCULATION.

Why, Mr. Chairman, regardless of all you say against them, when a Rogers or a Rockefeller dies the world goes on the same. Their money goes not with them. If it did, great corporations would go out of business, railroads would disband, and thousands upon thousands of men would be thrown back upon their own resources. The money of these men, whether rightfully made or wrongfully made, remains in public use. It is kept in circulation and does the whole community good. It enters

directly into the wage account and establishes the farmers' market. I have often heard from this floor assaults upon such concerns as the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. No matter whether it offends in some particular or not, it is still the accumulator and the distributor of vast capital, which after all, it should be remembered, is the real inspiration of labor. If Edison had not invented the electric light we might still be without that great boon, regardless of the fact that a thousand, yea a hundred thousand, envious Edisons, now fully informed as to the value of electricity, declare they would have worked out the problem, if Edison had not. So we may account for some of the critics who can better manage railroads and corporations than they are now managed, and so it may be with those who assail the Pennsylvania Railroad. But where does the capital come from that makes the Pennsylvania Railroad? I have sent for a report, and find there are 65,000 shareholders, who have faith enough in the company to risk their money with it. They are dependent for the return of every dollar they advance, upon the developing power of the railroad to bring the factory and the farm together.

And these 65,000 shareholders are not all rich men, nor are they centered in any one State or country. More than 30,000 of them are women, and many others are executors of estates and trustees or guardians for children. You do not, when you unjustly agitate against a railroad, do it so much injury as you tend to destroy the security of the savings of tens of thousands, and the wages of hundreds of thousands of employees.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I very much regret that I can not. I would like to yield, but I have not the time. If I could be given a little more time, I would be very glad to do so.

A REMARKABLE SAVING FUND.

There is another side to this story, Mr. Chairman, which I should like to introduce. In the wage-earning, food-consuming city of Philadelphia we have 350,000 separate homes. Not apartment houses, but separate dwellings, where each man stands with his family, the sovereign of his home. These separate dwellings alone are equal to the total population of the District of Columbia. Many of them have been acquired by their occupants through the building associations and many of them through savings which they have been able to lay away.

But there is an institution in my city to which I must refer. It provides not the story of the rich man, but the story of the thrifty poor. I know of no society so unique in financial history as the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society. It is one of several of the same kind which we encourage in the city of Philadelphia and to which we refer with pride. An organization intended to encourage savings, it was incorporated in 1824, and from that time to this has accepted deposits from the working people, receiving no more than \$500 from any one depositor in any one year. On the 1st of January last there were 273,320 depositors in this institution, and that number has since been increased to more than 276,000. These men, women, and children, who have no telephones or automobiles, are the owners of \$111,000,000. Almost every nationality is represented by these depositors, the major number, of course, being natives of the United States. Wage earners predominate, and women and children are conspicuous amongst those who have adopted this method of saving against a rainy day.

SMALL INVESTORS BUILD RAILROADS.

I have here a table showing the occupations of the depositors who opened accounts with the society during 1910:

Males:	
Wage earners	11,980
Salaried employees	6,825
Agriculturists	570
Professional men	345
Business men	1,939
Minors	484
No occupation	1,001
Total	23,144
Females:	
Wage earners	3,856
Wives of wage earners	6,344
Wives of salaried employees	3,684
Business women	18
Professional women	46
Domestic servants	2,826
Salaried employees	1,562
Minors	244
No occupation	4,618
Total	23,196
Males	23,144
Females	23,196
Total	46,340

When wage earners and their wives, whose deposits are necessarily small, appear in such large numbers in one institution in one year it speaks well for the faith and stability of the breadwinners of the country; but if we look deeper into the subject we will again find that, after all, it is this same breadwinner who stands behind the great undertakings which give play to the activities of the captains of industry. Where do the deposits of the wage earners of this single institution go? There must be some earning power to those deposits, for interest is regularly paid upon them to the depositor, and he, in turn, has become the investor. The District of Columbia has \$500,000 of that money. It was employed in improving and beautifying the Capital City. Sixty-five other States, cities, and boroughs throughout the country—not in Pennsylvania alone, but in all sections of the United States—have borrowed more than \$25,000,000 of those savings to build schoolhouses and highways and sewers and needed public improvements. And every man who worked in any one of those communities was a consumer of the products of the farm.

But this is not all. The money of these Philadelphia savings-fund depositors—these wage earners of my city—has gone into the development of the Middle West and the South in the construction and maintenance of railroads that have made the farm profitable.

It is this substantial and unseen interest of the working people of this country in its general development that I would draw to the attention of the House. The poor man is as deeply interested in legislation affecting our national prosperity as is the man of wealth. Whatever injures one as a body will affect the other, and if by reciprocity or free trade we transfer to other countries that which we have mutually built up for ourselves we injure neither class alone—we injure all. [Applause on the Republican side.]

CONSTRUCTIVE INFLUENCE OF WAGES.

Numerous railroads enjoy the confidence of these working-men of my city, and they are paying upon the bonds they have issued, the interest they promised to pay, which affords a return to the wage-earning depositors. That it may be understood how far-reaching and beneficial is the effect upon the whole country of the wage-earning power in a small part of a single city, I insert, without reading, a list of the railroads gridironing the country which are indirectly encouraged and promoted by the workmen depositors of the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society:

- Alabama Central Railroad Co. (Southern).
- Alabama Great Southern Railroad Co. (Southern).
- Allegheny Valley Railway Co.
- Allegheny & Western Railway Co.
- Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.
- Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. of South Carolina.
- Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.
- Baltimore & Potomac Railroad Co. (main line).
- Baltimore & Potomac Railroad Co. (tunnel).
- Beech Creek Railroad Co. (New York Central).
- Brooklyn & Montauk Railroad Co. (Long Island).
- Camden & Atlantic Railroad Co.
- Canada Southern Railway Co.
- Catawissa Railroad Co.
- Central of Georgia Railway Co. (Mobile division).
- Central Pacific Railway Co.
- Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.
- Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. (Illinois division).
- Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.
- Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.
- Cleveland & Pittsburg Railroad Co.
- Columbus & Toledo Railroad Co. (Hocking Valley).
- Continental Passenger Railway Co.
- Delaware River Railroad & Bridge Co. (Pennsylvania).
- Easton & Amboy Railroad Co.
- Elmira, Cortland & Northern Railroad Co. (Lehigh Valley).
- Harrisburg, Portsmouth, Mount Joy & Lancaster Railroad Co. (Pennsylvania).
- Jefferson Railroad Co. (Erie).
- Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway Co.
- Lehigh Coal & Navigation Co.
- Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.
- Lehigh Valley Railway Co. of New York.
- Long Island Railroad Co.
- New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co.
- New York & Erie Railroad Co.
- New York, Lackawanna & Western Railway Co.
- Norfolk & Western Railway Co.
- Northern Central Railway Co.
- Northern Pacific Railway Co.
- North Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
- Ohio Connecting Railway Co. (Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis).
- Pennsylvania Co.
- Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
- Pennsylvania & New York Canal & Railroad Co.
- Perkiomen Railroad Co. (Reading).
- Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co.
- Philadelphia & Erie Railroad Co.
- Philadelphia & Reading Railroad Co.
- Philadelphia, Wilmington & Baltimore Railroad Co.
- Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.
- Pittsburg, Virginia & Charleston Railway Co. (Pennsylvania).
- St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railway Co.
- Schuykill River East Side Railroad Co.

South Carolina & Georgia Railroad Co. (Southern).
 Southern Pacific Railroad Co. of California.
 Southern Pacific Railroad Co. of New Mexico.
 Steubenville & Indiana Railroad Co. (Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis).
 Union Pacific Railroad Co.
 United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co.
 Virginia Midland Railway Co. (Southern).
 Wabash Railroad Co. (Detroit & Chicago extension).
 Washington Terminal Co.
 Western North Carolina Railroad Co. (Southern).
 Western Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
 West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Co.
 West Shore Railroad Co.

WHAT FREE TRADE MEANS TO THE HOME.

And now, Mr. Chairman, in the short time I have remaining I want to show what this so-called farmers' free-trade bill means to the wage earner, as well as to the farmer. The excuse for this bill, as explained by the Democratic leaders, is that it will "relieve the farmer of taxation" at the customhouse. This is familiar but discredited Democratic doctrine. During the last fiscal year we collected at the customhouses a tariff upon imports from foreign countries from importers and jobbers who were well able to pay, a total approximating \$330,000,000. This represented one-third of all our revenue, and the importer who felt the necessity of going abroad to spend his money paid it. In the collection of that tariff we avoided internal or direct taxation upon the people for one thing, and, for another thing, kept our mills running and our workmen employed. Now the Democrats propose to change this condition and lop off \$10,000,000 of that revenue, which must be replaced in some other way, upon the pretense that farm implements and other commodities used by the farmer may be admitted free. Well, we can get at this whole question very quickly by a rough and ready calculation. If we concede the Democratic contention that the tariff is a tax, what does the whole thing amount to so far as the masses of the people are concerned? Divide the entire \$330,000,000 by our 90,000,000 of population and you will find that the "great burden" upon the people of this land amounts to about \$3.70 apiece per annum. Total abstinence from one hour's ride in an automobile or from one theater party in one year would wipe out that score if applied directly to the individual. Yes; one good Democratic dinner once a year in one first-class hotel in Washington would pay the bill. Or, if we were to calculate "the great economy" which reciprocity and free trade are to bring us through Democratic auspices, regardless of the direct loss to all the people in capital and labor, it would, if amounting in the aggregate to \$15,000,000, represent a saving to the individual of the price of three cheap cigars in one whole year.

WHERE THE SHOE PINCHES.

But let us take up the bill which now bears the name of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and see where it leads us. It puts upon the free list, first of all, "agricultural implements." And what was the duty collected at the customhouses on these important articles during the last fiscal year, 1905, for which we are given comparative figures? Why just exactly \$2,775. That was all the Government received from the importer, and that is the amount which our Democratic friends propose to save to the American farmer. Why, Mr. Chairman, if the Democratic Party which is now in control of this House would put up at public vendue the automobile which former Speaker CANNON has turned over to Speaker CLARK, and which the gentleman from Missouri thus far declines to use, the American farmer, as well as the entire country, would be immediately relieved of this awful tax. [Laughter.]

And where does the workingman come in on this proposition? Let the farmer reason this out for himself. There were 648 establishments in the United States engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements in 1905, and the total capital invested was \$196,741,000. The total number of wage earners employed in these establishments was 47,394. They were all consumers in the sense that they purchased the products of the farm. You propose now to jeopardize these American manufacturers and the wages of the men employed in them to save \$2,775 at the customhouses.

CALCUTTA CAN MAKE CHEAT BAGGING.

But when it comes to bagging for cotton, sacks, burlaps, and so forth, which are used by the cotton planter exclusively, what are the facts? The duties here amounted to \$4,879,870; on cotton ties, \$2,570. Here is a full half of the entire ten millions to be saved, and I ask where the American farmer, outside of the cotton belt, comes in? I can not now give the figures showing the number of hoop and band iron workers engaged in the manufacture of cotton ties, but I shall submit a statement prepared at the Census Office bearing upon this subject.

I am able, however, to state that the census of 1905 showed that we had 16 establishments in the United States manufactur-

ing jute and jute goods; that they had invested upward of \$11,000,000, and that they employed at American wages more than 6,000 men and women. Since that census was made other establishments have been reared nearer to the cotton fields, employing labor in that vicinity, which is now distressed, because the removal of the duty upon these commodities used by the cotton planter means the elimination of the American manufacturers and the introduction into this country of the output of the cheap and miserable labor of Calcutta.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One minute more.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one more minute to the gentleman.

THE INDUSTRIES TO BE HIT.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In this last minute I propose to introduce a statement prepared by the Census Bureau at my instance, showing, paragraph by paragraph, so far as possible, the tremendous importance to industry of this free-trade "entering wedge":

Total for the United States for certain selected industries.

[Census of 1905 (calendar year 1904).]

Industry.	Number of establishments.	Capital.	Average number of wage earners.	Value of product.
Total.....	63,994	\$2,178,109,000	1,079,052	\$3,707,234,000
Agricultural implements.....	648	196,741,000	47,394	112,007,000
Carriages and wagons.....	5,588	152,345,000	77,882	155,869,000
Jute and jute goods.....	16	11,019,000	6,083	9,066,000
Leather, tanned, curried, and finished.....	1,049	242,584,000	57,239	252,621,000
Boots and shoes.....	1,316	122,526,000	149,924	320,107,000
Saddlery and harness.....	1,076	29,264,000	15,032	42,055,000
Slaughtering and meat packing, wholesale.....	929	237,715,000	74,134	913,914,000
Flour and grist mill products.....	10,051	265,117,000	39,110	713,033,000
Food preparations.....	766	51,784,000	11,333	61,180,000
Bread and other bakery products.....	18,227	122,363,000	81,284	269,609,000
Lumber and timber products.....	24,136	694,370,000	502,300	827,465,000
Sewing machines and attachments.....	46	23,695,000	12,671	20,870,000
Salt.....	146	25,680,000	4,666	9,438,000

Hoop and band iron and similar products are manufactured very largely in rolling mills and steel works, and it is impossible to compile statistics of capital, employees, and total value of products as distinct from other branches of work carried on in the same establishments; however, hoops, bands, and cotton ties were reported in 1904 from Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Georgia, Massachusetts, and Alabama; Pennsylvania produced 200,461 tons; Ohio, 102,823 tons; and the other 4 States, the remaining 53,939 tons. Skelp was produced by Pennsylvania to the extent of 1,058,588 tons, or two-thirds of the product of the country. Ohio made 211,624 tons; West Virginia, 192,644 tons; and Illinois, Connecticut, and New York produced the remaining 94,834 tons.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, etc., are manufactured very largely in rolling mills and steel works under the same conditions as hoop iron. The total value of wire and wire products for these mills and for other establishments manufacturing wire and wire products independently of rolling mills, was, for the year 1904, approximately \$83,354,000.

MORE THAN A MILLION MEN INVOLVED.

These figures are based upon the census of 1905 and will doubtless be vastly increased when the new census is completed. They are significant, and I commend them to the careful attention of every Member of this House, and to every citizen who may hereafter be called upon to vote upon these questions at the polls. In this mere free-trade "entering wedge" you strike at 63,994 establishments, capitalized at more than \$2,000,000,000, with an annual product in 1905 of more than \$3,700,000,000. And the number of wage earners employed—and this, from my point of view, is the most serious aspect of the entire controversy—was in excess of 1,079,000. Why, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, 1,000,000 wage earners means 1,000,000 families of 5 persons each. You are striking not only the wages of 1,000,000 men, but the consuming capacity of 5,000,000 souls, and this is only the beginning!

It is no time for the man in the West or the man in the South to stand against his brother in the East. If he grieves at abuses, let him look to the law and the administration of the law. To invoke the foreign corrective of free trade will be but to hurl the deadly boomerang, which recoils upon the thrower. We can not compete against the foreign manufacturer and yet maintain the American wage. And if we can not maintain that wage, we surely can not sustain the purchasing power which has afforded prosperity to the tiller of the soil. We want to continue to buy your eggs and your beef and your flour, and we want to continue to sell to you our textiles, our machinery, and our farming implements. We have been interdependent in our industrial and agricultural relations, and it is to be hoped that

the pressure of Democratic oratory may not divide us, nor prompt us, in theory or in practice, to "kill the goose that lays the golden egg." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, as a farmer I rejoice in the great interest that has been manifested in this debate in behalf of the farmers of the United States.

This safeguarding of the farmers' interests is due in large measure to the fact that the farmers of the country are organized, and it is not amiss to say that they are organized for the sole purpose of securing a square deal, which has long been denied them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I hope the day will soon come when the farmers of the Nation will come into the full possession of all the benefits which are justly due them from all branches of one great government.

As a farmer, one among the few farmers in this House, I favored Canadian reciprocity. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As a Democrat I could figure no other course consistent with the declarations of my party in national council and in caucus in this House.

As a farmer I heartily indorse the bill now pending before this body, for the main reason that the farmers of this country will receive untold benefits from its passage.

As a Democrat I favor its enactment into law, because it is the redemption of one more pledge to the people by our party. So far as this House is concerned—which is the only branch of the Government we now control—I think I can safely predict the absolute fulfillment of every promise, which, when accomplished, will give us next year absolute control of all branches of this great Government. Our record so far justifies this belief and this hope. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Canadian-reciprocity agreement, of course, only applies to Canada. This bill applies to the whole world. Should any harm come from the first, the good of the second will largely predominate.

No harm will come from the first to the farmer, but great blessings will flow to him from the second.

Canadian reciprocity will prove a blessing; this free list will prove a godsend to the American farmer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I favored Canadian reciprocity because in agricultural products the balance of trade between Canada and the United States was largely in our favor. I will vote for this bill because in great measure it weakens the power of many great trusts which have plundered the farmer.

I favored Canadian reciprocity because it was the beginning of the end of the protective-tariff system. I favor this measure because it means the prosperity of the farmer and because it shows that the Democratic Party is the only sincere friend the farmer has in this country in national legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

With no financial investment of any character save in farming operations, with no knowledge of any profession save farming—and it is one of man's noblest professions—I am willing to risk my destiny on the policies outlined by my party. If failure comes, it will not be because of Democratic policies.

I have labored hard for the welfare of the farmer. I have given my time and means for his advancement. I am here because the farmers of my district trusted me. That trust is sacred to me. Their interest and their welfare is always uppermost in my mind; and as God has given me the light to see, I will advance their interest by my vote for this measure. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The tariff-protected interests of this country have met defeat because of their greed to oppress the people upon the necessities of life. The farmers of this country produce the main sustenance of human life—bread and meat. Any policy which demands more than a reasonable price for these two great foods must bring disaster to the farmer, because he is but one-third of our population, and our form of government is majority rule. It has never been the policy of the organized farmers of this country to ask anything save a reasonable price for their products. There is nothing in this bill to prevent a reasonable and profitable price for farm products, but there are many items which insure a reasonable price for what the farmer consumes, and this will prove profitable as well as novel to the American farmer.

The protective tariff on farm products is admitted a myth by Republican leaders; the taking away of the protective tariff from farm consumption of manufactured articles is but simple justice and true reciprocity as between the farmer and other classes.

Levy no tax save for revenue only.

As the farmer receives no benefit from the nominal tax on his production, he should not be burdened with a real tax upon his consumption.

To secure profits by legislation for any class means that other classes must be oppressed. It should never be the policy of our Government to grant special favors to special classes. This bill grants no special favor to the farmer in giving him many articles on the free list for his consumption, because his production has been on the free list, in effect, at all times.

This bill perfects the Democratic idea that as the farmer has always sold in the free markets of the world he should have the right to buy in the free markets of the world.

Considering the investment in money, the uncertainty of crop maturity, the great mental and physical labor involved, the farmers as a class have reaped but small benefit compared with other lines of business in the Nation.

The main reason for this condition of affairs is due in large measure to the fact that the farmer in his consumption paid heavy tribute to all other lines of business, which under the protective tariff have organized great trusts to plunder him in nearly every article he consumes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This bill is a "trust buster" of the first magnitude, and every Member of this House who is sincere in his professions to curb or break down the trusts should support it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill not only secures benefit to the farmers, but to millions of people in other walks of life, and it must be considered upon a broader plane than affecting only one class of our citizens.

Boots, shoes, harness, beef, veal, mutton, pork, lard, flour, corn meal, biscuit, bread, timber, shingles, sawed boards, sewing machines, salt, and numbers of other articles which are used by every citizen of our great country are put on the free list.

Though commonly called an agricultural free-list bill, its benefits directly reach every person in our cities as well as those upon the farms.

This bill helps to break down the barrier between the city and the farm, because it means increased trade among our people at home. The farmer will know that the value of what he buys is set by the natural law of supply and demand and that he is no longer the prey of his city brother, who has had the advantage over him by the legislation of a protective tariff.

I can not impress the fact too strongly upon the farmers of this country that, in large measure, the prices of their products depends upon their own action. I am a strong believer in farmers' organizations whose object is to secure reasonable prices for farm products. I commend every organization which tries to teach the farmer intelligent methods of marketing his produce. Distribution is a prime factor in the price of farm products.

No one can complain when the farmer, under the law of the land, by legal and honorable methods, by and through his own organizations, secures a reasonable price for his labor and his product.

I will always demand for the farmer a reasonable profit for his product, but to have that profit to come by his own effort and the use of his own sense in the sale of his crop and not by some law which must oppress others to help him.

As I would tear down the legal wall of the protective tariff that oppresses the farmer, so would I vote to wipe out any law which seeks to prevent the farmers from organizing to protect their interests or the laboring man to secure good wages. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The farmers could by organization bring the balance of the world to their feet, because they have the power to starve by organizing a great trust of meat and bread.

You can not starve the farmer. He can live by himself. He can produce his bread, his meat, his shelter, and his clothes if necessary. Let the farmers of this country issue the order that for 60 days no wheat, no cattle, no hogs, no corn should go to the market and millions of people would face starvation.

The farmer has no desire to use his great power to oppress other people, but he does demand, and rightfully so, a reasonable price for his product and the right to buy unrestricted by arbitrary laws. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The bill now pending before this House gives him this right. The Democratic Party is responsible for it, and to our party the farmer owes this freedom.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I take great pride in laying before this House certain legislation which has been enacted in my own State for the benefit of our farmers. I have copies here of State laws which I will print in the RECORD as a guide to other States, and I ask the membership of this House to give them careful consideration. I trust you will have

them adopted in your States. They have rendered untold benefit to Kentucky farmers, and will bring great relief to your farmers if you will adopt them. They have been upheld by the highest court in Kentucky as constitutional. I am glad to say that I had some part in their enactment, and the gentleman from the fourth Kentucky district [Mr. JOHNSON] was largely responsible for the passage of some of these acts.

An act to amend section 3 of an act of the General Assembly of Commonwealth of Kentucky, approved March 21, 1906, entitled "An act permitting persons to combine or pool their crops of wheat, tobacco, and other products and sell same as a whole, and making contracts in pursuance thereof valid," being chapter 117 of the acts of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the year 1906.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. That section 3 of an act entitled "An act permitting persons to combine or pool their crops of wheat, tobacco, and other products and sell same as a whole, and making contracts in pursuance thereof valid," approved March 21, 1906, being chapter 117 of the acts of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the year 1906, be, and the same is hereby, amended and reenacted so as to read as follows:

Such persons so entering into such an agreement or contract as is set out in the foregoing section are hereby permitted to select an agent or agents through or by or with whom said parties so entering into such agreement may classify, grade, store, hold, sell, or dispose of said crop, or any of them, and said agent or agents shall have the right to take, receive, hold, store, classify, grade, sell, or dispose of said crop so placed in said agreement for the purpose of accomplishing the object of such combination or agreement between such principals; and contracts and agreements entered into by such agent or agents for the purpose of classifying, grading, storing, holding, selling, or disposing of said crop so combined, united, or pooled, either in parcel or as a whole, are hereby permitted, and shall not, because of any such combination or purpose of such original agreement of such principals so entering into said combination, or of such agent or agents, be declared illegal or invalid. All contracts heretofore made by any person or persons for the purposes set out in the foregoing sections are hereby declared valid, if otherwise legally binding on the parties.

To prevent any breach or violation of any contract made for the purposes set out in the foregoing sections a restraining order and writ of injunction may be written by a proper officer, as prescribed in the Civil Code of Practice.

For any breach or violation of any contract entered into for the purposes set out in the foregoing sections the injured party may recover the damages sustained by him by reason of such violation of such contracts of the person violating the same, and also of any person who shall induce or persuade another to violate such contract, which damages shall include the reasonable expense and attorney's fees incurred by the injured party in prosecuting an action to recover such damages or to prevent a violation of such contract, if the party complaining shall succeed in doing so, which may be recovered in the same action or original proceeding. Said agent, when so selected as herein provided, shall have the sole right to sell said crop so pooled or combined, and it shall be unlawful for any owner of such crop to sell or dispose of same and for any person knowingly to purchase the same without the written consent of such agent, and upon conviction thereof he or they shall be fined in any sum or amount not exceeding \$250 for each offense, to be fixed by the jury in their discretion.

Sec. 2. Whereas many crops of tobacco and other products have been combined and pooled in this State under contract and agreement entered into for the purposes set out in the above section an emergency is now declared to exist which requires that this act shall take effect from and after its passage and approval by the governor.

(Approved Mar. 13, 1908.)

An act to prevent the sale or transfer of personal property where the possession is in one person and the title thereto is vested in another.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. It shall be unlawful for any person having the possession of personal property, the title to which is vested in another, to sell or otherwise dispose of such property without the written consent of the person in whom the title is vested. Any person guilty of such offense shall be fined not less than \$100 nor more than \$500 for each offense. Any person having notice of the manner in which such property is held, who shall purchase it of the person having the possession thereof, or of any other person without the written consent of the person in whom the title is vested, shall be fined not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000 for each offense.

Sec. 2. An emergency exists for the immediate operation of this law, therefore the same shall be in force from and after its enactment.

(Approved, Mar. 24, 1908.)

An act to amend an act entitled "An act permitting warehousemen to commingle tobacco of like grades," approved March 25, 1908.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. That section 3 of an act entitled "An act permitting warehousemen to commingle tobacco of like grades," approved March 25, 1908, be, and the same is, amended, and the said act is amended by adding at the end of section 3 thereof the following words: "And it is provided that any of such warehousemen may in such receipts agree and bind themselves to pay the person rightfully holding same and entitled thereto the value of the property described therein, in the event of loss or damage from any cause while in the possession of such warehousemen."

So that said section when amended will read as follows:

"Sec. 3. All warehouse receipts so issued by any corporation, company, partnership, or individual engaged in the business as above set forth shall be negotiable and transferable by indorsement in blank or by special indorsement and with like liability as bills of exchange now are and with like remedy thereon. And it is provided that any of such warehousemen may in such receipts agree and bind themselves to pay the person rightfully holding the same and entitled thereto the value of the property described therein, in the event of loss or damage from any cause while in the possession of such warehousemen."

Sec. 2. Inasmuch as the tobacco crop in this Commonwealth is now being delivered to warehousemen, and the growers can not otherwise secure the benefit of this act, an emergency is declared to exist, and this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

(Approved, Mar. 4, 1910.)

An act to authorize and regulate the recordation of agreements for pooling farm products.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. It shall be lawful for any person or corporation to whom or to which any article of farm products has been pooled or pledged for any purpose to record a list of the persons pooling or pledging same, together with a general description of the land upon which same was grown, or proposed to be grown, in the office of the clerk of the county court of the county in which said land is situated.

Sec. 2. Such recordation shall have the same effect as to creditors or purchasers as the recordation of chattel mortgages.

Sec. 3. Any person buying or soliciting pool or pledged property the list of which have been recorded as herein provided, shall upon conviction be fined not less than \$10 nor more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not less than 15 nor more than 90 days, or both so fined and imprisoned.

Sec. 4. For recording the agreements herein provided for the clerk shall be allowed a fee of 2 cents for each 20 words.

Sec. 5. Whereas it is greatly to the interest of the farmers of the State that a public record should be kept which shall be notice that their farm products have been pooled or pledged, an emergency is declared, and this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

(Disapproved, Mar. 8, 1910.)

Passed March 8, 1910, the objections of the governor to the contrary notwithstanding.

An act to declare lawful agreements to abstain growing crops of any given kind for any definite period.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. That it shall be lawful for the growers of any kind of farm products to agree to abstain from growing any kind of crops for any given period or season.

(Neither approved nor disapproved by the governor.)

An act to further regulate the pooling of farm products.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared lawful for any number of persons to combine, unite, or pool any or all of the crops of wheat, tobacco, corn, oats, hay, or other farm products raised by them, or proposed to be raised by them, whether or not the said crops have been sowed, set, pitched, or planted, for the purpose of classifying, grading, storing, holding, selling, or disposing of same, either in parcels or as a whole, in order or for the purpose of obtaining a greater or higher price therefor than they might or could obtain or receive by selling said crops separately or individually.

Sec. 2. Whereas it is greatly to the interest of the farmers of the Commonwealth and a public generally that the privilege defined in section 1 of this act should be speedily declared, an emergency is declared to exist, and this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

(Neither approved nor disapproved by the governor.)

Almost every article placed on the free list in this bill is controlled by some great trust. The American people for years have taxed themselves to build up these great trusts, and now that they have grown to be oppressive industrial giants, more than able to defend themselves in the markets of the world, it is time for the people to cease taxing themselves and demand justice from their own creations which seek to destroy them.

One of the fundamental principles of Democracy is "the greatest good to the greatest number." There will never be a downward revision of the tariff in the interest of all of the people so long as each individual Member upon this floor seeks to protect some special interest in his district. If necessity demands, we must be willing to make some personal sacrifice for the common good of our great country. I have the honor to represent the great hemp-producing district in the United States. The production of hemp in the United States has been confined almost entirely to the Blue Grass region of Kentucky. The placing of India hemp, or jute, upon the free list has, in effect, put our farmers out of business on that crop. Yet our farmers have not come to Congress with a single petition asking for a duty on jute.

The placing of a protective duty on jute means a higher price for hemp, but it also means a higher price for the twine of the grain growers, for the burlap of the cotton growers, for the cordage of the entire Nation, and our people are not selfish enough to ask that a tax be placed upon every farmer of the Nation in order that they might add some value to their hemp crop. I commend the patriotic spirit of the people whom I represent. We are willing to contribute our share to a downward revision of the tariff in order to lighten the burden of labor and agriculture, so long overburdened with unjust taxation.

I desire to add to my remarks a note on the hemp crop, which I will not take time to read, but will put it in the Record.

The loss of revenue to the Government under this bill is \$10,028,989. This amount is inconsiderable in comparison with the great saving and advantage to all of our people. By the policy of economy which the Democratic Party proposes to inaugurate there will not be the great demand for revenue, and

this amount will not be missed. The cutting off of one battleship will fill up the gap caused by this free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Kentuckians are always for peace, and especially on water. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The American farmer has been unnecessarily frightened by Canadian reciprocity. My belief is that the farmer will receive a benefit therefrom. A Republican President (not his party) and a Democratic House can share the honors of Canadian reciprocity. This bill was drawn and will be passed by the united Democratic Party upon this floor. If defeat comes in the Senate or the veto comes from the White House, it will strike a deadly blow at the home of every farmer and laboring man in the Nation. I trust for once at least the Republican Party will forget partisan politics and give agriculture and labor their just due.

The Democracy did not hesitate to vote for Canadian reciprocity for the reason that it was recommended by a Republican President. With dignity and patriotism we met the issue and saved a Republican President from disgrace and humiliation at the hands of his own party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

To-day we present this bill for the relief of labor and agriculture. Will the Republican Party, in control of every branch of the Government except this House, permit labor to prosper and agriculture to blossom and ripen into a glorious harvest?

The threat of corporate gold is beginning to be heard on account of the passage of this bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has told this House of the threat of the Steel Trust in his district. No doubt threats to bring on a panic in the Nation will be made in other congressional districts. It is the old story of corporate greed. If the trusts can not rule the country, they will destroy its peace and prosperity.

That threat means a broader controversy than is embodied in this bill. It reaches to the foundation of American Government. The question must be settled, "Which is the greater, the power of the people through their Government or the power of the trusts?" [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The trusts should take heed from the verdict of the American people rendered at the polls last fall. If the trusts of this country undertake to punish the American people for that verdict, they will "have sown the wind and shall reap the whirlwind."

For a great trust to deliberately and maliciously undertake to destroy the peace and prosperity of this Nation is as grave a crime as for the anarchist to strike at the very foundation of Government by murder or treason, and I for one am ready to help write upon the statute books of our land any law sufficient to prevent the deed. It has been shown repeatedly that the Steel Trust and other great trusts of this Nation need no legislative protection.

Their bluffs and their threats should be called by this House and the issue taken direct to the people as to whether they or the trusts are masters. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, by the passage of this bill agriculture will be greatly stimulated. The cry has gone up from the overcrowded cities of "back to the farm." The people now can go back to the farm with new hope and new energy. Our boys and girls can stay on the farms, because the Democratic Party proposes to see to it that they will not be driven away by unjust taxation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The necessities of the field and home will be put upon the free list, and the farmer boy will no longer be the serf of some great trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The farmer will gather new inspirations and new joys, and, with good humor and good cheer, bountifully feed the world.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer is the solid rock upon which rests the security of this Nation. It is his labor, his conservatism, his patriotism, which is the great balance wheel in the vast machinery of our national existence. Generous in nature, sound in sense, clean in morals, the American farmer turns back the tide which would sweep us either into plutocracy or into anarchy. In the American farmer is the main hope for the continuation of a democracy. May God stay the day when we forget the farmers.

Nine billions of dollars each year is the contribution of the American farmer to the national wealth!

Surely the Senate and the President will not deny the benefits of this bill to the makers of such magnificent wealth. If they do, there will be a new Senate and a new President at the next election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The farmers had a hand in the last election; in the next they will have both hands. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Just one year ago, upon the floor of this House, I warned the President against the oppression of the farmer. His adminis-

tration had dragged Kentucky farmers into the Federal courts and convicted them because they dared to organize to protect themselves from the Tobacco Trust.

At that time I used this language upon the floor of this House:

Is the President willing to go before the farmers of Ohio in the campaign to be held in that State this fall upon the issue of whether the farmers have the right to fix the price of their products themselves, either singly or collectively?

Is he willing to have brought into the limelight the records of the two worthies believed to be responsible for the prosecution of the Burley Tobacco Society? This question being answered in the affirmative, Judson Harmon ought to be reelected governor of Ohio by a majority of 100,000.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

I missed the figure only 377. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As a Democrat I rejoice at the great work already done in this House for the benefit of all of the people by my party. There is more good yet to come. I rejoice at the solid front we present to the disorganized and dismembered party on the other side. [Applause on the Democratic side.] By organization and by teamwork great victories are ahead of us. Let no Democrat pull back in the harness—harness is on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] With free sewing machines the farmers' wives can sew up our protection friends, the stand-patters, in free burlap and salt them away with free salt to keep until the final judgment day. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the hope of the American farmer is in his own organization and in the policies of the Democratic Party. I am a great believer in organization. In referring to a speech I made here in 1909 I find these words:

When, by organization, the Democrats of the South stand side by side and divide honors with the great States of Ohio and Indiana, and other States North, West, and East that made such Democratic gains in the last election, we can land the Hon. CHAMP CLARK in the Speaker's chair and the White House after that.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

CHAMP CLARK is in the Speaker's chair [applause], and the White House is waiting for a Democrat. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, we novices in the art or profession of manufacturing Federal law, subject, of course, to revision by the Senate, the President, the Supreme Court, and the powers above, have eagerly absorbed what has been said and have learned much that can not possibly be true. How could it all be true when judged by the votes on the reciprocity treaty and by the explanations given for those votes? There is no consensus of opinion on either side of the House, even amongst the most experienced and tutored as to the causes or probable effects of that measure.

In so far as the discussion relates to the protective-tariff theory, there is, however, some unanimity on one point, at least a partial agreement that the protective tariff should be regarded as a "local issue." That this particular national policy must be wrought out of the clash of class, section, district, and other special interests, and settled by a sort of mutual give-and-take, less euphemistically known as log-rolling. This makes of the tariff a sort of a grab bag, and we may reasonably expect that the more powerful get the first, last, and biggest grabs.

I am a Republican, or what used to be a Republican [applause on the Republican side], because I believe in the protection of infant industries that stand some eventual chance of becoming self-sustaining. That many of these industries, once fostered by protection, are now self-sustaining and do not need a protective tariff is abundantly shown and notoriously confessed as to the great steel industry by Mr. Andrew Carnegie. Many industries, having outgrown the cradle, have not been required to hustle for their livelihood, but have been carried bodily to a ward in a hospital where our stand-pat friends advocate keeping them during all eternity, to be doctored, nursed, and nourished at the public expense. One is reminded of the prayer of the man who possessed a cantankerous invalid wife: "Oh, Lord, let her get well, or—or—something." [Laughter.]

It is argued that by taxing one industry for the benefit of another industry, and vice versa, we create a home market that is productive of wealth. This brings to mind a story told by David Starr Jordan concerning the eagle and the blue-tailed lizard. It seems that the eagle one day swooped down upon the lizard and bit off and ate the lizard's tail; whereupon the

eagle acquired sufficient energy to lay an egg. The lizard climbed the tree, sucked the egg, and, through the encouragement thus afforded, grew a new tail. This process continued through many years, apparently, without much profit to either party save as it added to the interest of existence. [Laughter.]

A tale of similar import, but more profitable sequence, was related of a man who lived near the Petaluma marshes and started to raise carp. He was doing fairly well selling carp from his pond, when he suddenly conceived the idea of raising a side line of cats for the fur. He discovered that he could feed the carp to the cats and the cats to the carp, so that he increased mightily in his output of cats and carp and became wealthy. [Laughter.]

I have learned, Mr. Chairman, that it is customary to decorate the oratory of this floor with fruits, with flowers, with flags, and with farmers in various states of happiness and misery. [Laughter.] I respectfully submit a poem produced by a laureate of my district and which concerned itself with the tariff speeches of my esteemed opponent at the primaries:

I read these tariff speeches o'er—the more I read of them the more I do not know, but then I can rely upon our Congressman. Upon the very slightest hint he puts a red-hot speech in print, and when he prints that speech, you see, he has it mailed out here to me.

Mac makes it very clear just how if I pay more than I do now for socks and gloves and baby's dress—while I pay more they cost me less. And then he shows me where I lose by paying somewhat less for shoes, for though I pay less than before, my shoes they really cost me more.

He makes it clear to me that what I lose I gain, you see; and on such things as clothes and shoes I seem to gain but really lose. Thus, if I buy my socks too low, they'll still be higher—Dunc says so—and shoes I thought were high last fall were really low shoes after all.

[Laughter.]

Mac says if I pay less for shoes or hats, the maker has to lose. And if he loses, then, you see, he charges up the loss to me. Now, when I have to pay him more, he reckons profits to his store, and Duncan finds a share for me in all of this prosperity.

The speeches shed a radiant light upon the theme and make it bright; I merely read them o'er and o'er to find more's less and less is more. In buying hat, or coat, or vest, dear's cheap, and cheap is dear at best. High's low, low's high, far's near, near's far, white's black, black's white—and there you are.

We live in topsy-turvy land when McKinlay waves his magic wand.

[Laughter.]

Concerning the change and evolution that has come over the early Republican protective doctrine, designed to foster infant industries, I would further submit the following:

Mary had a little lamb,
Its fleece was white as snow;
It followed her to Pittsburg,
And now you ought to see the darned thing.

[Laughter and applause.]

The old idea of encouraging new industries is being destroyed by the present system, for, in so far as trusts and monopolies are being encouraged, individual enterprise and individual initiative are being suppressed. A monopoly need not confine its charges to a high percentage of profit on the product, but it can charge up to the public all the graft and mismanagement that may go to make up its costs. It is not compelled to be efficient. It can afford to dispense with improvements in machinery and methods. It can put valuable patents in cold storage. Thus the tariff, in so far as it aids the trusts, throttles progress instead of fostering industry.

In song and oratory we are properly reminded of the gratitude we owe to the Providence that placed us in this land of liberty and plenty. Is there not shown a lack of appreciation when we hear the solemn assertions made by some of the gentlemen that our prosperity is not due to the natural bounties of our country, not to the genius and efficiency of our people, but to a system of taxing ourselves. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Whenever protest is made against the existing protective tariff an argument promptly adduced in its favor is one which was best phrased by the Hon. "Bathhouse" Coughlin in the city hall of Chicago. He asked a fellow alderman how he could advocate the creation of prohibition territory and consequent loss of revenue from saloon licenses, when, as he stated it, "we are all of us heartily in need of funds." If either the Government or any interest happens to be "heartily in need of funds," there is always a means of raising revenue by boosting the tariff. I do not believe that it helps matters much to hold that we ought to lower the wall to such a point as to provide only for the higher wages of American labor plus a profit to the manufacturer or producer. This amendment still justifies the establishment in our country of industries that do not belong here. It would justify the raising of coconuts in hothouses. It would justify a tremendous tax upon tea in order that the laborer engaged in tea culture could be recompensed at upward of a dollar a day, while he is now receiving probably less than 10 cents a day on the other side of the ocean. I am unpatriotic enough to be grateful to the heathens who in their blindness are picking tea for us at that rate of wages, and I would not

advocate forcing them to adopt our standard of living by the wearing of American clothes, or even the drinking of Missouri champagne, Mr. Chairman, for I fear they might be brought to feel the necessity of charging us more for doing us this service.

No one has ever shown any fund from which can be drawn the tax levied by the tariff and paid out in subsidies to the protected interests except the fund that resides in the pockets of the people. Those who assume that the tariff is a means of creating prosperity or of creating wealth are much better at juggling and at picking coins out of the air than was Hermann, the magician. If we can tax ourselves rich, we can prove pover to be a productive industry. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Equally, an individual may become opulent by shifting coins from one pocket to another, and the Nation can acquire wealth, if not merit, by unanimously consenting to the reciprocal picking of pockets by all the people.

Economists would doubtless urge that this universal and fairly distributed pocket-picking system would be unproductive, but we have had too much of doctrinaire teachings to listen to any more of it.

It might be surmised that should the pocket-picking system become thoroughly established it would not be equally enjoyable to all the people. There would be some more adept than others. There would probably be coteries formed in the profession that would band together in "strong-arm" or "hold-up" work, and when, if perchance through popular clamor, because of overactivity, the practice were put into partial disrepute, and there arose the question of proper limitation, it would be found that the least skilled and the unorganized would first be deprived of the privilege of picking pockets. [Laughter.]

Through many of us newly elected Members the people are protesting, not against the wealth of the country, but against the present system of distribution, which fully deserves the bitter resentment it has incurred. The evils of distribution are caused by special privileges and the protective tariff creates and licenses privilege. It would not interest the men described in the Pittsburg Survey, who are worked to death and thrown on the junk pile, to figure out and to ascertain how many wives per annum a Pittsburg millionaire could afford out of the dividends of the Steel Trust. [Laughter.] Rather would he be interested in supporting one wife and some few children with less work and more pay. There would be little satisfaction to a cash girl working for Marshall Field & Co. at a weekly wage of \$3 to know that she and that corporation were jointly worth over \$50,000,000. [Laughter.] The people are not satisfied with statistics of national wealth, they want better conditions for themselves.

But after all, the greatest sin that can be laid at the door of the protective tariff is the economic waste which it encourages. The fortunes piled up by the richest men of the country amount to nothing when set against the annual loss caused by the employment of men in unjustifiable occupations.

A subsidy which supports those occupations must come from other occupations which belong on our soil and in our country, and the men engaged in either the wrong thing or the right thing in the wrong place form an army which we might call the "army of the mal-employed." They have to be supported by the well employed, just as much as every standing army is a charge upon industry.

Some day I expect to hear our stand-pat Republican friends making the old confession, "We have caused to be done those things that ought not to be done; we have left undone those things that ought to be done, and there is no health in us." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The Record, with its vast compilation of statistics, shows a mathematical ability engaged in proving out what is logically absurd. The accuracy of the almanac does not prove the value of the nostrum it advertises, nor can questions of ethics be determined by the use of logarithms. One is rather inclined to doubt the efficacy of such figures when they are used to prove views diametrically opposed. We certainly get into "topsy-turvy land" when we try to follow the statistics. You must remember the old rhyme—

Down here below two and two make four;
Perhaps up in heaven they make six or seven.

The statement was made on this floor that the dividends paid on the stocks of the great corporations were the proof of the wealth of the country and meant prosperity. There might properly be query made as to whether dividends represent the fruit of production or extortion, whether they were produced by the use of plow and ax or spindle and loom, or whether they were "produced" at the point of a revolver or searched for in the pockets of victims rendered unconscious by sandbag or lead pipe.

As a freshman in this course of education, I can not understand how a country can get rich by sharing its natural resources with all who choose to come, dividing our patrimony, as it were, and at the same time keeping out all possible things that can be excluded that would go to increase the size of our hoard. Privilege clamors for cheap labor and immediate development of everything. Statesmanship calls for readjustment of opportunity for ourselves and our children.

The balance of trade argument is not entirely convincing to some of us. Whenever China or Russia improve their balance of trade by exporting foodstuffs in time of famine, there seems to be something the matter with the mathematical self-sufficiency of this theory. If a freezing tramp should sell his clothes, he certainly would improve his balance of trade, although not his condition. [Laughter and applause.]

Anyone who has lived on the Pacific coast can not fail to entertain profound respect for the self-helping ability of the Japanese. They are the most remarkable self-helpers in all the world, and no one need ever again invite them to help themselves. Some two years ago, in the islands of Hawaii, just at a time when the cane-grinding season was at hand, the Japanese engaged in that industry unanimously struck. They did not appear to be satisfied with their wages nor disposed to recognize the contract they had made with the planters, which procedure was not entirely original on their part. In the course of the dispute they wrote a series of resolutions to the planters to the effect "that it was the duty of the planters, in accordance with the true American principle of protection, to get an increase in the sugar duty and thereby raise the value of sugar, and then out of the added profit they should divide with the laborers." Strange that this simple and excellent and wholly American plan was not at once adopted. [Laughter.]

Let us consider some more phases of Hawaiian sugar. The business was built up first under subsidy and then under a protective tariff. The sugar land is nearly all of it in the hands of the great corporations. These corporations are paying large dividends on inflated values. This is the upper crust of the pie. Next there comes a filling of upward of 400,000 tons of sugar, for which, together with all other sugar, imported and domestic, the American people are paying heavy taxes. The lower crust consists of oriental labor. The yellow man is everywhere displacing the white man, even in the skilled occupations. The white man of small means has little or no chance to inhabit the "Paradise of the Pacific." It is to-day a country of corporations and yellow men. The white men are so greatly outnumbered that there seems danger that the pie may be turned over, to the obvious benefit of the under crust, but to the destruction of the upper crust. To prevent such an unfortunate occurrence and to protect the protected sugar industry we are taxed for an increase in our Navy. To protect the Navy, which must protect the protected sugar industry, we must be taxed to fortify Pearl Harbor. To protect Pearl Harbor, to protect the Navy, to protect the protected sugar industry, we must keep near Pearl Harbor a considerable army of men, and these must be supported out of public taxation.

This is an illustration of the "American doctrine," and the American consumer can realize as he pays his grocery bills that he is not only patriotically encouraging an American industry for the benefit of corporations and yellow labor, but that he is encouraging an indefinite increase in our Navy and a probable increase in our Army, always with the possibility that the Navy and the Army aforesaid may have to be actively used to further protect the protected sugar industry, with all the waste of life and of property incident to war, and at a very rough estimate with four hundred and eighteen thousand millions of dollars of pensions to pay in the years to come. [Laughter.]

I can not agree with those gentlemen on the majority side who believe in a tariff for revenue. There is doubtless justification for a high tariff on certain luxuries, but there is no fairness in a revenue tariff laid upon necessities. The burden is not upon the proper shoulders. Mr. Rockefeller probably pays less Government revenue on the food he consumes than does the average hod carrier. He would doubtless like to pay as much, but he can not without eating as much. For the present we must look to the tariff for revenue. Eventually we shall provide for Government funds from income tax, from heavy taxation of community-created land values, from rentals of the public domain, all of them direct and comprehensible. We shall have internal-revenue taxation on articles not necessities.

I have discussed theory without any idea that we could afford or should make any sweeping changes at once. Too many people inhabit the rickety structure to permit of its immediate demolition. A revision downward, schedule by schedule, is the beginning of the work, and a notice to make preparations to vacate.

[Applause on the Democratic side.] At some time or other these patients, the "invalid industries," must leave the hospital, whether to turn their steps to self-support or to the cemetery. [Laughter.] They can not forever remain parasitic. The tariff has been too often revised upward by its friends. The people have commissioned its enemies to revise it downward. That we may have a more just system of distribution and a more equitable system of taxation, we must study the sources of our wealth and the means whereby this wealth may be saved and increased for the benefit of the many.

There is great hope in the growing ideals and the clearing outlines of the great policies of State and national conservation. By saving the common wealth for all our people and by wiping out the great special privileges in land and other natural resources, by breaking down the extortions of monopoly and by regulation of our public utilities, we shall make this country better for the average man, and no worse for any man. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HARRIS] 30 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of this House I am a trifle hesitant in rising for the first time to present my views in the form of a speech.

I was much interested, night before last, in the dream of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. His dream of empire in all things commercial, financial, and political, given and fore-ordained by the Almighty, but still needing the aid and protection of mere men for its perfect fulfillment, entranced me.

His wonderful revelation of the final purposes of All-Wisdom, under the guiding hand, however, of the owners of the soil in the cotton belt, was not, nevertheless, completely satisfying.

To my mind—developed in a harsher and less favored climate, where life is not one long, sweet dream of universal dominion, as it is a struggle to find means to keep warm most of the year and to keep cool the remainder—it left some things undisclosed or undeveloped. When his dream is fulfilled, when all people are converted from a fondness for wool, and the sheep shall have become as extinct as the dinosaur and the dodo, when the taste of mutton and of lamb shall be as forgotten as the flavor of the viands at Belshazzar's feast, will the lords of the soil in the cotton belt extend to the world and the people thereof something of the grace that has been shown to them, or will they take advantage of their monopoly and charge all the traffic will bear? [Applause on the Republican side.]

When the peoples of those portions of the earth where cotton has been grown and spun and woven and worn for ages before the soil of his empire was disclosed to the eyes of civilized man come knocking at his door seeking market for their cheaper wares, will he invoke the law for their exclusion or will he invite them to his feast? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Pending the fulfillment of the dream and during the process of construction, I am of those who can not see that harm or injustice has been done to him or his, because under a system of human laws industries have grown up here that give employment to thousands who live in less favored spots, who do not expect to enter into his kingdom, that have furnished market for enough of cotton to give a manufactured product of over \$450,000,000 each year, and other industries that use cotton as a part of their product, to the value of the cotton consumed in them of over \$34,000,000 more.

However, Mr. Chairman, I did not rise to engage in a general debate on the question of protection versus free trade. I content myself with saying that I am a protectionist, and desire to foster every industry that needs it in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I rose to say a few words, present a few figures, and show why the products of one industry should not be included in this or any other free list.

As I come from a manufacturing State and from a district which has a great and vital interest in this proposed bill, I do desire, however, to state why the proposed placing of boots and shoes upon the free list works a great harm to a large body of honest laboring people. I believe also that it will work harm to the people that the members of the majority of this House claim that they desire to benefit.

A protectionist by faith and by the demonstrations of recent commercial history, I have believed that the claim of the benefits of diversified industries is a sound one, and that by their growth and increase the farmer has benefited and gained an advantage by the creation of markets at his door. In my judgment the prophecy of the early exponents of the protective policy has been bountifully and wonderfully fulfilled and the faith in it of my Republican predecessors marvelously justified.

My reasoning has been done on the basis of what I have seen in the manufacturing section where we are consumers of food products and not producers.

I do not desire to trespass long on the time of this House, but I do desire to call attention to some things.

First, I want to call attention to the New England group of States, according to the last bulletin that I have been able to get. We have in that group of States wage earners in our shops and factories to the number of 940,750 people. We pay to them annually wages to the amount of \$439,050,232, and they turn out products to the annual value of \$2,025,998,437. The details of these figures I have set forth by States in the table, which I will not stop to read if it may be made to appear in the RECORD:

New England wage earners and wages.

	Number.	Wages.	Value of products.
Connecticut.....	181,605	\$87,942,628	\$369,082,061
Maine.....	74,958	32,601,759	144,020,197
Massachusetts.....	488,399	232,388,946	1,124,092,051
New Hampshire.....	65,366	27,693,203	123,610,904
Rhode Island.....	97,318	43,112,637	202,109,583
Vermont.....	33,106	15,221,059	63,083,611
Total.....	940,750	439,050,232	2,025,998,437

Following the usual method of calculation, but giving a margin for safety in the figures, we may allow four persons dependent on the wages of one wage earner—3,663,000 people who are looking to the work in the shops and factories for their livelihood.

These wage earners spend their money, as we do, pretty largely for food. In my section they are accustomed to three meals a day, 365 days in the year, when work is plenty. We furnish the markets for the producers of the West, the far West, and the South. The grains and meats of the Middle West, the fruits of California, the early fruits and vegetables of Georgia, Florida, and the Carolinas, come to us to be consumed and find a ready and constant market.

In the matter of the particular industry for which I wish to speak the figures are instructive, and at least furnish food for reflection. It is a widespread industry, free from trusts and combinations. It is an industry that is throughout the country:

Boot and shoe industry.
(1,316 factories.)

Capital.....	\$122,526,093
Wage earners.....	140,924
Wages.....	\$69,059,080
Materials.....	\$197,363,495
Product.....	\$320,107,458

This industry is distributed over 17 States, which turn out an annual product of \$1,000,000 and upward, besides other States which have a smaller output.

I have prepared a table of those 17 States, showing the number of wage earners in that industry in each State and the annual value of the product of each. This table I will not read, unless it is demanded, if it may appear in the RECORD. It may be enough to say that the number of wage earners in those States varies from 579 in the smallest to 74,191 in the largest, and that the grand total employed in that industry is 171,891, and that the annual value of the boot and shoe product of those 17 States is \$314,290,987.

Wage earners in the boot and shoe industry in 17 States.

California.....	819
Connecticut.....	579
Illinois.....	4,891
Kentucky.....	861
Maine.....	7,001
Maryland.....	735
Massachusetts.....	74,191
Michigan.....	2,000
Minnesota.....	1,930
Mississippi.....	11,903
New Hampshire.....	12,226
New Jersey.....	4,483
New York.....	19,086
Ohio.....	15,374
Pennsylvania.....	9,968
Vermont.....	1,943
Wisconsin.....	3,901
Total.....	171,891

Distribution of industry, States producing \$1,000,000 and over.

California.....	\$1,077,088
Connecticut.....	1,279,755
Illinois.....	9,026,238
Kentucky.....	1,029,939
Maine.....	12,351,293

Maryland.....	\$1,011,393
Massachusetts.....	144,291,426
Michigan.....	3,531,028
Minnesota.....	4,169,732
Mississippi.....	23,493,552
New Hampshire.....	22,425,700
New Jersey.....	6,977,300
New York.....	34,137,049
Ohio.....	25,140,220
Pennsylvania.....	14,607,867
Virginia.....	2,627,244
Wisconsin.....	6,513,563
Total.....	314,290,987

In my own State of Massachusetts there are 502 establishments; there is an average number of over 62,000 people employed, which runs in good times to over 74,000 people; there are over \$33,000,000 in wages paid out; there is a product of an annual value of over \$144,000,000; and our average wage rate is the highest in that industry in any section in the world. Brockton, in my district, pays more than any other place. I have prepared again a table, and those figures I will now read:

Boot and shoe industry in Massachusetts.

Establishments.....	502
Wage earners.....	62,633
Wages.....	\$33,106,667
Materials.....	\$88,493,009
Value of product.....	\$144,291,426
Average wage.....	\$529.44
Above average.....	\$68.84

When I have called your attention to the figures of the shoe industry I have told but half the story. For every wage earner in the shoe factories in the city of Brockton there are many others whose industry depends on his, but whose industrial product is mentioned in no tariff and is covered by no schedule.

Shoemakers do not build the factories in which they work, the houses in which they live, the store in which they spend their money, the bank in which they deposit their savings, the schoolhouses in which their children learn to be good citizens, or the churches in which they worship.

The craftsmen whose product is the completed structure for all of these, built upon the spot, benefits as much and often more than the workman in the factory. The duty covers him indirectly but none the less surely, and he prospers when they do and goes without work and without food and clothes when they do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

These men and their families, again, are consumers and not producers of food. They, too, form a large army; they earn a large amount of money; and they, too, make the market for the products of the soil. All of these have been hard pressed the last few years. All the protection they now have is 10 per cent on boots and shoes. It is perilously low and leaves them on the danger line now.

With Germany and France and Canada imposing duties on boots and shoes, with these countries equipped with the same machinery that our own people have, copying the style and methods, gaining in efficiency in the use of our most approved machinery, and with a wage rate only about one-half of ours, can we expect to benefit the boot and shoe worker by putting his product on the free list?

If you destroy or seriously injure so great an industry, if you send our manufacturers to Canada and Germany and England, to make there, with the same machinery but with cheaper labor, and send in here free of all duty that which has been made here and has supported so many, what answer will you make to the abandoned and desperate body of workers, and what will you say to the farmer who loses so great a food market here at home when they ask you why you have done this thing? [Applause on the Republican side.]

You are proposing to do this to placate the farmer. I have more confidence in that same farmer than you have. I have seen him in the days from 1878 down through 1879 and the early eighties, when drought parched his crops, when the grasshopper pest ate the rest, and when the resumption of specie payment imposed upon him an added burden of debt, sit down with aching but brave heart and a good conscience and refuse to follow the Democratic-Socialistic doctrine of repudiation under the guise of "greenbackism."

I have seen him from 1890 to 1896, when neither he nor the workers in our shops and factories prospered and when things pressed him hard, refuse again to follow the proposed remedy of 16 to 1.

I have seen him steadily following out and supporting the doctrine of protection because he believed that as industry grew around him he profited through his own home markets, and he relied more upon those markets than he did upon the duties set forth in the tariff schedule.

That same farmer is a wise man. He notices that in the last 10 years the population of this country has increased 12,000,000.

He believes that Mother Columbia is not yet sterile, and that in the next ten years she will add to her family some 19,000,000 more. He knows that this added 19,000,000 have got to be fed, as well as housed and employed, and that he will have his hands full in feeding the family.

I have faith to believe that in offering to him old Doctor Democrat's unvaried panacea for that "tired feeling," and every ill, from toothache to smallpox—and like that liniment that was offered to Bill Sykes after his slaughter of the hapless Nancy, also good to remove spots from the trousers and stains from the soul—your Democratic free-trade mixture, you will find he will refuse to take it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In behalf of that industry I ask you to stop and pause before you do us that harm. I live in the next town to the city of Brockton, which town is a little sister to that good city, as they are both children of the one mother, old Bridgewater. I had my office in Brockton for many years. I was there in 1892 and the years that followed. I know what happened to us when the shoe industry languished. I know what came to us when the factories closed and the work ceased. I do not want to see it again. I am speaking for the workers and not for the manufacturers.

The manufacturer will generally take care of himself, but when you say to these people that you are going to strike out that industry, you are going to open the markets of this country free to the world while every other country but England has a tariff from 17½ per cent to 35 per cent against us, I do not believe you are going to do the shoe worker or your farmer much good. In the interest of that industry and the 171,891 people engaged in it, I ask you to stop and think before you do this thing. You will answer to them if you do, and what that answer will be I think I know in my section. You are in control, and you advertise the wisdom with which you are going to deal with the affairs of the country. I invite your attention to some of the great internal questions of finance, commerce, and the regulation of these horrid monopolies, and I think you will find something there that is worthy for your great wisdom to be brought to bear upon which will bring more benefit to the country than it will to remove the tariff wall and strike down the industries we have which are of benefit to the farmer in the West and the factory worker of the East. Take out those things which keep them apart, and do not make us compete with all the world in a fair market where we have good wages and good living. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from Massachusetts use?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, it is a great honor to be a Member of this House and a great privilege to have the opportunity to address the Representatives of 90,000,000 free Americans. In view of this I may occupy the liberal time kindly yielded to me by my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and now, in the very beginning, I invite you, my brethren, to draw near and hear the true gospel of Democracy, pure and simple, as it shall be proclaimed unto you by the prophet Ezekiel. [Laughter and applause.]

Our distinguished and able Speaker, upon assuming the chair, when he was elected on the first day of this session, said this:

My Democratic brethren, coupled with the joy of once more seeing a House a larger majority of which is of my own political faith is a keen sense of our responsibility to our country and our kind. It is an old adage worthy of acceptance that where much is given much is required.

After 16 years of exclusion from power in the House and 14 years of exclusion from power in every department of Government, we are restored to power in the House of Representatives and in that alone. We are this day put upon trial, and the duty devolves upon us to demonstrate, not so much by fine phrases as by good works, that we are worthy of the confidence imposed in us by the voters of the land, and that we are also worthy of their wider confidence. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We could not if we would, and we would not if we could, escape this severe test. We will not shirk our duty. We shrink not from the responsibility. That we will prove equal to the situation in which we find ourselves placed through our own efforts and by our own desires there can be no doubt, and the way to accomplish that is to fulfill with courage, intelligence, and patriotism the promises made before the election in order to win the election. [Applause on the Democratic side.] By discharging our duty thoroughly and well, subordinating personal desires to principle and personal ambition to an exalted love of country, we will not only receive the indorsement of the people, but, what is far better, we will deserve their indorsement.

Chief among these promises were:

1. An honest, intelligent revision of the tariff downward, in order to give every American citizen an equal chance in the race of life, and to pamper none by special favor or special privilege; to reduce the cost of living by eradicating the enormities and cruelties of the present tariff bill; and to raise the necessary revenue to support the Government. * * * [Applause on the Democratic side.]

2. The passage of a resolution submitting to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by the popular vote. * * * [Applause.]

3. Such changes in the rules of the House as are necessary for the thorough and intelligent consideration of measures for the public good, several of which changes are accomplished facts; if other changes are deemed wise, they will be promptly made.

* * * * *
4. "Economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened." The literal fulfillment of that promise which so nearly affects the comfort and happiness of millions we have begun—and we began at the proper place—by cutting down the running expenses of the House by more than \$188,000 per annum. Economy, like charity, should begin at home. That is where we began.

The Constitution gives the House the practical control of the purse strings of the country, and the House should insist, resolutely and firmly, on exercising that control to the end that the appropriation bills may be reduced to the needs of the Government economically and effectively administered. It is our duty to provide every dollar needed for the proper and economical conduct of the Government, but it is equally our duty to prevent waste and extravagance in public expenditures, for we should never forget that it is a difficult task for millions of families to live now in decency and comfort. Surely it is the part of wisdom, statesmanship, humanitarianism, and patriotism to legislate so as to reduce their burdens to the minimum. * * * No good citizen desires to cripple the Government in any legitimate function, but no good citizen desires that the people be loaded down with unnecessary taxes.

5. The publication of campaign contributions and disbursements before the election. The bill to accomplish that desired reform has been prepared and introduced. It will be speedily passed by the House.

6. The admission of both Arizona and New Mexico as States. [Applause.] I violate no confidence in stating that so far as the House is concerned, they will be speedily admitted and they will be admitted together. [Applause.]

These are a few of the things which we promised. We are not only going to accomplish them, we have already begun the great task. What we have done is only an earnest of what we will do. We this day report progress to the American people. The rest will follow in due course.

No man is fit to be a lawgiver for a mighty people who yields to the demands and solicitations of the few having access to his ear but is forgetful of that vast multitude who may never hear his voice or look into his face. [Applause.]

I suggest to my fellow Members on both sides of the big aisle—which is the line of demarcation betwixt us as political partisans, but not as American citizens or American Representatives—that he serves his party best who serves his country best. [Applause.]

These were the words of our Democratic Speaker—a patriotic and honest sentiment, expressed in beautiful and in forceful language by a great and good man, whom we all delight to call our friend, CHAMP CLARK, whose big heart beats in unison with the throbbing hearts of the toiling masses of the American people, and who desires above everything else to do those things, and those alone, which will bring about the largest and best results for the greatest number of all the people. I was one of the first to propose his election as Speaker in a speech on the floor of this House, and I am proud of it, and I predict that the historian's record will show him to be one of the greatest Speakers who ever presided over this magnificent legislative body. [Applause.]

How are we fulfilling the promises which we made and which were enumerated in the speech which I have just read? We have already passed the bill providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people. I voted for this bill with a great deal of pleasure. I have advocated it upon the stump and in this Hall heretofore. I believe that the source of all power is the people; and if left to me, I would not only permit them to elect United States Senators, but I would permit them to elect every officer of this Government by direct vote of the people, from the President of the United States down to the constable in the neighborhoods in which they live. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The offices belong to the people, and when an officer is elected he should serve the people, and they should have a voice in selecting him, and he should be responsible to them for the performance of his duties.

We have passed the bill providing for the publication of campaign contributions. This bill provides that the publication shall be made not only before the election and up to the day of election, but that it shall be made of those contributions which may come later, subsequent to the election. The American people are honest themselves as a rule. You may take the plain citizen throughout this country, and in his heart there is integrity and honesty and sincerity and patriotism. He wants the same to be reflected by his officers in the posts which they hold, and therefore he demands that the elections in this country shall be fair, that they shall be honest, that they shall reflect the sentiments he feels, and therefore he desires that the campaign contributions shall be known before the election as well as after, in order that he may be advised of the influences that have been brought to bear in order to control elections and from what sources they come.

We have passed the Canadian reciprocity bill which came to us, the pact entered into between Canada and the United States. It has received the approval of this House and has gone to the Senate. We have passed the apportionment bill providing for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress throughout the United States.

This record has not been surpassed by Congress, since I have been a Member, in the length of time this Congress has been in session. This is but an earnest of the honest, energetic, and sincere efforts we propose to use in passing other remedial and good legislation to follow. Every promise we have made as enunciated by our distinguished Speaker will be redeemed by the party now in power in this House. We believe not only in making promises and declarations to the people, but we believe in keeping the promises and declarations when made. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not believe that in order to secure the support of the people at the ballot box we should deceive them like the Republican Party did before the last presidential election by promising before election to revise the tariff downward, and then, after having by this deception secured the election, with unblushing shame revise it upward. We promised to revise it downward, and we will keep that pledge. Therefore we have under consideration what is familiarly known as the farmers' free list bill. This bill I will not now take the time to read in detail, but will incorporate it in my remarks, because I feel sure that all within the sound of my voice have read it and are familiar with its provisions.

It provides, however, for placing on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meat, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles. Do the farmers deserve consideration at our hands? Should we consider what is for their welfare and for their good? I say that of all the people in this country they deserve our highest consideration, because they do more for the Government and do more for the country and they add more wealth to the wealth which we already have than any class of people beneath the shining sun. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Therefore I say they should receive at the hands of every Representative on this floor the most careful, candid, and sincere consideration. Let us see for a few moments what they are doing for the country. I call attention to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1910, which I have in my hand, the last annual report published. He says:

Nothing short of omniscience can grasp the value of the farm products of this year. At no time in the world's history has a country produced farm products within one year with a value reaching \$8,926,000,000, which is the value of the agricultural products of this country for 1910. This amount is larger than that of 1909 by \$305,000,000, an amount of increase over the preceding year which is small for the more recent years.

Again he says:

A national asset amounting to 3,000,000,000 bushels, worth \$1,500,000,000, is found in the corn crop. Its production this year was 3,121,581,000 bushels, a crop that exceeds that of even the great agricultural year 1906. It is greater than the average crop of the preceding five years by 14 per cent.

A notable feature of corn production this year is the growing importance of the South. This has been manifested in a small way in very recent years, but now the increased magnitude of the crop in that section, both absolute and relative to national production, forces itself upon the attention.

Let a comparison be made with corn production in the South in the census year 1889, or 21 years ago. At that time the South Atlantic States produced only 6.2 per cent of the national crop of corn. This year they produced 9.1 per cent, or an increase relatively of about one-half. The relative increase for the South Central States is even greater, being from 14.8 per cent of the national crop of 1889 to 23.4 per cent in 1910. Then the South produced hardly more than one-fifth of the national crop; now it produces one-third.

While the value of this corn crop is below that of 1909 and also of 1908, its amount belongs to stories of magic. It can hardly be reckoned at less than \$1,500,000,000, a sum sufficient to cancel the interest-bearing debt of the United States, buy all of the gold and silver mined in all of the countries of the earth in 1909, and still leave to the farmers a little pocket money.

In reference to cotton he says:

For many years the cotton crop was fourth in value among the crops, being exceeded usually by corn, wheat, and hay. But in those days the price of cotton was very low. The crop of this year may be worth in lint and seed a round \$900,000,000 at the farm, or more than the corn crop was worth in any year prior to 1901, or more than the wheat or hay crop was ever worth.

Apparently the cotton crop of this year, including seed, is worth \$129,000,000 more than the crop of last year, and that crop was far above any previous one in value. During the last five years the cotton crop had an average value of \$685,000,000, so that the value for this year is 13 per cent above the five-year average.

Then he discusses hay, wheat, oats, potatoes, sugar, tobacco, barley, flaxseed, rye, rice, hops, and all cereals. Then he takes up the question of exports:

The value of the exports of farm products, after constant oscillation, increased to the enormous amount of \$1,017,396,404 in 1908, from which there was a decline in 1909 and another in 1910, for which latter year the amount stands at \$871,107,067, a value which has been exceeded only in the years 1901 and 1906 previous to 1907.

In the exports of 1910 the principal item was cotton, with a value of \$450,447,243. Next in order stands packing-house products, with a value of \$135,959,373; third in order are grain and grain products, valued at \$133,320,418; after which are tobacco, \$38,115,386; oil and oil-cake meal, \$19,251,012; fruits, \$18,504,591; live animals, \$17,447,735. Compared with 1909, there was a decrease in all of the principal items except in cotton, for which the increase was about \$33,000,000, fruits about \$2,500,000, and tobacco about \$7,000,000.

Thus he discusses the balance of trade and says:

THE TRADE BALANCE.

Until 1898 there was ever a balance of trade against the United States in merchandise other than farm products; in that year for the first time the exports of merchandise other than farm products exceeded in value the imports. From 1898 to 1902 the value of exports of merchandise other than farm products exceeded that of imports, and again from 1904 to 1909. The contrary was true for 1903 and 1910, the adverse balance of the last year for manufactures and other merchandise not produced on the farm being \$10,926,193.

On the other hand, in the case of farm products there has been an almost unbroken balance of trade in favor of the United States as far back as inquiry has been made. From 1851 to 1863 is found this favorable balance and also from 1866 to the present time. During the five-year period 1886-1890 the farmer's balance of trade in favor of this country averaged \$206,265,002; during the next five years the average was \$257,666,800; in the five years that followed the average was \$386,637,041; during the period 1901-1905 the average was \$431,234,941; and during the last five-year period, 1906-1910, the average was \$433,683,775. The increase in this quinquennial average has been unbroken since 1886-1890.

The total balance of trade in our favor in farm products from 1886 to 1910, inclusive, amounts to the enormous sum of \$8,577,437,791. But for the exportation of the products of the farm furnished by the farmers of this country to swell our foreign trade there would be a balance of trade against us from 1886 to 1910 of more than \$8,000,000,000. In view of this remarkable and marvelous result I ask you the question again, Are not the farmers of this country entitled to the highest consideration at our hands?

I believe that they are, and, in view of that fact, I introduced myself in the early days of this session of Congress two free-list bills, in which was included many articles which are contained in the present bill which is pending before the House. We propose to give to the farmers of this country some relief from the enormous taxes with which they have been burdened so long. We propose to give them recognition for the marvelous service which they have performed for this great Republic. What has the Republican Party ever done for the American farmer along this line? You have required him, by the strong arm of your unrighteous and oppressive law, to pay high taxes on everything on the face of the earth, practically speaking, which he was compelled to buy, and you have forced him to sell everything, practically, which he produces in a free-trade market in competition with the world. He asked you for bread and you gave him a stone. You have pursued him through all his life, in death, and, in fact, practically to the gates of eternity. I will demonstrate the truth of that statement. In the morning the first ray of light which he sees is through a protected window glass. When he arises he puts on his protected clothes, washes his face in a protected wash pan, wipes it on a protected towel, combs his hair with a protected comb, eats his breakfast out of a protected plate, stirs his coffee with a protected spoon, drinks it out of a protected cup and saucer, and eats his food with a protected knife and fork upon a protected table while sitting in a protected chair.

When he has finished his breakfast he puts on his protected hat and goes out and takes his protected bridle and catches his horse. He leads him out and puts on him his protected plow-gear and prepares to go to the field. When he arrives there he hitches him with protected trace chains to a protected single-tree attached by a protected clevis and pin to a protected plowstock on which there is a protected plowpoint. When he has finished his crop he hauls his corn to the crib and his cotton to the gin in a protected wagon. He gins his cotton in a protected gin, wraps it in protected bagging, binds it with protected ties, and presses and bales it in a protected press, and then he has the great and final privilege of selling it in the free-trade markets of the world. My Lord, what a dose of protection! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But you are not satisfied with that. You tax every article of clothing he and every member of his family wears. You even tax the cradle in which his good wife rocks the baby. Not only that, but when he passes off the stage of action and is cold in death, you compel him to be buried in a coffin that is protected. You screw down the lid with screws which are protected, with a screw driver which is protected, and then the minister of God, as he stands up to perform the last sad rites at the tomb, does so with the Word of God, the Bible, in his hand, that should at least be free, but alas, alas, how heartless and unsympathetic you are for it is also protected! [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

Therefore I say to you that you pursue him not only through life, but you pursue him even unto death and down into his grave and to the very gates of eternity itself. It seems that the only relief in life he can ever hope to obtain will have to come from the Democratic Party and the only relief even after he is cold in death must come from the final blast of old Gabriel, who will call him from his protected coffin in the grave to the home

above. May the good Lord deliver us from this overdose of protection and from this heartless policy of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, this House is Democratic. It is admitted, practically, that this bill will pass. It contains in it a provision for free bagging and ties. This is a just demand—

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

Mr. CANDLER. Yes, sir; with pleasure.

Mr. SLOAN. I was interested in your speaking of what was taken from the American farmer. Was that the reason why the exception was made in the lumber schedule here where it says?—

Planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

These, I understand, are frequently used in the making of coffins, and they are excepted in your free list. Is that done so that you can make that kind of a speech, which we have heard, probably, on every stump in the United States?

Mr. CANDLER. The gentleman has been fortunate in hearing so many good speeches, but unfortunate in not being profited thereby. I am sorry he did not learn something from them.

Mr. SLOAN. I asked if that was the reason for the exception.

Mr. CANDLER. Oh, no; the exception was not for that reason. As a rule the plain people in this country are not buried in coffins made out of rosewood. The rich only can afford them. Free lumber was put in this bill to help the thousands, yea, millions, of our people who do not own their homes to build a modest house and own the roof over their heads, and the exception was made because the lumber excepted is not necessary for that purpose. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I was proceeding, when I was interrupted, to discuss bagging and ties for a few moments. They are put upon the free list in this bill along with other necessities for the farmer. This is a recognition of a just demand by the farmers of the South, because they furnish that great product of this country—cotton—which travels across the water and brings back the gold that furnishes prosperity to it. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture says we exported \$450,447,243 worth of cotton, which means that it brought in that much gold. I say it is but just to them that they should have the bagging with which they wrap the cotton and the ties with which they bind it free of duty and free of taxation.

A few days ago the New Orleans Cotton Exchange passed a resolution upon this subject.

In a copy of a paper called the Progressive Farmer and Southern Farm Gazette, founded by Dr. Tait Butler in 1895 at Starkville, Miss., in my district, I find the following in the issue of Saturday, April 22, 1911:

That the Cotton Bagging and Tie Trust, "not satisfied with robbing the American cotton planter of nearly \$1,000,000 annually through unjust tariff placed upon bagging and ties under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, are planning to increase their levy on the cotton crop to \$2,800,000 annually" is declared in resolutions adopted a few days ago by the New Orleans Cotton Exchange. The resolutions appeal to Congress to place bagging and ties on the free list, and urge the enactment of the necessary legislation at the present extra session of Congress.

President W. B. Thompson, of the cotton exchange, in a letter * * * tells of the great importance to the South of this tariff steal. He says, in part:

"The cotton crop of the South yields annually an average of about 12,000,000 bales, of this total approximately five-eighths, or 7,500,000 bales, * * * are exported and exchanged for foreign gold. The mere statement of these facts attests the importance of the cotton-producing industry, emphasizes the obligation which the country owes the producer of this crop, and establishes his right to at least just treatment at the hands of the general lawmaking power.

"Under the present tariff law the duty on steel cotton ties amounts to 0.027 cent per bale, or to \$324,000, on a crop of 12,000,000 bales. This tariff is prohibitive, as is shown by the fact that no steel ties are imported. Therefore, the Government has no share in this impost which constitutes simply and safely tribute levied upon cotton farmers for the benefit of the Cotton Tie Trust.

"The duty on jute bagging imposed by the present tariff law amounts to 0.05 cent per bale, or to \$630,000, on a crop of 12,000,000 bales. This tariff is, to a large extent, prohibitive, inasmuch as it yields only about \$100,000 revenue to the Government. The balance constitutes a tribute paid by the cotton farmers to the Bagging Trust.

"But the Bagging Trust is not satisfied with its share of this impost. It desires to raise the duty to a figure which will not only prevent the Government from receiving any revenue therefrom, but will enable the trust to take from the farm four times as much as it has been able to take heretofore.

"From the reasons stated it will incontestably appear that not only the proposed outrage, but the present tax on bagging and ties is inequitable and wrong; and because the western farmer has now, and has had for more than 15 years his binder twine on the free list, the tax upon the southern farmer stands condemned of the additional vice of discrimination."

These are the facts, succinctly and concisely stated by Mr. Thompson in this letter. I received a letter—yesterday, I believe it was—from a jute-bagging manufacturer, and in view of the present situation and in view of the further fact that they have so long had the benefit of this tariff, which they have

taken from the people and put into their pockets, instead of it going as revenue into the Treasury of the United States, they are actually now down upon their knees. We have even got them to praying, because in this letter I find this expression, as he appeals that bagging and ties be not placed upon the free list. He says:

May God forbid such a result.

And not only that, he goes further and says:

We pray you, dear sir, to aid in averting such a calamity. Aid by writing your Representative to vote against free jute. Aid by asking your neighbor to do so. And pray with us that such a calamity may be averted.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Oh, you Republicans may applaud such sentiments, but you know a tax on bagging and ties is unjust, inequitable, and wrong.

The trouble with this manufacturer is that it is only the prayers of the righteous that availeth much. It is not the prayers of him who is willing by law to levy taxes on the cotton farmers and take the honest results of their toil and transfer them from their pockets to his own. The prayers of that man will never prevail. The Representatives of the people of this country will give them the relief which they ask and the relief which they ought to have.

This bill, of course, could not pass in a Republican House. If the same majority existed in this House at the present time as existed at the last session of Congress, of course this bill would not be passed. Because you Republicans refused to give the people relief and increased their tariff taxes when you promised to reduce them is one reason why you met defeat at the polls last November. We are going to give them relief, keep our promises, and reduce their taxes, and continue to defeat you at the polls until we have the Senate and the President, and then we will give the people genuine reform and permanent relief. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

How do I know this bill could not pass a Republican House? I know it because, in the first place, I hold in my hands the views of the minority, signed by S. E. PAYNE, JOHN DALZELL, S. W. McCALL, E. J. HILL, J. C. NEEDHAM, J. W. FORDNEY, and NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, comprising all the Republican Representatives upon the Ways and Means Committee, and I take it they speak by authority and speak for the other side, and they are unanimous against this bill. I see several of these gentlemen now present, kindly giving me their attention, and by their silence I presume I state the position of their party correctly in reference to this bill. I know for another reason that it could not pass, because in 1908 I introduced a bill covering many of the articles which are contained in the bill now under consideration. It provided for placing upon the free list the following articles:

First. All kinds of agricultural machines and parts thereof, such as cotton gins, steam plows, and other high-power agricultural machinery, agricultural drills and planters, farm rollers, cultivators, manure spreaders, mowers, reapers, harvesters, hay tedders, potato diggers, fanning mills, thrashing and separating machines, and the like, including those machines dutiable at 20 per cent ad valorem according to paragraph 460 of the present tariff act of July 24, 1897.

Second. All kinds of agricultural tools and implements, such as plows, harrows, rakes, horse-rakes, hoes, spades, shovels, axes, hatchets, forks, and scythes, including those tools and implements dutiable at 20 per cent ad valorem according to paragraph 460 of the present tariff act; handsaws, now dutiable at 30 per cent ad valorem according to paragraph 168 of the same act; pruning knives, now dutiable at 40 per cent ad valorem and upward according to paragraph 153 of the same act; grindstones, now dutiable at \$1.75 per ton according to paragraph 119 of the same act, and crowbars, hammers, sledges, wedges, and the like, now dutiable at one and five-tenths of 1 per cent per pound according to paragraph 144 of the same act.

Third. Horseshoes, muleshoes, and oxshoes, spikes, nuts, and washers, and nails of all kinds, now dutiable at from six-tenths of 1 cent to 2½ cents per pound according to paragraphs 160 to 163 of the same act.

Fourth. All kinds of vehicles peculiarly adapted to farm work, such as farm wagons, ox-carts, lumber trucks, horse sleds and sledges, wheelbarrows, and the like; also all parts thereof, including axles, wheels, tires, chains, cart and wagon skains, and the like.

Fifth. Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity, now dutiable at five-tenths of 1 per cent per pound according to paragraph 129 of the same act.

Sixth. Iron or steel wire rods for making rivets, screws, nails, and fencing, now dutiable at four-tenths of 1 cent per pound and upward according to paragraph 136 of the same act.

Seventh. Harness and parts of harness, suitable for animals engaged in farm work, now dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem according to paragraph 447 of the same act.

Eighth. Bagging for cotton or for wheat or other grain, gunny cloths, and similar fabrics, suitable for covering cotton or grain, composed of single yarns made of jute, jute butts, or hemp, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted or printed, not exceeding 16 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and weighing not less than 15 ounces per square yard, now dutiable at six-tenths of 1 cent per square yard according to paragraph 344 of the same act.

Ninth. Cloths, knit fabrics, flannels for underwear, and all other manufactures made wholly or in part of wool and valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, and ready-made clothing and wearing ap-

parcel of every description composed wholly or in part of wool and valued at less than \$1.50 per pound, now dutiable at rates averaging 100 per cent ad valorem according to paragraphs 360, 367, and 370 of the same act.

In this connection I will insert in my remarks the text of the present bill now under consideration:

A bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the day following the passage of this act the following articles shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds, and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour, and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain; oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared; round timber used for spars or in building wharves; shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of lignum-vita, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages.

A comparison of the two bills will show that they have the same purpose in view—that is, to give the farmer relief.

The bill that I introduced in the Sixtieth Congress was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, of which a large majority of the members were Republican. I made a speech upon the floor of this House, in which I advocated the passage of that bill, and I called special attention of the Ways and Means Committee to it. I made that speech on February 3, 1909, when, I understood, the Ways and Means Committee was then considering the tariff question and preparing what is now known as the Payne-Aldrich bill.

I not only introduced the bill, which went to the committee, but I emphasized it by making a speech on the floor of this House and called attention to it. But it received no consideration at their hands and was not reported by them. I appealed to deaf ears and to hardened hearts in the interest of the masses of the plain people of this country, and my appeal received the same answer as such appeals always received at the hands of Republicans. The answer was: "We will bless you; we will make you happy; we will enrich you by increasing your taxes instead of by decreasing your taxes." [Applause on the Democratic side.] And when the bill prepared by the Ways and Means Committee of the Sixty-first Congress passed the Republican House it not only did not reduce the taxes, it not only failed to put the items in my bill on the free list, but it increased the taxes from about 45 to about 50 per cent. Hence I repeat again that when the people asked you for bread you gave them a stone. You promised them reduced taxation; you gave them increased taxation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The pending bill will pass this House because the righteous indignation of the American people, aroused by the continued oppression of exorbitant taxes, demands its passage, and because the bill is supported by the loyal Democrats on this side, who represent the people, the masses of the American people, and represent no classes and represent no special interests and do not favor giving special privileges to anybody. Believing in equal rights to all and special privileges to none, we believe the farmers of the country should receive the relief which they are asking and which they have the right to demand. In view of that fact, we propose to pass this bill and relieve them of

the burdens under which they have labored. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is estimated that the bill will reduce the revenues of the Government by the sum of \$10,028,989. This, however, is a mere drop in the bucket in comparison with the other great benefits it will confer upon the American people. While it will reduce the revenues about ten million, it will take from the trusts and leave in the pockets of the people ten times that sum. We propose, by a reduction in the running expenses of this Government and by cutting off extravagant expenditures wherever we have an opportunity to reduce them without affecting the efficiency of the public service, to accomplish a saving more than sufficient to compensate for the loss of revenue which may be brought about by the passage of this bill. Not only will that amount be saved, but I dare say much more will be saved, especially if we are given a lease of power and sufficient time in which to accomplish it. As was so well stated by my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] this morning, we at present find ourselves in a situation brought about during the last session of the Republican Congress where by their legislation extravagant appropriations have already been made, and they must be met, and the revenue must be obtained necessary to meet them. We will maintain the national credit and with patriotism meet that condition and discharge those legal and binding obligations, but when that is done we can and will then give to the people an economical administration of all governmental affairs.

I appeal to you, my fellow Members in this House, regardless of party, to rise, if possible, above party lines, above self-interest, above the mere interest of your district, and to vote from a patriotic standpoint in the interest of the whole people and for this bill. A vote for this bill is a vote against the Agricultural Implement Trust, against the Bagging and Tie Trust, against the Leather Trust, against the Steel Trust, against the Beef Trust, against the Flour and Cereal Food Trust, against the Lumber Trust, against the Sewing Machine Trust, and against the Salt Trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A vote against this bill is a vote in favor of all these trusts. I appeal to you to vote for it, not only in the interest of the farmers and the toiling masses who make their living by honest, hard labor beneath the sun of heaven in the open field, and who produce the wealth of this country, and who have during all these years brought the balance of trade to our shores, but I appeal to you in the interest of the housewife and of the sewing woman who needs a sewing machine. The Sewing Machine Trust have been selling sewing machines abroad for a great deal less than they have been selling them to the working woman making an honest living by sewing day by day and sometimes far into the night. I appeal to you to let every sewing girl have her sewing machine without taxing it to such an extent that she is unable to pay for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In conclusion, I ask you on which side do you stand? Will you stand with the people and for the interest and welfare and development and prosperity of the whole country, or will you stand upon the other side and vote in favor of the trusts in this country? One way to destroy trusts is to put their products on the free list. This bill does that. Your vote upon this question will record you upon one side or upon the other. You profess to feel great interest in the farmer. Oh, how often did I hear that sentiment expressed during the debate upon the reciprocity bill. I do not criticize you for that. I feel an abiding interest in the farmer myself. He is among my very best friends. That is one reason why I have always stood and expect to continue to stand for everything I honestly and conscientiously believe in my heart is for his interest. In my district he is my friend and I am his friend and he knows it. I am, again, a member of the great Agricultural Committee by the unanimous vote of a Democratic Congress, and I hope by reason of that position to render him better service if possible. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Another reason why I believe in giving the farmer what he wants is that whatever is for his interest is for the interest of the whole people, and when I am serving him I am serving every class and condition throughout this country, because, as was very beautifully said by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL], he is the foundation rock upon which the whole superstructure stands. If the foundation should crumble, the whole superstructure must come down with it; but when we do those things which will give him prosperity, which will benefit him, through him you benefit every avocation, every calling, and every trade throughout this broad land, from ocean to ocean. Therefore, if you really are interested in him, if in your heart you really feel concerned in

his welfare and prosperity, I appeal to you to show it and prove it by your votes. Do not try to prove it alone by your words, by your speeches, because they are easily made, and, like promises, sometimes easily broken and forgotten; but a vote upon the record stands as a monument through all the years to come as to what your sentiments and what your real purposes and intentions were.

I appeal to you to vote in the interest of the farmer, because without him the prosperity of this country would be gone. You upon the other side of the House have claimed during all these years that you were in favor of protecting the infant industries of the country. You have taxed the farmers and the masses of the American people you say to furnish revenue to run the Government? Yes; but you have taxed them in order also to furnish protection to these great manufacturing industries throughout this country, and they have received the benefits of it, and from it they have amassed and accumulated vast fortunes, some of them so great that they have found difficulty in being able even to give them away as fast as they have accumulated in their coffers. If the farmers and the mass of the people of this country have so enriched these manufacturing interests during all these years, it is an old saying that turn about is fair play. I appeal to you to take away some of that protection and give the farmers the benefit of the reduction and let the infant industries, which are no longer infants but giants and able to compete with the nations of the world, contribute something to help the farmers and the plain people and the masses of the citizenship of this great Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Without these great agricultural interests, without these farmers, the smoke would disappear from the chimneys of your factories, the fires would die out of your furnaces, railroads would cease to operate, the wheels of commerce would stand still, the merchant would close his store, the lawyer would shut up his office, the doctor would close up his office, and your cities would become waste places, and barren deserts.

Therefore, my friends, fellow Members, I appeal to you to vote for this bill and to vote as you shall answer to your constituency, to your people, to your country, and to your God. I thank you for your indulgence, your patience, and your close and kind attention. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4413, to place agricultural implements and other articles on the free list, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies papers in the case of James W. Belvin, Fiftieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. CABY, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies papers in the case of John Clark, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 29, 1911.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 7958) to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLAYDEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 7959) to fix the salaries and to provide for the retirement of certain judges of the island of Porto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 7960) appropriating \$10,000 for the construction of a reservoir in Sandoval County, Territory of New Mexico; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7961) to authorize the exploration and purchase of mines within the boundaries of private land claims; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7962) to quiet title to certain lands in Dona Ana County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7963) pensioning the surviving officers and enlisted men of the New Mexico and Arizona Volunteers employed in the defense of the frontier of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona against Mexican marauders and Indian depredations from 1855 to 1890, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7964) to add to the Lincoln National Forest Reserve and to the Alamo National Forest Reserve, in New Mexico, certain portions of the Mescalero Indian Reservation in New Mexico and to provide for the sale of certain lands now embraced in said reservations for the creation of a fund for the benefit of said Mescalero Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7965) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7966) amending act of June 27, 1898, permitting payment of pensions to officers and men of Indian wars and their widows, between 1849 and 1854; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7967) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories to limit Territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7968) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey the unappropriated nonmineral desert lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7969) donating the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 36, township 1 south, range 34 east, New Mexico principal base and meridian, in New Mexico, to Bedford Forrest Camp, No. 1606, United Confederate Veterans; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7970) to establish a fish-cultural station at Trout Springs, Gallinas Canyon, San Miguel County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7971) to validate an act of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, with reference to the issues of certain bonds; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7972) to establish a soldiers' home at Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7973) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to allot agricultural lands in the Mescalero Apache Indian Reservation to the Indians resident therein, and setting aside the remainder of said reservation as a national park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7974) to authorize the issue of bridge bonds by the county of Valencia, in the Territory of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7975) appropriating \$10,000 for the construction of a reservoir in the Manzano Mountains, Torrance County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 7976) to provide for the erection of a public building at Webster Springs, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7977) to amend section 113 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 7978) to place on the free list salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7979) to place on the free list sewing machines and all parts thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7980) to place on the free list all timber and lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7981) to place on the free list boots, shoes, harness, saddles, and saddlery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 7982) to amend section 5 of an act approved August 30, 1890, entitled "An act providing for an inspection of meats for exportation, prohibiting the importation of adulterated articles of food or drink, and authorizing the President to make proclamation in certain cases, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 7983) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 7984) authorizing the Public Printer to pay pro rata leave to temporary employees of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 7985) providing for the admission, care, and maintenance of disabled or indigent employees of the United States of America on the Panama Canal in the several soldiers' homes of these United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 7986) to establish a fish-cultural station in the western part of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 7987) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead," approved February 19, 1909, in so far as it applies to the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7988) providing for the erection of a public building at Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 7989) to improve Lake Traverse in the States of South Dakota and Minnesota; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: A bill (H. R. 7990) granting relief to certain members of the Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7991) providing for the retirement of certain officers of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEALD: A bill (H. R. 7992) to provide for the acquisition and improvement of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7993) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served in the military or naval forces of the United States, their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and the act of February 6, 1907, granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico, and the general pension law granting pensions to those who contracted disabilities in the service and in the line of duty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7994) making an appropriation for the construction of an inland waterway from Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay, in the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Resolution (H. Res. 136) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department to have printing and binding done; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LEVER: Resolution (H. Res. 137) to authorize the Committee on Education to have printing and binding done; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 138) to provide for necessary printing and binding by the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior during the Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STANLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 139) to investigate violations of antitrust act of 1890; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDREWS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 80) approving certain laws of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 81) disapproving certain laws of the Territorial Legislative Assembly of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to provide for printing of 1,000,000 copies of what is known as Uncle Sam's Cook Book; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 7995) granting an increase of pension to Michael Grigeois; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 7996) granting a pension to Miguel Romero; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7997) granting a pension to John H. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7998) granting an increase of pension to Pascualita J. G. de Anaya; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7999) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius J. Demorest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8000) for the relief of Capt. H. C. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8001) for the relief of Juan Estevan Vigil; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 8002) for the relief of the legal representatives of J. H. Latta, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 8003) for the relief of David C. McGee; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 8004) to authorize the payment of \$5,000 to the widow of the late Tranquillo Luna, in full for his contest expenses in the contested-election case of Manzanares against Luna; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8005) for the relief of the heir and legal representative of R. W. Daniels, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8006) for the relief of Nathan Bibb, sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8007) for the relief of Eduardo Martinez; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8008) for the relief of Jose Antonio Barerras; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8009) for the relief of W. J. Goodwin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8010) for the relief of Louis Kahn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8011) for the relief of Rebecca J. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8012) for the relief of Ventura Maestas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8013) for the relief of Pedro Salazar y Garcia; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8014) for the relief of E. H. Biernbaum; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8015) for the relief of F. Nerio Gomez; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8016) for the relief of John S. Bowie; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8017) for the relief of W. A. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8018) giving the Court of Claims jurisdiction to adjudicate two claims for Indian depredations of the estate of Blas Lucero, late of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8019) granting to the Women's Missionary Union of El Paso, Tex., certain unappropriated land for a public sanatorium; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 8020) granting an increase of pension to Warren J. Hazell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8021) granting an increase of pension to Richard Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8022) granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Garvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8023) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8024) for the relief of the estate of Joseph G. Murphy; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 8025) granting a pension to Susan E. Whitmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8026) granting a pension to Elizabeth Teets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8027) for the relief of Emanuel Newland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 8028) granting an increase of pension to George W. Nobles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 8029) granting an increase of pension to William Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8030) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Israel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 8031) granting an increase of pension to Moses Casner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHUE: A bill (H. R. 8032) granting an increase of pension to Bridget McAloon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 8033) referring to the Court of Claims for adjudication and determination the claims of the widow and family of Marcus P. Norton and the heirs at law, assigns, legatees, or legal representatives of others; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 8034) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry W. Ross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8035) for the relief of John Streckfus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 8036) granting an honorable discharge to William Ham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 8037) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Hobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8038) granting an increase of pension to Herbert A. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 8039) granting an increase of pension to Horatio B. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 8040) granting an increase of pension to Richard Holt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 8041) for the relief of Andrew H. Russell and William R. Livermore; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HEALD: A bill (H. R. 8042) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8043) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Henthorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 8044) granting an increase of pension to Edward Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8045) granting an increase of pension to Phillip D. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8046) granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8047) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 8048) for the relief of Andrew J. McWhirter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 8049) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Crall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 8050) granting an increase of pension to Eugene A. S. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 8051) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Curas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 8052) granting an increase of pension to Helen K. Krischenmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 8053) granting a pension to Francis G. French, alias Frank Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8054) granting a pension to Carlos Dinsmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8055) granting an increase of pension to William Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8056) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Van Kleek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8057) granting a pension to Monta E. Milligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8058) granting an increase of pension to Luther L. Humphrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8059) granting an increase of pension to William J. Teed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8060) authorizing appointment of Hugh T. Reed upon retired list of the Army with rank of captain with 20 years' service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8061) for the relief of John D. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8062) granting an increase of pension to William M. Miner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8063) granting an increase of pension to Washington T. Alsop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8064) granting a pension to Eliza B. Herbst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 8065) granting an increase of pension to Charles Larkin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8066) for the relief of Walter F. Lockhart; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: A bill (H. R. 8067) granting an increase of pension to Augustus W. Fellows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8068) for the relief of Deloss M. Baker, Frank W. Clay, and Herman V. C. Hart, committee, and to reimburse those who subscribed and paid for site for post-office building at Adrian, Mich; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 8069) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8070) granting an increase of pension to Seth Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8071) for the relief of Mrs. L. A. Royster; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of Thomas Fox Paper Co. and Richardson Paper Co., of Lockland, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petitions of Parr Bros., John C. Thomas, Frank & Co., G. M. Fribley, A. J. Harris, John A. Hurst, C. W. Scott, C. E. Lashmers, William Lewis, Baad & Kline, and V. Acme Bros. Co., all merchants of New Philadelphia, Ohio, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of the estate of Joseph G. Murphy, of Jackson County, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: Petition of citizens of Phoenix, Ariz., requesting the sum of \$25,000 be appropriated for the purpose of devising means for checking the spread of the alfalfa leaf weevil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Local No. 270, International Molders' Union of North America, of Pittsburg, Pa., protesting against tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of La Salle, Ill., favoring a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GILLETT: Petition of South Amherst Adult Bible Class, of Amherst, Mass., requesting the passage of a bill forbidding the transmission of race gambling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Mapleton, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the Hanna bill, paying additional compensation to rural free-delivery carriers; J. Pedersen, of Medora, N. Dak., against parcels post; and S. T. Henderson and W. V. Henderson, of Crystal, N. Dak., protesting against raising the rates of postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HEALD: Petitions of Washington Camp, No. 18, of Violi, Del.; Camp No. 3, of Kenton, Del.; and Camp No. 17, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring legislation restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Affidavits to accompany H. R. 5289, to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John H. Hubbard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: Protest of citizens of Sigourney, Iowa, against the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAMB: Resolutions of Trade and Labor Assembly of Savannah, Ga., favoring amendment to the oleomargarine law reducing tax on same, and by Trade and Labor Council of Lowell, Mass., favoring amendment to the oleomargarine law, reducing the tax on same; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petition of John Rice and 50 others, favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 427, Patriotic Order Sons of America, urging enactment of an illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 102, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Steelton, Pa., urging the illiteracy test with relation to the admission of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Division No. 57, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Providence, R. I., to admit to the mails as second-class matter periodical publications issued by or under the auspices of benevolent and fraternal societies and orders and institutions of learning or by trades unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of Trades and Labor Assembly of Helena, Mont., in favor of parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts, against any legislation for a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. STONE: Papers to accompany a bill to increase the pension of Thomas A. Dobbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of Avoca Manufacturing Co., of Avoca, N. Y., protesting against jute bagging for baling cotton being put on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 29, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Eternal and ever-living God, our Father, incline Thine ear and hear our petition. Thou art infinite; we are finite; Thou art all inclusive, while we are but integral parts of a stupendous whole. Hold us close to Thee, that we may feel the warm, life-giving currents of Thy loving heart, and believe that whatsoever Thou dost order for us is better than anything we could desire for ourselves; that we may harmonize our thoughts with Thy thoughts, our ways with Thy ways, and submit our will to Thine. In the spirit of the Lord, Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. 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 bill H. R. 4413, a bill to place agricultural implements and other articles on the free list.

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 free-list bill, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record the speech delivered by President Taft in New York on the evening of April 27, 1911, on Canadian reciprocity. I ask that this be done in view of the speech made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] on yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to print in the Record the speech delivered by President Taft in New York the night before last. Is there objection?

Mr. DALZIELL. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no power to consent to the publication of the speech.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print that speech as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The President's speech is as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, and Gentlemen of the Associated Press and American Newspaper Publishers' Association:

I thank the toastmaster for his gracious and kindly introduction. He seems to expect a few candid remarks by me upon the press of the country, and has offered me this occasion as an opportunity for getting even, as it were, with some of its members. But I shall disappoint him. I have no grievance. This is the only world we have, the press is its chief instrument in the formation of public opinion, and I could not hope to change the tone of the press by what I might say here by way of suggesting improvement, and, so far as I am personally concerned, I might make it a good deal worse. I am in a position where every act of mine is fairly subject to review, and whether the comment be friendly and judicial or hostile and unfair, it goes

with other burdens of the office, is the price of serving the public, and is to be taken, as every thorough and sportsmanlike golfer will understand, as a "rub of the green."

Your toastmaster has been good enough to mention, as a subject upon which our minds will meet, a general arbitration treaty with Great Britain. I believe that the proposal for this is moving along with as much rapidity as is consistent with care in drafting the agreement and securing for it as broad a scope as possible.

It may not be inappropriate for me to refer to a kindred subject that will indirectly stimulate international peace, and will be a substantial step in that direction, to wit, the reciprocity with Canada.

I am glad to have the opportunity of speaking to a body which fully represents the most important agencies for the formation of public opinion in this country upon a question which has now reached a critical point in its settlement. The agreement is a commercial one, and affects the duties on imports from each country into the other, and, therefore, it is difficult to say that a detailed discussion of tariff schedules is not relevant and important in considering its wisdom. But the general, commercial, economic, and social arguments in its favor are so convincing that I may be pardoned if I do not dwell on specific rates.

The treaty provides for free trade in all agricultural products, and in rough lumber down to the point of planing. It reduces the duties on secondary food products by a very substantial percentage, and it makes such reductions on a number of manufactured articles that those engaged in making them have assured us that the reductions will substantially increase the already large Canadian demand for them.

We tendered to the Canadian commissioners absolutely free trade in all products of either country, manufactured or natural, but the Canadian commissioners did not feel justified in going so far. It is only reasonable to infer, therefore, that with respect to those articles upon which they refused free trade to us they felt that the profitable price at which they could be sold by our manufacturers in Canada was less than the price at which their manufacturers could afford to sell the same either to their own people or to us. Hence it follows that their refusal to agree to free trade in these articles, as we proposed, is the strongest kind of evidence that if we should take off the existing duty from such articles coming into the United States it would not affect in the slightest degree the price at which those articles could be furnished to the public here. In other words, the proposition to put on the free list for entrance into the United States all articles that Canada has declined to make free in both countries would not lower the price to the consumer here. Thus the reason why meats were not put on the free list in this Canadian agreement was because Canada felt that the competition of our packers would injuriously affect the products of their packing houses. If that be true, how would it help our consumer or lower the price of meat in our markets if we let their meat in free while they retained a duty on our meat?

The same thing is true of flour. They would not consent to free trade in flour, because they knew that our flour mills could undersell their millers. If that were so, then how much competition and lowering of the price of flour could we expect from putting Canadian flour on the free list?

And yet gentlemen insist that the farmer has been unjustly treated because we have not put Canadian flour and meat on the free list. And it is proposed to satisfy the supposed grievance of the farmers by now doing so, without any compensating concession from Canada. This proposal would be legislation passed for political-platform uses, without accomplishing any real good.

In another aspect, however, the effect of the proposal might be serious. Of course a mere reduction of our tariff, or the putting of any article on our free list, without insisting on a corresponding change in the Canadian tariff, will not interfere with the contract as made with Canada. Canada can not object to our giving her greater tariff concessions than we have agreed to give her under the contract. But if we do make such concessions, without any consideration on the part of Canada, without any quid pro quo, so to speak, after the contract has been tentatively agreed upon by those authorized to make contracts for ratification in both Governments, then we are in danger of creating an obligation against us in favor of all other foreign countries with whom we have existing treaties containing what is called the "favored-nation" clause. By this clause we agree to give the same commercial privileges to the country with whom we have made the treaty as we give to any other nation. This clause has been construed by our statesmen not to involve us in an obligation to extend a privilege to all