Also, petition of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, against the reduction of duties on cotton goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry chocolate workers of Fulton, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on chocolate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of Charles Debold, Bernhard J. Osmer, Frank Emmett, Conrad Haaren, L. Eyring, A. H. Fersch, J. Wadsworth, and Conrad W. Brech, against the reduction of the duty on cocoa and chocolate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Walter S. Rapelji, Irving S. Roney, C. S. Findlay, Adolph Celtz, John Lamerdin, Frederick J. Brittner, sr., Miss M. Estelle Lifhtbouren, J. A. Armstrong, Daniel A. Dolan, Julia E. Carpenter, F. J. Bittner, Joseph Hartel, John W. Farmer, Charles Herman, Joseph Sommers, C. A. McConnell, H. H. Wallace, J. C. Gounig, Lowell M. Palmer, Warren E. Burrows, and Willis F. Taplin, all of New York and Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Richard McCormick, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of the tariff on bound books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Miss A. Dunn and Miss Lillie Oberglock, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of the tariff on all lithograph work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William E. Lynn, Henry F. Reining, Joseph B. Lomax, Frank R. Treasure, Mrs. M. Buckley, and James D. Ackerman, all of New York, N. Y., protesting against placing Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Moehle Lithograph Co., Mrs. T. A. Reilly, and Louis Reilly, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction in the tariff on lithographic work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Charles Ainsworth, H. T. Daniels, Richard P. Boucher, Edward Everett Rice, Nathan E. Moore, and George F. Troy, all of Providence, R. I., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Miss Alice Hall Walter, Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of legislation preventing the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Low-Taussig-Karpeles Co., Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation to collect a filing fee on each protest against the assessment of illegal duties or for reappraisement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Roger Pierce, Myrom Richardson, and other business men of Boston, and the Samuel B. Capen's Men's Class, Central Congregational Church, Jamaica Plain, favoring the repeal of the clause exempting American vessels from the payment of tolls in the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of California, favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, town, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Connecticut, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of Dr. Edward Waldo Emerson and other citizens of Concord; President Clara H. Nash and members of the West Acton Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all of Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Eastern Millinery Association of New York, N. Y., against the clause prohibiting the importation of aigrettes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of different towns in New Jersey, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of 46 citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Paul Rieger & Co., San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the proposed increase of duty on materials for the manufacture of perfume; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Globe Grain & Milling Co., Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against an increase of the duty on jute burlap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against an import duty on wheat, oats, and barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pacific Oil & Lead Works, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the placing of coconut oil on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Standard Underground Cable Co., Los Angeles, Cal., favoring a differential duty on pig lead and lead-covered wires and cables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Warren & Bailey Manufacturing Co., and 7 other companies of Los Angeles, Cal.; Carlson Currier Co., and 4 other companies of San Francisco, Cal.; and the Holt Manufacturing Co., Stockton, Cal., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirty-seventh congressional district of New York, against taxing mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of the glove manufacturers of Gloversville, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the provision in House bill 3321 to charge a filing fee on protests against the imposition of duties or appeal for reappraisement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the thirteenth district of New York, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Hardin County, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for Federal aid for the improvement of public roads, and against a 1 cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *May 1, 1913.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 2973) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and then proceeded to call the names of the absentees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the amendment to Rule XII simply applies to a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to have the rule that was adopted read, if the Chair please.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read Rule XII.

The Secretary read as follows:

RULE XII.

VOTING, ETC.

1. When the yeas and nays are ordered the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically, and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate; and no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the presiding officer, but may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the presiding officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent. (Jefferson's Manual, Sec. XLI.)

2. When a Senator declines to vote on call of his name he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and having assigned them the presiding officer shall submit the question to the Senate, "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" which shall be decided without debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the roll call and before the result is announced; and any further proceedings in reference thereto shall be after such announcement. (Jefferson's Manual, Secs. XVII, XLI.)

3. Immediately after and before the result of each roll call is ascertained and announced the Secretary shall call the names of the absentees. (Amendment of April 28, 1913.)

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair's ruling is that the amendment to the rule applies only to a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Regular order, Mr. President.

On the roll call the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	Gallinger	Overman	Smoot
Borah	Gronna	Owen	Stephenson
Bradley	Hitchcock	Page	Sterling
Brady	Hollis	Penrose	Stone
Bristow	James	Perkins	Sutherland
Bryan	Kern	Pomerene	Swanson
Burton	Lippitt	Ransdell	Thomas
Chilton	Lodge	Robinson	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	McCumber	Root	Tillman
Crawford	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Townsend
Cummins	Myers	Sheppard	Warren
Dillingham	Nelson	Sherman	Weeks
du Pont	Norris	Simmons	Williams
Fall	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.	Works

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators have answered to the roll call, and there is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA,
JUNEAU, ALASKA.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Territory of Alaska, ss:*

I, William L. Distin, secretary of the Territory of Alaska, do hereby certify that the annexed copy is a full, true, and complete transcript of House joint memorial No. 2 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of Alaska, at Juneau, this 16th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] WM. L. DISTIN,
Secretary of Alaska.

House joint memorial 2.

Whereas more than three-fourths of the civil litigation in Alaska, calculated on a basis of the number of cases brought, is disposed of by the United States commissioners acting as ex officio justices of the peace and probate judges, and practically all the criminal litigation is either disposed of or initiated before these officials, by virtue of which facts and the additional facts that they also discharge the functions of recorders and coroners and various other public duties, they are, under the present governmental system in Alaska, by far the most important functionaries in the Territory, coming in their official capacity in closer, more frequent, and more varied contact with the mass of our citizens than any other officials, and being thus of more importance to the good order, peace, and general well-being of the community than any other officials; and

Whereas these commissioners, under the present system, are dependent exclusively on fees for their remuneration, which fees are in the larger number of cases inadequate as recompense for the services rendered, and in many precincts are altogether insufficient to enable the commissioner to devote himself exclusively to his official duties for a livelihood, and such fee system affords constant temptation to the commissioners to encourage litigation, and to that extent is a menace to the conscientious discharge of the duties of the office, and although there may be no case in which a commissioner has been induced by the hope of more fees to act otherwise than as his sense of right and justice dictated, such officials are, by virtue of said fee system, especially in criminal cases, placed under suspicion by the public that their acts are influenced by a desire to augment their remuneration, a suspicion which in itself tends greatly to hamper these commissioners in the discharge of their varied duties; and

Whereas it is deemed urgently necessary, as a most essential step in the improvement of governmental system for Alaska, that these commissioners be placed upon a salary affording them a reasonable and suitable income sufficient to support a family and sufficient to induce men of inteligence and ability to accept appointment to such offices: It is

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, urgently requested to enact a law placing the said commissioners upon a salary of at least $2,000 per annum, and that all fees collected in civil and criminal cases be turned into fund "C" of the district court of the respective divisions in which the precinct is situated, to be expended for the benefit of the court in the same manner as other moneys belonging to such fund.

Passed the house March 21, 1913.

EARNEST B. COLLINS,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

BARRY KEOWN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the senate April 3, 1913.

L. V. RAY,
President of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Territorial Legislature of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 4.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska (the Senate concurring), that—

Whereas since the discovery of gold at Cape Nome, in 1899, there has been produced and shipped to the United States from Nome upward of $72,000,000 of gold, inclusive of the sums sent out by mail; no record, of course, has been kept of the gold privately and personally taken out, but the amount is undoubtedly large. That during the same period there has been shipped to the city of Nome upward of $10,000,000 worth of commodities; that the development of dredge mining on Seward Peninsula and the rapidly increasing volume of business at Port Nome renders it absolutely necessary for a safe harbor. That this increasing business has made it necessary to operate a large fleet of small vessels to and from said port of Nome plying to various places along the coast of the Bering Sea, and the largely increasing trade of our merchants with Siberia, and the number of such vessels is increasing; and

Whereas there is no safe anchorage for such vessels at said port, and because of the want of such anchorage there has been a loss to our marine service and to the people of Nome during the period aforesaid of upward of $950,000 caused from marine disasters, due to a want of a safe anchorage from storms; and

Whereas a safe anchorage and breakwater can be constructed in the mouth of the Snake River at said city and the losses for the future due to the causes aforesaid be largely obviated:

The Congress of the United States is hereby urgently requested to appropriate $25,000 for a survey of the mouth of Snake River and a site for a breakwater in front thereof, and if found feasible by said survey that Congress then provide for the construction of a breakwater and such other works as may be needed to secure a safe anchorage at said point.

Passed the house March 20, 1913.

EARNEST B. COLLINS,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

BARRY KEOWN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the senate April 3, 1913.

L. V. RAY,
President of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Territory of Alaska, ss:*

I, William L. Distin, secretary of the Territory of Alaska, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 4 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of Alaska at Juneau this 16th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] WM. L. DISTIN,
Secretary of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 10.

To the President of the United States and the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, do most respectfully and earnestly represent that—

Whereas the city of Juneau, situated on the southeast coast of Alaska, is one of the oldest and most permanent towns in the Territory of Alaska; and

Whereas the said city of Juneau, owing to the opening up and developing of quartz mines in its immediate vicinity and surrounding said city, and the mining and milling of extensive ore bodies, has increased in population within the past two years from 1,500 to over 3,000 people, and is destined to continue increasing in population steadily for several years to come by reason of the permanency and stability of the well-known quartz mines now being operated and worked and the milling of the ores therefrom; and

Whereas at this time immense milling plants for the purpose of treating and milling the ores from mines in the immediate vicinity of Juneau are in the course of construction; and

Whereas the mines and mills aforesaid, together with the other industries and business enterprises which are now growing up and will continue to increase for years to come, insure a city of vastly increased population than at the present time; and

Whereas at the present time the public-school building in Juneau is entirely inadequate to accommodate the children of school age attending and desiring to attend said public school, which said public school can only accommodate, conveniently, 160 scholars; and

Whereas the number of scholars at the present time attending said public school is 250, an increase of more than 65 since September, 1912; and

Whereas owing to the said schoolhouse being inadequate to accommodate the number of school children attending the public school in Juneau, it has become necessary to rent a store building for the purpose of teaching the said children, and that more than 60 school children are compelled to go to said store building for instruction, and 2 additional teachers are engaged to instruct said school children in said store building; and

Whereas the present school building in Juneau is not only inadequate to accommodate the school children residing in Juneau, but is an old frame building and unfit for present and future use; and

Whereas it is estimated that it will require the sum of approximately $50,000 to erect, construct, and equip a schoolhouse sufficiently adequate to meet the present and future requirements of the city of Juneau:

Therefore we, your memorialists, do hereby most respectfully urge and solicit that the Congress of the United States pass an act permitting the city of Juneau, Alaska, to issue bonds for a sum not to exceed $50,000 for the purpose of erection, construction, and full equipment of a schoolhouse sufficiently adequate to meet the present necessity, as well as the future requirements, by reason of the steady increase in population of said city of Juneau; and

That on account of an emergency existing we particularly solicit and urge that the Congress of the United States pass the act referred to above with all expediency possible, compatible with public business; and

We, your memorialists, as in duty bound will ever pray.

In order to further carry out the object and purpose of this memorial we respectfully transmit herewith for consideration of the Congress of the United States a draft of a proposed bill, the terms of which are thought sufficiently comprehensive to cover the emergency existing as described in this memorial.

Adopted by the senate April 4, 1913.

L. V. RAY,
President of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house April 11, 1913.

EARNEST B. COLLINS,
Speaker of the House.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Territory of Alaska, ss:*

I, William L. Distin, secretary of the Territory of Alaska, do hereby certify that the above is a full, true, and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 10 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of Alaska at Juneau this 16th day of April, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.] WM. L. DISTIN,
Secretary of Alaska.

An act relating to affairs in the Territories, and authorizing the town of Juneau, Alaska, to issue bonds for public-school purposes, and prescribing the method of issuing bonds for such purpose.

Be it enacted, etc., That the incorporated town of Juneau, Alaska, is hereby authorized and empowered to issue its bonds in any sum not exceeding $50,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping additional public schools in the said town of Juneau.

SEC. 2. That before said bonds shall be issued a special election shall be ordered by the common council of the town of Juneau, at which election the question whether such bonds shall be issued shall be submitted to the qualified electors of said town of Juneau whose names appear on the last assessment roll of said town for municipal taxation. Thirty days' notice of any such election shall be given by publication thereof in a newspaper printed and published and of general circulation in said town before the date fixed for such election.

SEC. 3. That the registration for such election, the manner of conducting the same, and the canvass of the returns of said election shall be, as nearly as practicable, in accordance with the requirements of law in general or special elections in said town, and said bonds shall be issued only upon the condition that a majority of the votes cast at such election in said town shall be in favor of issuing said bonds.

SEC. 4. That the bonds above specified, when authorized to be issued as hereinbefore provided, shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 6 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, and shall not be sold for less than their par value with accrued interest, and shall be in denominations not exceeding $1,000 each, the principal to be due in 10 years from date thereof: *Provided, however*, That the common council of said town of Juneau may reserve the right to pay off such bonds in their numerical order at the rate of $5,000 per annum from and after the expiration of 5 years from their date. Principal and interest shall be payable in lawful money of the United States of America at the office of the town treasurer of the town of Juneau, Alaska, or at such bank in the city of New York, in the State of New York, or such place as may be designated by the common council of the town of Juneau, the place of payment to be mentioned in said bonds: *And provided further*, That each and every such bond shall have the written signature of the mayor and clerk of the said town of Juneau and also bear the seal of said town.

SEC. 5. That no part of the funds arising from the sale of said bonds shall be used for any purpose other than specified in this act.

SEC. 6. That said bonds shall be sold only in such amounts as the common council shall direct, and the proceeds thereof shall be disbursed under the limitations hereinbefore imposed and under the order and direction of said common council from time to time as the same may be required for the purposes aforesaid.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of members of the Merchants' Association of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on sugar, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the National Drainage Congress, favoring an appropriation for the prevention of floods and the abating of malarial diseases, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a telegram from N. C. Newerf, president of the Pacific Protective Society, relative to the validity of the Clayton-Bulwer and Hay-Pauncefote treaties, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of members of the Utah Chapter of the American Mining Congress, relative to the production of gold and silver in connection with western lead ores as affected by the duty on lead, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the conservation committee of the Daughters of the American Revolution, relative to the transfer of any part of the public domain to the individual States, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Concord and Oxford, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the pending tariff bill exempting from taxation the proceeds of all life insurance policies and life insurance funds, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRONNA presented resolutions adopted by the Farmers' Local Society of Equity, of Ramsey County, N. Dak., favoring the creation of better markets for farm produce, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club of Lisbon, N. Dak., favoring the reduction of the rate of postage on first-class mail matter to 1 cent per ounce, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club of Lisbon, N. Dak., favoring the retention of the duty on wheat, flour, and barley, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Local Society of Equity of Ramsey County, N. Dak., relative to the materials used in the construction of good roads, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIAMS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Merigold, Michigan, Blackwater, Indianola, and Laurel, all in the State of Mississippi, praying for a reduction of the duty on sugar, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TILLMAN. I present a number of telegrams from the Darlington Manufacturing Co.; the W. S. Gray Cotton Mills, of Woodruff; J. M. Geer, of Easley; Ellison A. Smyth, president of the Belton Mills, of Greenville; Alexander Long, president of the Aragon Cotton Mill and Arcade Cotton Mill, of Rock Hill; Ellison A. Smyth, president of the Pelser Manufacturing Co., of Greenville; J. A. Smyth, jr., president of the Watts Mills, of Greenville; the Woodside Cotton Mills, of Greenville; J. A. Smyth, jr., president of the Dunean Mills, of Greenville; Aug. W. Smith, of Spartanburg; the Excelsior Knitting Mills, of Union; the Monarch Cotton Mills, of Union; and a letter from J. I. Westervelt, president of the Carolina Mills, of Greenville, and J. I. Westervelt, president of the Brandon Mills, of Greenville, all in the State of South Carolina, remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on cotton. I move that the telegrams and letters be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Strawn, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Piqua, Kans., praying for an adjustment of railway mail pay consequent to the enactment of the parcel-post law, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club of Lisbon, N. Dak., praying for the retention of a duty on wheat, flour, and barley, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club, of Lisbon, N. Dak., favoring the reduction of the rate of postage on first-class mail matter to 1 cent, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BURTON. I present a telegram, in the nature of resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 30, 1913.*

Hon. T. E. BURTON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

By unanimous vote the board of directors of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce at a meeting held April 29 adopted the following resolution, which is respectfully submitted for your attention:

Whereas the Underwood tariff bill imposes a duty of 10 cents per bushel upon foreign wheat and admits duty free the foreign-milled products of such foreign wheat; and

Whereas this discrimination in favor of the foreign manufacturer is in contradiction alike of all accepted economic doctrine of the established tariff policy of all political parties and of all nations, and in effect pays a bounty to the foreign miller on all products of wheat sold by him in the markets of the United States; and

Whereas if American flour millers have to pay a tax upon foreign-grown wheat, then a simple justice requires that the foreign-milled products of such wheat shall pay an equivalent tax; and if foreign-milled wheat products are admitted duty free, foreign wheat should be admitted duty free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, believing the proposed legislation would inevitably destroy one of the most important manufacturing industries in the United States, and that it would further result in most serious injury to the American farmer, the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, through its board of directors, records itself as unalterably opposed, and earnestly urges upon the President and Congress of the United States the necessity of placing both wheat and its products upon terms of absolute equality.

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, Senators and Congressmen from Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, the members of the Senate Finance Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

CINCINNATI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
W. C. CULKINS, *Executive Secretary.*

Mr. SAULSBURY presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Delaware, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the closing of the gates of the Panama Exposition on Sundays, which was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

Mr. WARREN. I present a memorial of the National Consumers' Home Industry League, by its president, William S. Brewer, favoring the creation of a permanent tariff commission. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL OF THE NATIONAL CONSUMERS' HOME INDUSTRY LEAGUE.
(By its president, William S. Brewer.)

WASHINGTON, D. C.

To the Congress of the United States:

Respectfully represents your petitioner, president of the National Consumers' Home Industry League, of Washington, D. C.

Believing that the policy of taxation and representation and the fostering of home industries and the promoting of the same by our tariff

system has become the fixed policy of our Nation, and as such has invited capital and labor to enter into competition in our home markets and the markets of the world upon a basis of investment and a standard of living never heretofore reached by any other nation of the world; believing that the vested rights of the wage earner and the employer are inherent rights and that as such they should not be changed excepting after a scientific investigation which shall show such changes to be of benefit to all, and therefore necessary, we do respectfully petition that during the present session of Congress you will consider a joint resolution substantially as follows:

1. That a joint committee be appointed consisting of the chairman and the ranking member of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the chairman and the ranking member of the minority of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, who shall select and appoint a permanent commission of experts, not now in the Government service, who shall inquire into, collect, procure, tabulate, and collate information relative to the importation, exportation, manufacture, and sale of all goods, wares, and articles of merchandise which may be or become matters of trade between the United States and any foreign country, with all tariffs thereon affecting the same, for the purpose of supplying information to the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on which to base recommendations for tariff legislation which shall provide revenue for the support of the Government and safeguard our home industries against such foreign competition as will tend to reduce the American standard of living and wage.

2. That for this purpose said commission be authorized, by subcommittee or otherwise, to sit at such times and places as they may deem advisable; to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to summons and compel the attendance of witnesses, and to employ such clerical, expert, and other assistance as shall be necessary.

3. That all executive departments and their various bureaus shall at all times furnish said commission with such information as they shall possess, and all United States consuls in foreign countries shall furnish such information relative to the growth, manufacture, and value of such commodities as may become articles of export from those countries to which they may be accredited direct to said commission.

4. We believe tariff legislation, no matter how well intended, when based upon party lines or subject to party or local influences, is a menace to the prosperity of our Government, as well as to our institutions, and particularly to our home industries and its employers and wage earners.

Business, which has just enjoyed the greatest prosperity ever known, is at this time checked and, in many instances, threatened with annihilation by tariff legislation which imperils their existence on account of their inability to meet foreign competition because of the cheaper wages in foreign countries, where they have a lower standard of living.

After interviewing some of the most able men of affairs in and from all parts of the country and of all political beliefs, we find them agreed that the needs of all of the people, both producers and consumers, whatever their political views may be, should be the only basis for any change in the tariff, and that no political party should be permitted to decide this great question to the exclusion of those interests represented by the minority.

5. Employment and business is disturbed by each national election, greatly to the detriment of all citizens of the country and against the very principles of our Government. This uncertainty is due principally to the anticipation, whether justified or not, of the tariff and revenue policy to be enacted, or changes which may follow upon partisan lines, and not based upon a scientific analysis of the requirements both for revenue and the safeguarding of our home industries by a compensatory tariff.

A concrete example of the benefits to be derived from a tariff which fosters home industries is illustrated at the Challenge Cutlery Corporation's works in Bridgeport, Conn. This industry was established in England about a century ago. The tariff system prevented their exporting to this market. They built a factory here. Their workmen followed. These men receive about three times the wages here that they received in England. They are satisfied with their employment and consider their condition and wages here, upon an American standard, far more desirable than their former circumstances in England. A reduction in the tariff on purely partisan lines, as at present outlined, would encourage the closing of this and similar industries and the transference of the business to England. It is the consensus of opinion among all fair-minded American citizens that the status of this industry and many others similarly situated with respect to tariff legislation affecting their welfare should be changed only after a most thorough and scientific investigation.

The petition of the National Consumers' Home Industry League, which is annexed, has been circulated by every possible means at our command, with the request that for the above reasons every person receiving the same sign and return it as early as possible to our home address. Many labor, agricultural, economic, and other societies have joined and are aiding us in the work.

For these reasons we believe that tariff legislation upon purely nonpartisan economic principles, revising schedules as exigencies demand, will insure confidence in all lines of business, keep labor employed, and continue our home industries on full time.

And your petitioner will ever pray.

WILLIAM S. BREWER,
President National Consumers' Home Industry League,
619 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.

ENROLLMENT AND PETITION.

To the National Consumers' Home Industry League:

By my signature I authorize you to enroll me, without any charges or dues, a member of the National Consumers' Home Industry League.

I favor every honorable way of reducing the high cost of living, so long as it does not interfere with the continuance of home industries, and believe that this should be done.

I favor a just and necessary tariff for every American producer—workingman, agriculturist, or manufacturer—against cheaper foreign production which would injure home industry.

In order to conserve the welfare and interests of all and not to impose unjust taxation upon the consumer and to make business more stable, I favor the employment by the Government of a permanent body of nonpolitical tariff experts to recommend, in conjunction with the Ways and Means Committee, safe and scientific tariff laws based upon their findings as to what is the lowest tariff needed to support the Government and to safeguard our established home industries and their employees against idleness or wages on a basis that will humble the American laborer's home and family, thus removing the tariff from constant political strife to a basis of national patriotism and pride.

As a constituent and member of the National Consumers' Home Industry League, I instruct you to use my name and influence in petitions and otherwise to the President or the Congress or my Congressman urging tariff legislation upon this basis.

Name, ——— ———; occupation, ———; street, ———; date, ———; city, ———; State, ———.

Sign the above enrollment and petition and give to our representative, or mail at once to the National Consumers' Home Industry League, Washington, D. C.

T. E. MONTGOMERY, *Secretary.*

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, remonstrating against placing live stock and meat products on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, favoring the transfer of the control of the semiarid unappropriated grazing ranges to the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. OLIVER. I present a short telegram, in the nature of a memorial from 33 workers in decorated glass, employees of J. M. Kase & Co., Reading, Pa., which I ask to have read and inserted in the RECORD, omitting the signatures, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

READING, PA., *April 24, 1913.*

HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

American workers in decorated glass have hard struggle for existence even with present tariff. The proposed reduction constitutes a serious menace to our employment, and the sweeping exemptions under paragraph 659 mean our ruin. We, skilled workmen and artists employed by J. M. Kase & Co., art-glass makers, respectfully protest against such action.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Stockton, Cal., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on wheat, oats, and barley, if flour, oatmeal, pearl barley, etc., are admitted free, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Trades and Labor Council of Vallejo, Cal., favoring the adoption of an amendment to the eight-hour law, extending its provisions so as to apply to all grants or franchises granted by the Government relating to natural resources, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of Granville R. Farrar and 21 other citizens of Abington; Dr. Horace Bumstead and 20 other members of the Harvard Congregational Church, of Brookline; and of Dr. Edward Waldo Emerson and 13 other citizens of Concord, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

TARIFF DUTY ON LEAD.

Mr. BORAH. I present a memorial adopted by the Silver-Lead Producers of the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico, assembled in formal conference at Salt Lake City, Utah, April 3 and 4, 1913, remonstrating against any change being made in the duty on lead in ores. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL FROM THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN LEAD-ORE PRODUCERS TO THE SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, SPECIAL SESSION.

To the President, to the Senate, and to the House of Representatives:

The lead producers of the Rocky Mountain States respectfully present for your consideration the following facts relative to their industry:

The entire population of Utah, Nevada, Colorado, Arizona, Idaho, and Montana is dependent on the mining industry, of which lead mining forms a very important part.

The output of gold and silver is largely associated with and dependent upon the production of lead, much of the gold and silver ore being smelted on the lead basis. Restriction of the output of lead will therefore reduce the output of the precious metals.

The men employed in the lead mines receive the highest wages paid to mining labor in the United States. Almost all are native-born or naturalized citizens of a high average of intelligence.

Of the total traffic of the railroads of the Western States, it has been shown by railway statistics that over 80 per cent is furnished by mineral products.

All of the lead ores of the Rocky Mountain States contain some precious metal. Without these precious metals the lead could not be produced, because the cost of production exceeds the value of the lead alone. Crediting the value of the precious metals, such as gold and silver, against the cost of producing the lead, the average profit does not exceed one-half a cent per pound of lead, at the price of 4.4 cents, which is the average price for the last five years. This profit is in most cases less than 5 per cent on the capital invested, which is inadequate, in view of the risks involved in all mining enterprises.

The present duties on lead have produced for the last 10 years an average annual revenue of $734,638, which is approximately 80 per cent more than the revenue as estimated in the bill introduced in the last Congress (H. R. 18642). It is clear, therefore, that the present duties are not in any sense prohibitive, but, on the contrary, are competitive and revenue producing.

It may be admitted, however, that there is a disparity between the duty on lead in ore and the duty on lead in pigs, bars, and bullion, and that the latter might be reduced to the same basis as the lead in ore without any serious detriment to the lead producers. But the protection afforded by the duty on lead in ore is absolutely essential to the maintenance of the lead industry in this country. The fact that, even with the present duty of 1½ cents per pound on lead in ore, the margin between cost and selling price is less than one-half a cent per pound leaves no room for argument as to its necessity.

Under the rate of duty proposed last year revenue would be decreased if the quantities imported remained the same, or, in order to produce the same revenue as at present, the quantities imported would have to be increased 80 per cent. Such an increased importation could only be absorbed in our market by displacing the equivalent quantity of domestic lead. In such a case the Government would be no better off in the matter of revenue than it is now, but a part of our own lead industry would be cut off, and the money that should go to the development of our own resources would go to develop those of Spain and Mexico, our chief competitors in the production of lead.

The mining communities of the Mountain States afford the principal market for much of the agricultural product of the West. Anything that destroys or curtails mining must react to the injury of the farmers.

The development and growth of the Western States have been coincident with the development of mining. Whatever retards the latter must inevitably check the development of all other industries in the mining States.

For the foregoing reasons the lead producers of the Rocky Mountain States, through their representatives in conference at Salt Lake City, do respectfully request that no change be made in the duty on lead in ores, and that it be allowed to remain as at present—a specific duty of 1½ cents per pound on the lead contained—and that the duty on lead in pigs, bars, and bullion be reduced from the present rate of 2½ cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound, placing it on the same basis as lead in ores. We believe that so far as lead is concerned this would be a substantial compliance with the promises of the Democratic Party to revise the tariff downward. It would be a reduction of 29.4 per cent in the duty on lead in pigs, bars, and bullion, the form in which most of our imports are made, while leaving to the domestic producers of the raw lead ores the present measure of protection, which they need to insure the continuance of their industry.

It is respectfully urged, also, that the form of the duty be not changed from specific to ad valorem. An ad valorem duty affords the least protection at the time it is most needed; and in the case of lead it would be exceedingly difficult to determine the proper amount of the duty, and certain grades of ore could be imported and escape the payment of duty, for the reason that the lead in such ores would have no value at the port of entry.

Adopted by the Silver-Lead Producers of the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico, assembled in formal conference at Salt Lake City, Utah, April 3 to 4, 1913.

JAS. F. MCCARTHY,
President of the Conference.
GEO. W. RITER, *Secretary.*

TARIFF DUTY ON SUGAR.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, a few days ago I had printed in the RECORD a letter from Right Rev. Henry B. Restarick, bishop of the Espiscopal Church in Honolulu. I have now another letter from Bishop Restarick, which is a sort of supplement to the one which I presented. As it is very brief I ask that it be read.

There being no objection, the letter was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

HONOLULU, HAWAII, *April 17, 1913.*

The Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
Senator from California, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WORKS: May I add a few words to the letter which I sent you in regard to the sugar tariff? Mr. Roosevelt said to me in Washington in 1903, "I am absolutely opposed to orientalizing any American territory." I replied, "Mr. President, Hawaii was orientalized before it became American territory. You must remember that in dealing with the islands.

We have in Hawaii some 80,000 Japanese, and large numbers of these are married and mean to stay here. If the sugar industry here is ruined by the serious reduction or abolition of the tariff, these islands will be given over to the Japanese. With a Japanese manager on a sugar plantation instead of a white man, with Japanese engineers, blacksmiths, sugar boilers, overseers, etc., and by cutting the wages of workers in two, sugar might be grown on certain plantations at a small profit. But the white people would have to go elsewhere. The United States Government has insisted that the island policy should be to get Europeans. The planters have spent enormous sums to carry out this policy; free sugar would drive nine-tenths of the white population other than United States troops from the Islands. Many Americanized Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians would have to leave. Anyone who knows will tell you that I am not exaggerating when I write this.

Hawaii pays into the United States Treasury over and above what is spent on it (of course not counting the Army and Navy, etc.), some $1,200,000 a year in duties collected. Of course in former times these duties belonged to Hawaii. The islands have well paid the United States Government as an investment. The planters have honestly tried to bring white labor here; the Government threatens to destroy its own policy and hand over the islands to orientals.

Respectfully, yours.

HENRY B. RESTARICK,
Bishop of Honolulu.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 540) for the relief of Joseph Hodges, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 27) thereon.

Mr. WORKS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 488) to authorize the sale and issuance of patent for certain land to H. W. O'Melveny, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 28) thereon.

Mr. BRADY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 653) for the relief of William O. Mallahan, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 29) thereon.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. OVERMAN. From the Committee on Rules I report Senate resolution No. 4 with amendments.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment how soon we may expect a report upon the resolution I introduced some weeks ago in regard to the civil service? I am receiving many letters about the matter from all over the country, and I should like, as soon as possible, that we have some report from the committee upon that resolution.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, because of other engagements I have not been able to call the committee together, but I hope to do so very early in the coming week.

I may say while I am on my feet that I have had in preparation another resolution, the object of which perhaps is the same as that of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], but calling for more specific data. I intended to present that resolution to-day, but it has not as yet been completed in the form in which I desire to present it. I want to say that I shall do that out of no spirit of hostility to the civil-service law, but I shall do it because of a desire to have a real civil-service law administered according to both the spirit and the letter of that law. It is my belief that in some of the departments of this Government there has been an honest effort to so administer the law. I am satisfied, on the other hand, that in other departments there has been a deliberate purpose to disregard it. It may be that my information is not exactly reliable in all particulars, but when information comes to me to the effect that about 95 per cent of the employees in given departments are of one political faith I am at a loss to understand just how that can be in view of a belief I have that when it comes to mental capacity and proper equipment to perform the duties of office there is not a very great difference between the members of the several political parties in this day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Senator from Ohio made any personal investigation in reference to the proportion of Democrats and Republicans in the departments?

Mr. POMERENE. Well, when the Senator says "personal investigation" I may reply that I have not gone personally to these departments, but that I have, for instance, information to the effect that in one division of the Railway Mail Service the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, and 18 chief clerks are all Republicans, that 39 out of 40 other clerks are Republicans, and that 680 out of 720 clerks on the railroads are Republicans.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that seems inconceivable, and yet the Railway Mail Service is a very small division of the public service.

I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that for a great many years the Civil Service Commission has been a Democratic commission—two militant Democrats and one very mild Republican constituting it. It seems to me extraordinary, in view of that fact, that the service can be packed with Republicans to the exclusion of Democrats. I can not understand it.

Mr. STONE. Who are the militant Democrats?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator from Missouri knows them. One is from Louisiana—Mr. McIlhenny—and the other is from Illinois—a well-known Democrat, who has held office pretty much during his lifetime as a Democrat.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to say that I will show the Senator from New Hampshire how the civil-service law has been administered, and I have no doubt it will be astonishing to him. I stated on the floor here the other day that it had been charged—I did not charge it—that the law as to-day administered was a fraud. I do not charge that now, but I do charge that its administration has been a deception; that Congress has been fooled; that the people of this country have been fooled. They ask for an investigation, and I ask the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] to make an investigation. I say that his committee can do no better thing for this country and for the people of this country than to make an investigation of the civil service.

The President of the United States, through his Economy Commission, has made an investigation. I have tried to get their report, and I shall have the report. I only have a partial

report to-day, Mr. President, but I ask Senators to listen to this report as I read it, which shows that the civil service is a cloak for the spoils system. We had better have a spoils system than to have what is known as a civil-service system not carried out upon the principles of the law as enacted, but in order to put certain favorites upon the rolls.

Why, Mr. President, I am told that in one city they have at election times put 250 roundsmen, ward heelers, on the laborers' list, and in a few months promoted them over efficient clerks, one man having been given a $3,000 salary, another man eighteen hundred dollars, and another twelve hundred dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator whether they were Republican or Democratic cities where this was done?

Mr. OVERMAN. They were Republicans, I understand, who were put in.

Mr. GALLINGER. Appointed by Democratic mayors and other officials?

Mr. OVERMAN. Oh, no; they were put in by Republican customhouse officers. Now, if the Senator will listen to this report made to President Taft by his own Economy Commission, I think he will be astonished, as I am, as to the manner in which the law has been administered.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator knows, Mr. President, that I am not infatuated with the civil service——

Mr. OVERMAN. I know the Senator's views as to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. And I certainly shall welcome a careful and impartial investigation of the whole matter. I have no disposition to obstruct the proposed investigation in the least; and yet some statements have been made to-day that have struck me as being inconceivable; for instance, that so large a proportion of Republicans can be in office under the civil-service law as compared with Democrats. I know that the appointments in my own State, not very numerous it is true, have been absolutely without reference to political considerations.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator says the men who preside over the Civil Service Commission are Democrats. I do not know their politics, but if they have administered the law as this board says they have, whether they are Democrats or Bull Moosers or Republicans, they ought to go.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator says he does not know the politics of the members of the commission. The Senator knows the politics of Gen. John C. Black, and surely the Senator knows the politics of Mr. McIlhenny, the commissioner appointed from Louisiana.

Mr. STONE. I know that Gen. John C. Black voted the Republican ticket.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, I never heard of that, but I hope he was wise enough to do so on occasions.

Mr. STONE. I understand that he did.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KERN. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. KERN. I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether the Democrats who are on the Civil Service Commission are Democrats who voted the Democratic ticket?

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I am not going to try to distinguish between the various shades of Democrats any more than I would of Republicans. It has always been understood that Gen. Black was a Democrat of Democrats, and the gentleman appointed from Louisiana, the proprietor of a noted condiment, has always been known as a Democrat, and was confirmed by the Senate with the understanding that he was a Democrat.

Mr. OVERMAN. He was a Rough Rider.

Mr. GALLINGER. He was a Rough Rider and a Democrat; nobody questions it; and nobody has ever heretofore, to my knowledge, questioned that the Civil Service Commission, or a majority of the members of that commission, have been Democrats for a great many years. I have never found any fault with that.

Mr. KERN. I submit that it has been known throughout the country for years that the Civil Service Commission is made up of men who are not Democrats, but who were appointed to office by Republican Presidents as a reward for their infidelity to the Democratic Party.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a serious charge. The Senator surely does not make that charge against the member of the commission from Louisiana, does he? If not, it must be aimed at Gen. John C. Black, the brave old Democratic soldier.

Mr. KERN. I have not the honor of the acquaintance of the commissioner from Louisiana; but I understand that he was an associate of President Roosevelt, one of his intimates, and that he was appointed on that account, and not because he was a Democrat.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator from New Hampshire will agree with me that sometimes when a Republican President appoints a Democrat, or vice versa, when a Democratic President appoints a Republican to office, the appointee becomes the meanest kind of a partisan.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not think that can be so. I do not think gentlemen of standing, as these men are, change their politics because a Republican President chances to appoint them to office. I have too good an opinion of Democrats to believe that.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let us see what a board appointed by a Republican President says about that. I ask Senators to listen. I want to get the full report, and I expect to have it. This is only a partial report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senator begins with that, of course the Senator is aware that under the law it is provided that not more than two members of the commission shall be of the same political party.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; that is true. Here is what the Economy Commission says:

After an exhaustive study of the records of the Civil Service Commission——

Mr. THOMAS. Will not the Senator give the date of that report?

Mr. OVERMAN. This is a report made to President Taft just before he went out of office. I presume it is not over three months old. I do not know exactly when it was made, the date not being given here, but it was a short time ago. It was made, as I have stated, by what is known as the Taft Economy Commission.

After an exhaustive study of the records of the Civil Service Commission and of the evidence which was obtained from the departments (the results of which are shown in the pages that follow), the President's commission has come to the conclusion that the interpretation which has been given to the act by the Civil Service Commission has been such as practically to defeat its primary purpose; that instead of giving to applicants the benefit of competitive examinations, and instead of giving to the service the benefit of rules adopted for "testing the fitness of applicants," instead of making available to the Government persons who had by the rules established been given a rating of superior merit, every "condition of good administration" has been made subordinate and subservient to demands that can find no explanation except a desire to continue a system which the law was designed to supplant.

The spoils system——

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I can see the reason for that finding on the part of the commission. The law provides that civil-service appointments shall be equitably apportioned among the States. I never believed in that principle; and the fact is that in many instances men and women making the highest rating, the highest percentage, are denied appointments for the reason that the quota, as they say, of the States from which they come is full. I think very likely there have been instances of that kind, but the Civil Service Commission has been compelled by statute law to make such appointments. I can not believe, I repeat, that the Civil Service Commission, a Democratic commission, has deliberately done anything to exclude Democrats from getting office when they have passed satisfactory examinations.

Mr. OVERMAN. This is a Republican commission that has reported on a Democratic commission—have it that way, then.

Mr. GALLINGER. Have it that way, then; but I do not see that the Economy Commission, as quoted by the Senator, has anything to say about politics, has it?

Mr. OVERMAN. There is no politics in it. They are trying to find the truth, and they give the truth in this report.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the point that was made which attracted my attention—I should not have said a word had it not been made—was that 95 per cent of the employees in many of the departments are Republicans. I do not see that the Economy Commission, whether it has made a good showing or a bad showing in other directions, has had anything yet to say about politics.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is not a word here about politics, except they say the effect of the administration of the civil-service law has been to bring back to us by this means, cloaking deception and deceit, the spoils system. The "spoils system" means putting into office men that belong to the party in power. That, reading between the lines, is really what this report finds.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit just a word, I for one will await with a great deal of interest and some degree of anxiety the report of the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is the chairman on

all phases of the civil-service law. I trust particular attention will be given to that question, because the Senator made the charge on the authority of somebody as to the political complexion of civil-service appointees. It has been represented to me over and over again that Republicans have not been getting a fair show in the departments, even under Republican administrations.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why, Mr. President, I have letter after letter saying that the fact is just the other way. I do not know whether the statements they contain are true or not, but this information has come to me because I have introduced the resolution. I have not been seeking information. I have letter after letter stating that in every department of the Government three-fourths of the employees are Republicans. I have not made any partisan fight about this matter. I want to get at the truth.

Mr. GALLINGER. About nine-tenths of them have not any politics. They do not go home to the States to vote as they used to do before the civil-service law was enacted.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is true.

Mr. GALLINGER. They are political somethings—I do not know what. I was going to use a word that I will not use. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I would suggest, to settle this controversy, that the Senator station tellers at the entrances of the departments, and ask every clerk who enters whether he is a Republican or a Democrat.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not think that would do any good, for the reason that a good many would say they are Democrats who never have been Democrats.

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps they said before that they were Republicans when they were really Democrats.

Mr. OVERMAN. Perhaps they did; but I am sorry this matter is taking a partisan turn. Let me continue reading this report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. OVERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I will say for the benefit of my Republican friends that during the past six years I found that the great body of the men in the departments with whom I came in touch were Republicans, but since the election they are nearly all Democrats. [Laughter.] There would be very little satisfaction derived from putting tellers at the doors, because they have all changed their politics.

Mr. WARREN. And a great many of them, when they went into the service, went in as Democrats, changed their politics with the change of administration, and will do so again in the future.

Mr. OVERMAN. There may be a few who have done that. I will not make any wholesale charge against the clerks in the departments.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not care whether they are Republicans or Democrats. I do care, however, to know whether the Civil Service Commission is violating the law. I should like the Senator from North Carolina to read again the part of the report which alleges a violation of the law, and interpret it, and advise the Senate in just what respect the Civil Service Commission, headed by the distinguished general, John C. Black, is violating the law of the land.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have not finished reading the report. I will read again what I had read when I was interrupted and will read further. I am glad to furnish the information. I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that I have not the full report. I expect to get it soon. I am only quoting now the statement made by the President's Economy Commission. They say here that they give later the facts upon which they base the statement.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know something of the work of the Economy Commission. I have collaborated a little with that commission in certain phases of the civil-service administration. I was not aware that the Economy Commission charged that the Civil Service Commission was violating the law. I was perfectly aware that the Economy Commission was of the opinion that the civil-service law is inadequate, as everybody who has read or studied the law must admit. It is very inadequate with regard to promotions in the service. But this is the first time I have ever heard that the Civil Service Commission fraudulently admitted men or women to the service contrary to the provisions of the law.

Mr. OVERMAN. Before I finish reading this document the Senator will see that the Economy Commission, before they made their report, brought to the attention of the Civil Service Commission the facts that are stated here, and the Civil Service Commission did not deny them, but evaded the very issue that is raised here—that they were administering the law in such a way as to bring back the spoils system.

Mr. CUMMINS. That, however, is a mere conclusion of the Senator from North Carolina, possibly gathered from the report of the Economy Commission.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let us see whether it is or not.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to know the facts. If the Senator from North Carolina alleges that the Civil Service Commission, in holding examinations, has given false ratings to applicants and has thus introduced into the civil service men who were not entitled to enter the civil service under the law, I should like to know it and I should be the first to condemn it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I knew the Senator would; and I knew, as I have said, that he would be astonished when he heard this report from the President's own commission.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the particular complaint made by the President's own commission, as I understand—I have not read it all, but I have talked with some who helped prepare the report—is as to a want of classification in the service, supplemented by the total absence of a system of promotion upon merit. I believe a great many people have been promoted in the service against merit; but that is not the fault of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Economy Commission say that the interpretation that has been put upon the law by the Civil Service Commission has been such as to "defeat the primary purpose of the law." Then, they go on to make other statements. I said that I had only part of the report, but that I would get it all. I am reading the summary of the report of the commission.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well; but I hope the Senator from North Carolina will not lend the great weight of his influence to a charge of fraud against the Civil Service Commission, with regard to entrance into the service, until he has carefully examined the whole subject.

Mr. OVERMAN. I said I made no charge of fraud. I said there were charges of fraud which I did not make. This report says that the law is administered contrary to its provisions and its true interpretation, and is deceitful and a sham.

Mr. CUMMINS. There are a great many people who help to administer the civil-service law. The members of the Civil Service Commission are not the only administrators of the civil-service law. I do not believe the Economy Commission intended to charge that the Civil Service Commission had been negligent in the performance of its work or had intentionally either violated or evaded the law.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from Iowa may not put the same interpretation upon this report that I do. I am reading it in order that the Senate may put its own interpretation upon it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. What has become of the morning business?

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I realize that this report is not very pleasant reading for the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the Senator's reading it, but I should like to introduce the bills that I have been waiting to introduce. The Senator can read the report or anything else he wants to read afterwards.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator can introduce the bills in my time, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. LODGE. If the morning business is finished, of course I have not anything to say, but I did not know that such was the case.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is not finished; but if the Senator rises to make that point, I suppose I can get time later during the morning hour in which to read this paper.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; there is not the least objection to that.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts now to enable him to introduce his bills.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think the Senator has it in his power to yield. I can take him off the floor by a demand for the regular order, but I do not wish to make it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Certainly, the Senator can.

Mr. LODGE. I only thought it would be better if we could get rid of the morning business, which many Senators are desirous of transacting.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think this is more important than some of the bills we are going to introduce to-day.

Mr. LODGE. Then, Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is reports of committees.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question upon the regular order. He rose originally to submit a report of the Committee on Rules. I should like to ask him when the committee had a meeting. I was not aware that the committee had met, or had disposed of the subject concerning which the report is made.

Mr. OVERMAN. The committee met and instructed me to report a certain resolution introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. After the suggestions and agreement between him and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], I made the report that the committee authorized me to make, with the exception that a certain matter was referred to the Committee on Commerce instead of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which I thought would be agreeable to the committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no complaint to make of the Senator from North Carolina. He very naturally came to that conclusion, but some members of the committee desired to be heard before any change was made.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then, Mr. President, I desire to recall the report. It was my mistake.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I do not ask that. I rise simply to say that when the report comes before the Senate for adoption I shall feel at liberty to make such suggestions as may seem best to me in regard to it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of course. We had a unanimous agreement in the committee as to what the report should be. There was a division of sentiment on the floor of the Senate as to two things. One was as to waterways, and the other was as to the matter of conservation. In making the report on behalf of the committee I referred one of those items, as suggested by the Senator, and as I thought I was fully authorized to do by the committee, to the Committee on Commerce, and the other to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. One subject was referred to the Committee on Conservation of Natural Resources and another to the Committee on the Territories.

Mr. CUMMINS. The committee has never had under consideration, and has never decided, what part of the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and what part should be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the report.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not ask that, but I want to have it perfectly clear that I had nothing to do with making the report.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to withdraw the report. If there be no objection, consent is given.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, before anything is withdrawn and the subject is disposed of, I desire to say just a few words.

I agree with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] that we are more interested in the proper and honest administration of the law than we are in the personnel of the commission. That should go without the saying. But as to the personnel, I desire to make a remark, somewhat in the nature of a further reply to the observations of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. He said that the Civil Service Commission was universally understood to be a Democratic commission. He said, in substance, that he had not supposed there was any question about that. I, for one, question it. I think there are a great many other people who question it.

It may not be important, Mr. President, and I do not think it is of particular importance, whether a majority of the members of the commission are Democrats or Republicans. Still, since the question has been brought before the Senate, the real facts ought to be known; and I can not permit the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire to go unchallenged.

I do not know anything about the commissioner from Louisiana beyond what has been said here to-day—that he was one of Col. Roosevelt's Rough Riders, a close personal friend of his, appointed by him in furtherance of the general policy of that distinguished President to recognize the valuable services of his Rough Riders.

As to Gen. Black, the chairman of the commission, I have not regarded him, and I do not believe Senators on this side or Democrats generally throughout the United States for some years have regarded him, as a member of the Democratic Party. There was a time when he was a distinguished and valued and important member of the Democratic Party; but we are all familiar with the fact that in the not distant past he abandoned his party organization, and supported the Republican ticket. If he has reallied himself with the Democratic Party since then, he has not given public notice of the fact.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I ask the Chair what is to be the effect of a demand by any Senator for the regular order. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] demanded the regular order, and still we are going right on with the discussion of a matter which may be important to the Senators who are discussing it. There are a great many of us, however, who do not care a continental whether Gen. Black is a Republican or a Democrat, but who would like to introduce our bills and get through with the morning business, and then allow anyone who desires to do so to discuss this subject at length.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, in deference to the very courteous suggestion of my pious friend from North Dakota, I will yield the floor to his demand for the regular order. I hope the Senator will take his seat now, as I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am gratified to know that the Senator will do so. A Senator generally takes his seat at his own volition, or upon the direction of the Chair, and not that of any other Senator.

Mr. STONE. I take it, now, upon the direction of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GALLINGER and others. Regular order!

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to give notice that there will be some other calls for the regular order during the present session.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report has been withdrawn by unanimous consent. Reports of committees are still in order.

RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. From the Committee on Military Affairs, I report back with amendments Senate resolution 35, submitted by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] on April 9, and I submit a report (No. 30) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution. It is a mere matter of inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. If there be no objection——

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. PENROSE. Let it be read.

Mr. LODGE. Let it be read. I reserve the right to object.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. DU PONT April 9, 1913, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to transmit to the Senate of the United States, as early as possible, the following information:

(1) The nature and character of the duties that retired officers of the United States Army may be detailed to perform under existing laws, regulations, and orders;

(2) The laws, regulations, and orders, if any, that define what is known as active duty on the retired list, and whether such laws, regulations, and orders permit officers on the retired list to apply for such duty; and

(3) The number of retired officers of the Army who have applied for active duty on the retired list since January 1, 1908, and the percentage of those applying who have been detailed on active duty on the retired list during this period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 10, after the word "duty" and the semicolon, to strike out the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 15, after the word "period," to insert a semicolon and the word "and," and add the following paragraph:

(4) The number, rank, and pay of officers now on the retired list, and the avocations in civil life in which they are now engaged.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 1690) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Exeter, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 1691) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lebanon, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 1692) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Littleton, in the State of New Hampshire; and

A bill (S. 1693) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Claremont, in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 1694) granting an increase of pension to Lot H. Fleming;

A bill (S. 1695) granting a pension to Edward G. Goodbub;

A bill (S. 1696) granting an increase of pension to Joel Yeager;

A bill (S. 1697) granting an increase of pension to George S. Kendall (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1698) granting an increase of pension to John Marsh (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1699) granting an increase of pension to George W. North (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 1700) for the relief of the heirs of Salvador Costa (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1702) to change the name of oleomargarine to margarin; to change the rate of tax on margarin; to make margarin and other substitutes for dairy products subject to the laws of any State or Territory into which they may be transported; to afford the Internal-Revenue Bureau means for the more efficient detection of fraud and for the collection of revenues; to repeal an act defining butter and imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine, approved August 2, 1886, with amendments thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1703) for the relief of George P. Chandler;

A bill (S. 1704) for the relief of Edgar B. Strang; and

A bill (S. 1705) to correct the military record of Robert D. Magill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1706) to authorize the provision of accommodations for the United States courts in the Federal Building at Sunbury, Pa., and to increase the limit of cost for said building accordingly; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1707) for the relief of F. B. Schnure; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1708) for the relief of John E. Frymier; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1709) granting a pension to Mary A. Heck;

A bill (S. 1710) granting an increase of pension to Boaz D. Blose;

A bill (S. 1711) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Miller;

A bill (S. 1712) granting an increase of pension to John Chambers;

A bill (S. 1713) granting a pension to Kate G. Caton;

A bill (S. 1714) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Hoch;

A bill (S. 1715) granting a pension to Mary A. Dunkle;

A bill (S. 1716) granting a pension to George W. Painter;

A bill (S. 1717) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Reese;

A bill (S. 1718) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Bowman;

A bill (S. 1719) granting a pension to Susan Olewiler;

A bill (S. 1720) granting an increase of pension to William D. Martin;

A bill (S. 1721) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Jefferson Morris;

A bill (S. 1722) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Bradford;

A bill (S. 1723) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Goss;

A bill (S. 1724) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Smouse;

A bill (S. 1725) granting a pension to Mary E. Mathews;

A bill (S. 1726) granting a pension to Philip B. Depp; and

A bill (S. 1727) granting an increase of pension to Peter Bruner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1728) to prevent the desecration of the flag of the United States and to provide punishment therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 1729) granting an increase of pension to John McCrory (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 1730) to create a trade commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 1731) granting an increase of pension to Martin Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1732) providing for the establishment of a hospital ship in connection with the American fisheries (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 1733) for the erection of a memorial to Col. Edward Dickinson Baker at Balls Bluff, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1734) granting an increase of pension to William Box;

A bill (S. 1735) granting an increase of pension to Cordelia R. Bragg; and

A bill (S. 1736) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Bates; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING (for Mr. CRAWFORD):

A bill (S. 1737) granting an increase of pension to William W. Pinkerton (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1738) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 1739) to reserve certain lands and incorporate the same and make them a part of the Caribou National Forest Reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 1740) to apply a part of the proceeds from the sale of public lands to the support and maintenance of farm-life schools for the benefit of agriculture and to increase the knowledge of farming; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1741) for the relief of the estate of Henry Kizer, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1742) for the relief of W. T. Hawkins; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1743) for the relief of Stanley Mitchell; and

A bill (S. 1744) to appoint Frederick H. Lemly a passed assistant paymaster on the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1745) providing for the establishment of a term of the district court for the eastern district of North Carolina at Wilson, N. C.; and

A bill (S. 1746) to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1747) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 1748) granting an increase of pension to Mary Salsgiver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 1749) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Riley Pennell; and

A bill (S. 1750) granting a pension to Henry Swain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 1751) providing for the presentation of medals to all surviving soldiers of the Battle of Gettysburg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1752) granting a pension to Judson P. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 1753) granting an increase of pension to Wingate S. Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 1754) to withdraw from the Yellowstone National Park and restore to the public domain of the United States a certain tract of land lying on the north side of said park and segregated from the remainder of said park by the Yellowstone River and comprising an area of about 2,969 acres; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1755) for the relief of certain nations or tribes of Indians in Montana; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 1756) granting an increase of pension to James M. Carpenter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 1757) for the relief of the administrator and heirs of John G. Campbell to permit the prosecution of Indian depredation claims; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 1758) for the relief of Warren E. Day; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LEGISLATIVE JOURNALS IN THE MAILS.

By Mr. BRYAN:

A bill (S. 1701) to admit legislative journals of State and Territorial legislatures to the mails as second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BRYAN. The bill is short, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill (S. 1701) to admit legislative journals of State and Territorial legislatures to the mails as second-class mail matter.

Be it enacted, etc., That legislative journals of the several State or Territorial legislatures, not exceeding 100 copies to each member of any such legislature, when mailed from the State or Territorial capitals during legislative sessions, shall be accepted as second-class mail matter.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment relative to the enforcement of the antitrust laws, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the Glacier National Park, Mont., from $100,000 to $250,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $2,000 to print a report of the proceedings of the National Convention of State Railway Commissioners, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $10,000 for settling land suits in eastern Oklahoma, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURTON submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OLIVER submitted four amendments intended to be proproposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SAULSBURY presented two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS UNDER MARCUS P. NORTON'S PATENTS.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads the bill (S. 1269) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the postal service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling handstamp patents or otherwise, which both the author and the committee think properly belongs to the Committee on Claims. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Claims. The Chair hears none.

STENOGRAPHER TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Printing be, and hereby is, authorized to employ a stenographer, compensation at the rate of $75 per month, to be paid one-half out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for.

THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. SMOOT. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 70) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 4,750 additional copies of H. R. 3321, a bill to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I suppose I can rise to discuss the resolution. I was about, before concluding my remarks, to read from the report of the Economy Commission. I will just go on with my remarks on that matter. As the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] requested that I should read over what I had read, I will read the whole paragraph of the Economy Commission report——

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state his inquiry.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask what is the subject before the Senate at present?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. OLIVER. I submit that the Senator from North Carolina is not talking to the subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think under paragraph 3 of Rule VII debate is not in order. The rule provides that—

Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar shall be entertained by the presiding officer, unless by unanimous consent; and if such consent be given——

Which has happened in this case—

the motion shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be decided without debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be taken up.

I make the point of order that debate is not in order under that rule.

Mr. OVERMAN. Has unanimous consent been given for the consideration of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is then before the Senate, and is debatable.

Mr. LODGE. At this stage of the proceedings debate is not in order. It is open to the Senator to object, of course.

Mr. OVERMAN. If it is before the Senate by unanimous consent, then I have a right to debate it.

Mr. PENROSE. Not under the rule.

Mr. LODGE. Not under the rule I have read.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems that Senators do not want to hear the truth. I will bring it out at another time. I give that notice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Utah.

The resolution was agreed to.

WORKS OF ART IN CAPITOL BUILDING.

Mr. GALLINGER. I send a resolution with the accompanying papers to the desk and ask that it be read and that the resolution and the papers accompanying it may then be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The resolution (S. Res. 74) was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That the document herewith submitted entitled "Works of Art in the United States Capitol Building, including biographies of the artists," compiled under the direction of the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds, by Charles E. Fairman, be printed as a Senate document.

ALLEGED SLAVERY IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. BORAH. I offer a resolution and ask for its present consideration. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD in connection with the resolution a certain letter which is printed in the National Humane Review for April, 1913.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho submits a resolution which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 71), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate any and all facts bearing directly or indirectly upon the truth of the charge, publicly made, that human slavery exists at this time in the Philippine Islands, and that human beings are bought and sold in such islands as chattels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho asks for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. I will ask the Senator what he desires to do? What does the resolution call for?

Mr. BORAH. Facts.

Mr. STONE. From whom?

Mr. BORAH. The Secretary of War.

Mr. WARREN. Is there a letter accompanying the resolution which the Senator wishes to have read?

Mr. BORAH. There is a letter to be printed in the RECORD, signed by the secretary of the interior of the Philippine Islands, alleging the existence of slavery in those islands to be a fact.

Mr. WARREN. I should like to have it read if it is from the Secretary of the Interior, who has charge of the islands.

Mr. BORAH. It is from the secretary of the interior of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. WARREN. Oh!

Mr. ROOT. I should like to have the letter read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary proceeded to read, and read as follows:

The Philippine Legislature has ample power to pass such humane legislation as it sees fit——

Mr. ROOT. Is the Secretary reading a letter which is addressed to anyone written by anyone? He seems to be reading from a newspaper.

Mr. BORAH. It is a letter printed in a newspaper.

Mr. ROOT. Is it addressed to anyone?

Mr. BORAH. It is addressed to some one, and it is also signed by the secretary of the interior.

Mr. ROOT. I merely want to have the whole letter read. I do not know what it is.

Mr. BORAH. That is precisely what has been requested. The part preceding the letter is simply a comment of the paper. That which the Secretary is now proceeding to read is the letter itself. I assume that is what the Senator wanted.

Mr. ROOT. That is what I wanted, but the Secretary evidently did not begin at the beginning of the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

In a letter from the Hon. Dean C. Worcester, secretary of the interior of the United States Government of the Philippine Islands, written in Manila recently, and addressed to Dr. William O. Stillman, president of the American Humane Association, the following remarkable statement of fact appears:

* * * * * * *

A portion of Dean Worcester's letter is here quoted, as follows:

* * * * * * *

The Philippine Legislature has ample power to pass such humane legislation as it sees fit for the regularly organized provinces. The Philippine Commission has the same authority with reference to the so-called special government provinces. So that there is no lack of adequate authority to pass humane legislation covering the entire Philippine Archipelago.

So far as I am aware, the only laws thus far passed by the commission or the legislature which can properly fall under this head are the "Act for the prevention of cruelty to animals" and the "Act prohibiting slavery, involuntary servitude, peonage, and the sale and purchase of human beings in the Mountain Province and the Province of Nueva Vizcaya and Agusan and providing punishment therefor." This act passed by the Philippine Commission under its authority as the exclusive legislative body for the territory inhabited by Moros and other non-Christian tribes is of course applicable only to that territory. Acts similar to or identical with this act have been passed by the upper house and sent to the Philippine Assembly for three consecutive years, and, indeed, are now pending there. Up to the present time the assembly has always refused to pass such an act.

The organic act passed by Congress on July 1, 1912, provides "that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist in said islands." Unfortunately, however, Congress provided no penalty for the violation of this provision, and the supreme court of these islands held, prior to the adoption of the act hereinbefore mentioned, that—

"There is at present no law punishing slave holding as a crime.

"The constitutional provision of the Philippine bill 'that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist in these islands,' while operating to nullify any agreement in contravention of it, requires supplementary legislation to give it effect criminally."

We are dealing not with a civil remedy but with a criminal charge in relation to which the bill of rights defines no crime and provides no punishment. Its effects can not be carried into the realm of criminal law without an act of the legislature.

The situation then, so far as concerns legislation prohibiting slavery, peonage, and involuntary servitude, is that there exists ample authority, but that the lower house declines to use its authority in this regard. We have, of course, the provisions of the old Spanish Penal Code against forcible detention, but in the large majority of cases this can not be proven, as the persons involuntarily held are afraid to tell the truth.

The legislative council of the Moro Province has passed an anti-slavery law of its own, but except in the Moro Province, the Mountain Province, Nueva Vizcaya, and Agusan the sale, barter, and purchase of human beings is still lawful in the Philippine Islands.

The Philippine Assembly excuses its conduct by the claim that slavery does not exist in these islands. This is absurd. There are Negrito slaves held to-day in the city of Manila.

DEAN C. WORCESTER,
Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho.

The resolution was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 73), which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, at $1,440 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

NEGROES IN CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. STONE. I submit a resolution for reference to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment. I ask that the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 72), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment shall inquire into and report as to the number of negroes employed in the classified civil service, showing the number employed in each department or other governmental establishment in the District of Columbia and at other places, giving aggregate salaries paid, and as far as possible showing the kind of service in which such employees are engaged, so that the Senate may be fully informed as to the premises.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a clipping from yesterday morning's Washington Post setting forth an account of a meeting held in this city the night before by what is known as the National Democratic Fair-Play Association. I know nothing about the association, but there are some very interesting things stated in this report. Among other things the report shows that there are 926 negroes employed in the Treasury Department, 593 in the Interior Department, and so on. I ask that the paper be referred to the committee along with the resolution I have offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution, together with the accompanying paper, will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution heretofore submitted by me, I ask the Secretary to read, for the information of the Senate, a marked paragraph in the paper which I send to the desk, and which I had intended to read myself. After it has been read I ask that it may be referred to the committee, together with the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

After an exhaustive study of the records of the Civil Service Commission and of the evidence which was obtained from the departments—the results of which are shown in the pages that follow—the President's commission has come to the conclusion that the interpretation which has been given to the act by the Civil Service Commission has been such as practically to defeat its primary purpose; that instead of giving to applicants the benefit of competitive examinations, and instead of giving to the service the benefit of rules adopted for "testing the fitness of applicants"; instead of making available to the Government persons who had by the rules established been given a rating of superior merit, every "condition of good administration" has been made subordinate and subservient to demands that can find no explanation except a desire to continue a system which the law was designed to supplant. Practically the only effect of the law as interpreted has been to eliminate from the possibility of appointment to positions in the classified service such persons as had entirely failed to obtain any standing whatever; i. e., to obtain an average above the passing mark. This conclusion—that the result has been to defeat the operation of the purposes of the act—is amply supported by the facts which are shown in detail below. (Report submitted as a statement of fact.)

In submitting this report the thought has been that its chief value will lie in statements of fact. In order that controversy might be confined entirely to critical comment and constructive recommendation the statements of fact are entirely separated in the text from that part which is purely descriptive. To the end that all controversy might be eliminated from the descriptive statement this portion of the report was prepared and submitted to the Civil Service Commission on ———, 1912, with the request that it be reviewed and corrected or enlarged upon, if need be, in order that it might be accepted without question or cavil as a basis for discussion. This descriptive text having been returned, after making such modifications as would eliminate every recital concerning which question had been raised, critical comment and constructive recommendations were submitted January 28, 1913. On ———, 1913, the comment of the Civil Service Commission, as an answer to the critical statements and constructive recommendations, was returned (Exhibit —), together with a proposed change in the rules (Exhibit —). To this answer the President's commission filed a reply (Exhibit —) which, in brief, calls attention to the fact that

the answer or comment of the Civil Service Commission avoided the issues which had been raised and that the proposed memorandum, while it was in the nature of an admission of past interpretation and practice that have been adverse to "good administration," does not reach nor correct the evil results that are clearly written on the face of the record as a matter of experience. (Recommendations of the President's commission.)

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, in the same connection I wish to have read a paragraph from a letter which I have received, desiring that it also go into the RECORD and be referred to the committee with the resolution.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

Now, sir, I happen to be a Federal employee at the New York customhouse for the past year and three months, and if you had but a faint idea of how favoritism and "pull" are worked here you would not ask for an appropriation to conduct an inquiry, but simply demand it in the interest of common decency.

In the division in which I am employed and to which I was appointed from a civil-service list there are three grades of pay—$840, $960, and $1,095 per annum. You are instructed on your appointment that you are advanced from one grade to the higher on your efficiency. After a few months in the service I learned the efficiency meant "pull," and from my acquaintance in the division it looked to me as if illiteracy was a qualification for advancement. Mr. Loeb in 1909 abolished the night inspectors and former customs watchmen, later called customs guards. He demoted day and night inspectors by the wholesale, the majority of whom were Civil War veterans. He had 250 laborers off the scales sworn in as watchmen, ranging in salaries from $840 to $1,095 per annum, placing at their head a deputy surveyor who had been an inspector for a few months (by Executive order) at $3,000 per annum. None of these laborers ever passed a civil-service examination of any kind, but they were all more or less active Republicans, the majority being district captains. All this time an eligible list for night inspector was in existence, but none were taken from it until all these henchmen were well provided for, a good number being appointed roundsmen at $1,200 per annum.

With a few exceptions, all of these laborers have been advanced in salary notwithstanding the fact that some of them have had several charges of a more or less serious nature preferred against them. Some of them are good men, but there are others who are simply a disgrace to the customs uniform. Yet they go ahead, while the civil-service man remains stationary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The papers will be referred as requested.

Mr. ROOT. Was the signature to the letter read?

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator insists on it, I will have it read.

Mr. ROOT. I wish the signature read, of course.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of course you will have the writer turned out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Thomas O'Hara, Customs Guard, Room 135, Customhouse, New York.

Mr. BACON. Has morning business closed, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business has closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. If there be nothing further to be presented to the Senate, 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 2 hours and 30 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

SPECIAL FISCAL AGENTS.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am directed by the Committee on Finance to report the resolution (S. Res. 75) which I send to the desk. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate approve the appointment of the Right Hon. Sir Edgar Speyer, Bart., P. C., and the Messrs. Henry Oppenheimer, Henry William Brown, Henry Gordon Leith, James Speyer, and Eduard Beit von Speyer, trading under the name, style, and firm of Speyer Bros., at London, England, to be special fiscal agents of the Navy Department at that place, agreeably to the nomination.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate on the 28th ultimo agreed to the amendment of the standing rule of the Senate numbered 12, relating to the calling of the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Notice of the motion will be entered.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 5, 1913, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 1, 1913.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John W. Martin, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Jacksonville, in the State of Florida, in place of William H. Lucas, superseded.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

Warner S. Kinkead, of Kentucky, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Louisville, in the State of Kentucky, in place of J. Frank Taylor, whose term of office expired by limitation January 17, 1913.

Charles R. Kurtz, of Pennsylvania, to be surveyor of customs in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, in place of Perry M. Lytle, resigned.

COMMISSIONER OF CORPORATIONS.

Joseph E. Davies, of Wisconsin, to be Commissioner of Corporations, in the Department of Commerce, vice Luther Conant, jr.

ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY.

Walter W. Warwick, of Ohio, to be Assistant Comptroller of the Treasury, in place of Leander P. Mitchell, deceased.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Louis W. Murphy, of Iowa, to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of Iowa, in place of Michael J. Tobin, superseded.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

Edward K. Campbell, of Alabama, to be chief justice of the Court of Claims, vice Stanton J. Peelle, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Andrew H. Hudspeth, of New Mexico, to be United States marshal, district of New Mexico, vice Secundino Romero, resigned.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Mrs. Annie G. Rogers, of Leadville, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Leadville, Colo., vice Andrew P. Adolphson, term expired.

SURVEYOR GENERAL OF WASHINGTON.

Richard Roediger, of Tacoma, Wash., to be surveyor general of Washington, vice Edward P. Kingsbury, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Frank B. McCoy, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be colonel from April 28, 1913, vice Col. John S. Parke, Infantry, unassigned, detached from his proper command.

Lieut. Col. Richard M. Blatchford, Infantry, unassigned, to be colonel from April 30, 1913, vice Col. Arthur Williams, Eleventh Infantry, retired from active service April 29, 1913.

Maj. John P. Finley, Infantry, unassigned, to be lieutenant colonel from April 28, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Frank B. McCoy, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Frederick R. Day, Thirtieth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from April 30, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Richard M. Blatchford, unassigned, promoted.

Capt. Benjamin F. Hardaway, Seventeenth Infantry, to be major from April 30, 1913, vice Maj. Frederick R. Day, Thirtieth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Russell C. Hand, Thirteenth Infantry, to be captain from April 30, 1913, vice Capt. Benjamin F. Hardaway, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Robert S. Griffin to be engineer in chief and Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a period of four years from the 18th day of May, 1913.

Commander Victor Blue to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of four years, vice Commander Philip Andrews, resigned.

Paymaster John H. Merriam to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 21st day of February, 1913.

Boatswain William Fremgen to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 31st day of January, 1913.

Lieut. Charles P. Huff to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1913.

Lloyd Noland, a citizen of Virginia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 16th day of April, 1913.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters in the Navy from the 19th day of April, 1913:

Robert Morgan,
James P. Shovlin,
John A. Price,
Alfred R. Hughes, and
James L. Jones.

Milton J. Rosenau, a citizen of Massachusetts, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 28th day of March, 1913, in accordance with a provision contained in an act of Congress approved August 22, 1912.

George A. Stowell, a citizen of Oregon, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of April, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Robert Boyd to be postmaster at Dothan, Ala., in place of Byron Trammell, removed.

Ed. G. Caldwell to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Ala., in place of Dora Crook. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1909.

W. L. Crew to be postmaster at Good Water, Ala., in place of Cicero A. Ross, deceased.

David M. Scott to be postmaster at Selma, Ala., in place of David M. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1913.

J. L. Thornton to be postmaster at Alexander City, Ala., in place of Henry C. Willis. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

ARKANSAS.

Louis K. Buerkle to be postmaster at Stuttgart, Ark., in place of Edward Hall, deceased.

William A. Bushmiaer to be postmaster at Alma, Ark., in place of Thomas B. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

G. G. Dandridge to be postmaster at Paris, Ark., in place of W. M. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1913.

Ernest J. Patton to be postmaster at Cabot, Ark., in place of Samuel P. Beck, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

C. W. Collins to be postmaster at El Centro, Cal., in place of Ora L. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

Ellis T. Tanner to be postmaster at San Jacinto Cal., in place of George B. Hannahs. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

CONNECTICUT.

Edward Perkins to be postmaster at Suffield, Conn., in place of Edmund Halladay. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1911.

FLORIDA.

Bessie Bryan Simpson to be postmaster at Kissimmee, Fla., in place of Frank Vans Agnew. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1912.

Crawford I. Henry to be postmaster at Apalachicola, Fla., in place of J. F. Warren, resigned.

William Jackson to be postmaster at Daytona, Fla., in place of William C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1913.

B. P. Morris to be postmaster at De Funiak Springs, Fla., in place of William C. Eddy. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

J. A. Williams to be postmaster at Alachua, Fla., in place of Simeon C. Dell, resigned.

GEORGIA.

B. F. Baker to be postmaster at Woodbury, Ga., in place of Mary E. Hinton. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1912.

W. F. Brown to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ga., in place of Claude E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

Charles V. Clark to be postmaster at Louisville, Ga., in place of Lewis R. Farmer. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1913.

Mattie E. Gunter to be postmaster at Social Circle, Ga., in place of Mattie E. Gunter. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1912.

Andrew J. Irwin to be postmaster at Sandersville, Ga., in place of Samuel B. Robison. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1912.

Samuel B. Lewis to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1912.

Henry M. Miller to be postmaster at Colquitt, Ga., in place of Henry M. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1913.

ILLINOIS.

Clifford W. Brewer to be postmaster at Knoxville, Ill., in place of Orange L. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Marshall E. Daniel to be postmaster at McLeansboro, Ill., in place of Frank J. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Katherine M. McClements to be postmaster at Park Ridge, Ill., in place of William S. Chittenden, resigned.

Thomas Moyer to be postmaster at Paris, Ill., in place of Paul P. Shutt. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Benjamin F. Neal to be postmaster at Toledo, Ill., in place of John F. Ashwill. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

John Odum to be postmaster at Harrisburg, Ill., in place of Thomas S. Reynolds, resigned.

INDIANA.

James E. Burke to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Ind., in place of Albert L. Anderson, removed.

Charles B. Donovan, jr., to be postmaster at East Chicago, Ind., in place of Moses Specter. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

Daniel Ganz to be postmaster at Odon, Ind., in place of Harry H. Crooke, resigned.

Charles L. Haslet to be postmaster at Chesterton, Ind., in place of Charles E. Hillstrom. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1912.

Charles L. Wood to be postmaster at Albany, Ind., in place of William A. Hayes, deceased.

IOWA.

W. H. Carmody, sr., to be postmaster at Valley Junction, Iowa, in place of Albert S. Burnett, resigned.

Harry F. Chance to be postmaster at Redfield, Iowa, in place of Edgar O. Winter. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Charles B. Clark to be postmaster at Ogden, Iowa, in place of Clinton L. Zollinger, resigned.

Lloyd Crow to be postmaster at Mapleton, Iowa, in place of S. H. Carhart. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1913.

B. W. De Vine to be postmaster at Livermore, Iowa, in place of Joseph C. Bergen. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1912.

S. A. Douglas to be postmaster at Adel, Iowa, in place of Albert C. Hotchkiss. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

W. H. Dudley to be postmaster at Earlham, Iowa, in place of Eugene M. Crosswait. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Kaspar Faltinson to be postmaster at Armstrong, Iowa, in place of William Stuart. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

F. M. Finnell to be postmaster at Algona, Iowa, in place of M. P. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Thomas M. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Charles City, Iowa, in place of Lyman H. Henry, removed.

Milton Funk to be postmaster at Lewis, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Reuben M. Gable to be postmaster at Lost Nation, Iowa, in place of Robert M. Willard. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1912.

J. S. Guynn to be postmaster at Traer, Iowa, in place of B. F. Thomas, deceased.

Edwin L. Helmer to be postmaster at Sanborn, Iowa, in place of Richard M. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

A. D. Hix to be postmaster at Zearing, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Anton Huebach to be postmaster at McGregor, Iowa, in place of Louis N. Kramer. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Peter Jungers to be postmaster at Hospers, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

A. W. Lee to be postmaster at Britt, Iowa, in place of W. A. Simpkins. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

Ed. McConaughey to be postmaster at Allerton, Iowa, in place of John C. Meredith. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

P. A. McCray to be postmaster at Rolfe, Iowa, in place of Marion Bruce. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1910.

Frank W. Miller to be postmaster at Olin, Iowa, in place of Dennis Bittner, resigned.

Walter Rae to be postmaster at Massena, Iowa, in place of William C. McCurdy, resigned.

C. W. Remore to be postmaster at Northwood, Iowa, in place of Frank Scammon. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1911.

John H. Schulte to be postmaster at Breda, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

William D. Schulte to be postmaster at West Point, Iowa, in place of Robert A. Gardner. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

E. H. Vary to be postmaster at Mechanicsville, Iowa, in place of William L. Comstock. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

KANSAS.

A. F. Achenbach to be postmaster at Soldier, Kans., in place of Benson L. Mickel. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

Gus Charles Buche to be postmaster at Miltonvale, Kans., in place of James Hall, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

T. J. Doyle to be postmaster at Englewood, Kans., in place of Etta M. Townsend. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

A. Ellingson to be postmaster at Scandia, Kans., in place of Charles C. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

E. P. Epperson to be postmaster at Scott City (late Scott), Kans., in place of James B. Morris, to change name of office.

E. C. Gresham to be postmaster at Bucklin, Kans., in place of Raymond S. Frazier. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Charles Hewitt to be postmaster at Wakefield, Kans., in place of Henry Avery, resigned.

J. R. Lovitt to be postmaster at McCracken, Kans., in place of Clarence P. Dutton. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

C. C. McKenzie to be postmaster at Morrill, Kans., in place of Ulysses S. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

J. W. Niehaus to be postmaster at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in place of Guy A. Swallow. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Claude Rowland to be postmaster at Protection, Kans., in place of W. C. Monticue, removed.

Leonard Shamleffer to be postmaster at Douglass, Kans., in place of George W. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1912.

A. B. Smith to be postmaster at Robinson, Kans., in place of Harry M. Leslie, resigned.

J. H. Stanberry to be postmaster at Attica, Kans., in place of Elva B. Hilton. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

J. H. Weltmer to be postmaster at Claflin, Kans., in place of Bert Fancher. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

KENTUCKY.

Cleo W. Brown to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ky. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Charles M. Griffith to be postmaster at Russellville, Ky., in place of Jacob B. Coffman, deceased.

Orrin Derby Todd to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Ky., in place of Mike Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

LOUISIANA.

Cary E. Blanchard to be postmaster at Boyce, La. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

Mary Hunter to be postmaster at Pineville, La. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Adah Rous to be postmaster at Lake Providence, La., in place of Adah Rous. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1913.

Will A. Steidley to be postmaster at Kinder, La. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

Theodore Tate to be postmaster at Eunice, La., in place of Hiram Fuselier. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1912.

MAINE.

Frank T. Clarkson to be postmaster at Kittery Point, Me., in place of Horace Mitchell, resigned.

S. H. Frost to be postmaster at Pittsfield, Me., in place of Charles B. Haskell. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Benjamin R. Gifford to be postmaster at Woods Hole, Mass., in place of George C. Look, resigned.

William J. O'Brien to be postmaster at Kingston, Mass., in place of Samuel Atwell. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912

MICHIGAN.

Carl L. Farwell to be postmaster at Barryton, Mich., in place of James L. Campbell, removed.

John C. Hoopingarner to be postmaster at Berrien Springs, Mich., in place of Guy C. Mars. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Berend Kamps to be postmaster at Zeeland, Mich., in place of William Glerum, resigned.

Ray Maker to be postmaster at Bear Lake, Mich., in place of Charles W. Glover. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Leonard J. Patterson to be postmaster at Tawas City, Mich., in place of William B. Kelly, deceased.

Mortimer D. Snow to be postmaster at Standish, Mich., in place of Louis H. Tovatt. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

MISSISSIPPI.

E. S. Chapman to be postmaster at Utica, Miss., in place of Alexander Yates. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Ollie O. Conerly to be postmaster at Gloster, Miss., in place of Jennie D. Ligon. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

C. S. Summers to be postmaster at Charleston, Miss., in place of William Quarles, jr., resigned.

R. Parrish Taylor to be postmaster at Oakland, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Dora E. Tate to be postmaster at Picayune, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1912.

MISSOURI.

Charles C. Crickette to be postmaster at Queen City, Mo., in place of William H. Funk. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Abel F. Daily to be postmaster at South St. Joseph, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

M. W. Daugherty to be postmaster at Ironton, Mo., in place of Adrian Steel. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1912.

Edward T. Duval to be postmaster at Skidmore, Mo., in place of George Stoolfer. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Patrick C. Gibbons to be postmaster at Edina, Mo., in place of Edwin S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1913.

T. B. Hardaway to be postmaster at Jasper, Mo., in place of George B. Wade. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Hugh B. Ingler to be postmaster at Republic, Mo., in place of Martin L. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1912.

J. Lee Johnson to be postmaster at Flat River, Mo., in place of John A. Knowles. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

Meredith B. Lane to be postmaster at Sullivan, Mo., in place of John H. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

Harvey Morrow to be postmaster at Buffalo, Mo., in place of Robert A. Booth, resigned.

De Witt Wagner to be postmaster at Memphis, Mo., in place of Robert D. Cramer. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1910.

William Warmack to be postmaster at Greenville, Mo., in place of Abner Barrow. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1913.

MONTANA.

Alice Hensley, to be postmaster at Moore, Mont., in place of Patrick H. Tooley, deceased.

Charles Lepley to be postmaster at Fort Benton, Mont., in place of George W. Crane. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1913.

George S. Miller to be postmaster at Deer Lodge, Mont., in place of Ithel S. Eldred. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

T. A. Rigney to be postmaster at Laurel, Mont., in place of Edward L. Fenton. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

NEW JERSEY.

Patrick J. Ryan to be postmaster at Elizabeth, N. J., in place of Palmer H. Charlock. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1913.

William J. Wolfe to be postmaster at Chatham, N. J., in place of Ezra F. Ferris. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1913.

NEW YORK.

Harry A. Inglee to be postmaster at Amityville, N. Y., in place of Frederick B. Powell. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

Alfred J. Kennedy to be postmaster at Flushing, N. Y., in place of Thomas B. Lowerre. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

William F. O'Connell to be postmaster at Andover, N. Y., in place of Arthur B. Burrows, deceased.

Frank D. Wade to be postmaster at Addison, N. Y., in place of Charles L. Crane, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA.

L. B. Hale to be postmaster at Fayetteville, N. C., in place of Alexander L. McCaskill. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1910.

Russell A. Strickland to be postmaster at Elm City, N. C., in place of Jesse D. Sharp. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1912.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Nicholas Johnston to be postmaster at Aneta, N. Dak., in place of William T. Cameron. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

OHIO.

David H. Heiby to be postmaster at Ohio City, Ohio, in place of Sidney J. Winney, resigned.

OKLAHOMA.

T. H. Hubbard to be postmaster at Cordell, Okla., in place of Carlos C. Curtis, resigned.

W. P. Madden to be postmaster at Cheyenne, Okla., in place of Maud A. Falconer. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

W. F. Parker to be postmaster at Davis, Okla., in place of Charles B. Ramsey, resigned.

Samuel R. Staton to be postmaster at Cushing, Okla., in place of A. H. Holland, resigned.

OREGON.

August Huckestein to be postmaster at Salem, Oreg., in place of Squire Farrar. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1910.

Harry M. Stewart to be postmaster at Springfield, Oreg., in place of Byron A. Washburne. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1913.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Allen A. Orr to be postmaster at Lewistown, Pa., in place of William F. Eckbert, jr., resigned.

J. Frank Patterson to be postmaster at Mifflintown, Pa., in place of Andrew C. Allison. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

George B. Richardson to be postmaster at Knox, Pa., in place of Joseph M. Brothers, deceased.

C. J. D. Strohecker to be postmaster at Zelienople, Pa., in place of Clarence L. Dindinger. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1913.

RHODE ISLAND.

Thomas H. Galvin to be postmaster at East Greenwich, R. I., in place of Nathaniel H. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

George M. Anderson to be postmaster at Ninety Six, S. C., in place of Julis E. Deloach; name changed by marriage.

TENNESSEE.

William Brewer to be postmaster at Woodbury, Tenn., in place of Andrew N. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1913.

Clarence W. Moore to be postmaster at Smithville, Tenn., in place of James H. Christian. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1913.

Charles E. Rodes to be postmaster at Manchester, Tenn., in place of Finis R. Sharp. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1912.

TEXAS.

Mina Daughtry to be postmaster at Chillicothe, Tex., in place of John W. Hedley, resigned.

James W. Davis to be postmaster at Alvord, Tex., in place of Henry L. Sands, deceased.

T. A. Fuller to be postmaster at New Boston, Tex., in place of Richard B. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1910.

L. E. Haskett to be postmaster at Childress, Tex., in place of U. S. Weddington, removed.

Frank W. Kirkland to be postmaster at Mount Calm, Tex., in place of Lucius C. Guin. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

T. E. Van Landingham to be postmaster at Lone Oak, Tex., in place of George L. Johnson, deceased.

VIRGINIA.

Hoge M. Brown to be postmaster at Radford, Va., in place of Warner J. Kenderdine. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1913.

George V. Cameron to be postmaster at Louisa, Va., in place of Codrington D. Flanagan, resigned.

Charles E. Clinedinst to be postmaster at New Market, Va., in place of Charles W. Wickes. Incumbent's commission expired May 13, 1912.

E. L. Wade to be postmaster at Vinton, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1912.

J. R. Williams to be postmaster at Brookneal, Va., in place of Bezer Snell. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1912.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1913.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Alexander R. Magruder to be secretary of Legation at Copenhagen, Denmark.

COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

H. M. Smith to be Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries.

GOVERNOR OF ALASKA.

J. F. A. Strong to be governor of Alaska.

COMMISSIONER OF LABOR STATISTICS.

C. P. Neill to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Pearl Berkheimer, Augusta.
T. G. Robinson, Marvell.

COLORADO.

Thomas Ryan, Salida.
Eva B. Hamilton, Stratton.

GEORGIA.

D. P. Philips, Lithonia.
W. B. McCants, Winder.

ILLINOIS.

W. H. Chapman, Clifton.
William Twohig, Galesburg.
G. A. Griffith, sr., Rankin.

KANSAS.

L. D. Cassler, Canton.
J. O. Ferguson, Independence.
F. M. Cook, Jamestown.
G. W. Barker, Minneapolis.
J. J. Wilson, Moran.
Agnes H. Gallagher, Summerfield.
L. G. Wagner, Sylvia.

LOUISIANA.

Overton Gauthier, Jennings.
Mattie D. Boatner, Vidalia.

MICHIGAN.

Theophilus Belanger, River Rouge.

MISSISSIPPI.

Henrietta Welch, Carrollton.
J. C. Jourdan, Iuka.
W. M. Noah, Kosciusko.
Lillie W. Nugent, Rosedale.
Truman Gray, Waynesboro.

MISSOURI.

A. L. Galloway, Cassville.
J. S. Fowler, Cole Camp.
A. P. Beazley, Eldon.
R. J. Ball, Gallatin.
John Hetrick, Laclede.

C. B. Bacon, Marshall.
T. A. Dodge, Milan.
A. H. Martin, Perry.

MONTANA.

R. M. Corley, Stevensville.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

D. V. Cahalane, Charlestown.

NEW JERSEY.

A. L. Williams, Vineland.

NEW YORK.

John Soemann, Lancaster.
P. M. Giles, Le Roy.

NORTH DAKOTA.

John Galyen, Belfield.
A. L. Menard, Welton.

OKLAHOMA.

Sam Flourney, Elk City.
D. M. Hamlin, Newkirk.

OREGON.

L. F. Reizenstein, Roseburg.
R. E. Williams, The Dalles.

PENNSYLVANIA.

T. H. McKenzie, Barnesboro.
Hugh Gilmore, Williamsport.

TEXAS.

J. R. De Witt, Brackettville.
S. D. Seale, Floresville.
J. B. Phillips, Howe.
N. A. Burton, McKinney.
J. W. White, Uvalde.

VIRGINIA.

A. W. Sinclair, Manassas.
J. E. Rogers, Strasburg.

WEST VIRGINIA.

J. W. Dingess, Huntington.
T. H. Buchanan, Wellsburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May 1, 1913.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Infinite and eternal Spirit, God over all, we come to Thee in prayer because spirit can meet spirit, be exalted, strengthened, purified, ennobled by the contact.

"Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If any man hear my voice and open the door I will come in to him and will sup with him and he with Me." Happy is the man who shall open the door of his heart that the King of Glory may come and be his guest and partake with him of the bread of life. Help us to open our hearts to that Spirit that we may be the better fitted for the duties of this new day, and all praise we shall give to Thee. 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 H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time of the adjournment yesterday there was under discussion the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE]. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, paragraph 169, on page 45, line 20, by striking out the figures "25" and inserting the figures "45."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendemnts thereto be closed in 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman state how that time is to be divided?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want 5 minutes for this side. I am willing that gentlemen on that side may have the remaining time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Which section is referred to?

Mr. MANN. Paragraph 169.

The CHAIRMAN. The last paragraph under the metal schedule.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I should like 5 minutes under that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. MOORE. This being the basket clause, there ought to be more discussion than 15 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that unless amendments are offered I shall have to try to limit debate. I am willing that gentlemen who have amendments may discuss them.

Mr. MANN. Of course there are a great many things covered by the basket clause. Gentlemen wish to discuss the provisions of the bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will make it 20 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Let us get it by unanimous consent, and see how the time is to be divided.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will let the Chair divide the time. I want 5 minutes on this side.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to have 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will make it 25.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will let the debate run, but I give notice that I intend to close it in a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his request?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If there is objection.

Mr. MANN. Make it 25.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I consent this time, but I intend to push the consideration of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE METAL SCHEDULE.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this is the end of the metal—the iron and steel—schedule, which provides for the rates of duty upon more articles that enter into consumption in the life of the Republic than any other. I am glad to see that this committee has so materially reduced the tariff rates in this particular schedule, because it is shown by the testimony of those who are mainly engaged in the production of the articles covered by this schedule this manufacturing business requires less protection than any other in the bill. The officers and men connected with the United States Steel Corporation so testified in the investigation carried on for a year by a committee of this House, and the man who is said to have had more information on that subject than any other man in America, or probably in the world—Mr. Schwab—testified that this industry did not need the tariff.

We have here a schedule on the basis of which rests in a great measure the prosperity of the country, and we are dealing with a subject the product and sale of which have made those engaged in it the most prosperous people in the country. They are the people of all others who do not need, who are not entitled by reason of such need, to one particle of protection. I do not say this at mere random. I do not say that we have gone beyond the principle of enacting a tariff which will provide for the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

I do not, as a Democrat, concede the right of the American manufacturer to have any such thing in his favor. I stand here as a Democrat in favor of a tariff in preference to direct taxation, but when that tariff is levied, I want to see it levied for the purposes of revenue, and I never shall vote for a tariff that is levied for the protection of an industry beyond the point where it will raise the necessary revenue of this Government when economically administered. That has been the faith in which I was born, the faith in which I was reared, the faith in which I have lived in public life, and it is the faith in which I propose to conduct myself as a Member of Congress.

It is said we are to bring into competition with American labor the cheap product of European labor in this particular branch of industry. The United States Steel Corporation is the most gigantic industrial giant on the face of the globe to-day. The evidence before the Ways and Means Committee, the publications in the magazines, and the evidence before a committee authorized by this House to investigate its affairs show that it claims to have a capital of nearly $2,000,000,000. The very first president of that corporation, in giving evidence before that committee, stated to that committee that at the present time that corporation did not need the tariff to protect it from European manufacturers. He stated that even taking into consideration the lower scale of wages paid in Germany and England and other countries, that corporation, nevertheless, could manufacture iron and steel and their products more cheaply than could any country on the face of the globe. I shall put into my remarks the evidence of Mr. Schwab, the first president of this corporation, for whose capacity and knowledge of the business in every detail the present president of this corporation, Mr. Farrell, on last Wednesday vouched. Mr. Schwab appeared before that committee on August 4, 1911, and I will quote a statement which is to be found on page 1303 of the hearings before that committee to investigate the steel corporation. Mr. Schwab had previously stated that they could manufacture iron and steel products more cheaply than any country in the world, a statement that rather startled the Republican members of that committee. Mr. DANFORTH asked him:

Even with the added load of labor?

He replied:

Yes; I think the reason for that is because we manufacture in such large quantities; we manufacture under the economic conditions that I speak of, and our tonnage is so great.

Though pressed and pressed again by the Republican members of that committee to retract that statement, he insisted that what he said was true, but that they needed a tariff, not for the purpose of presently protecting either their labor or themselves in the manufacture of the products of this great industry, but for the future. If, perchance, the manufacturers in Germany and England and other foreign countries should become so efficient in producing the products of iron and steel as we are now, he stated that corporation would then need the protective tariff, but for the present time, in order to produce the products more cheaply than they are produced abroad, it was not necessary to have the tariff. So that we have here an industry represented by this great industrial giant, and this officer telling the country and the Congress that it does not need a protective tariff in order to manufacture more cheaply at home than they can abroad.

What, then, becomes of that great proposition that the Democratic Party by this bill have brought in a bill which is to carry ruin to the American laborer and to destroy industries? Ah, says my friend from Pennsylvania, we by this bill give to the Steel Corporation, which has grown to be the great giant of which I have spoken, advantage over the independents. Well, independent manufacturers sounds very sweet, but the other day, in the inquiry before the same committee to which I have referred to investigate the Steel Corporation, Mr. Farrell, president, said the only difference between the Steel Corporation and the independents was that the independents were not stockholders in the Steel Corporation, but they pursued the same policy and the same methods. That is, they had an understanding, written at times, pools, independents and the Steel Corporation alike, by which they fixed the price of the products manufactured by both, and when it became a little dangerous to have those in evidence they burned up the books and they carried them along under gentlemen's agreements, and when the gentlemen's agreements became dangerous they then resorted to the famous Gary dinners by which to have an understanding. Those are the men engaged in this business so vital to the welfare and interest of our people, who charge that we, the party in power in this House, who have been endeavoring to bring some relief to the people in regard to this most important schedule, which affects the smallest implement of agriculture and household affairs up to the greatest, they charge that we are to bring ruin and destruction upon the labor of the country, these men who by reason of an unnecessary, unwholesome, and vicious protective system have been able to enlarge their business until its proportions startle not only the American people, but attract the attention of the world. For myself, I think that these men who have grown rich and powerful and strong in the commercial world, who thus declare publicly that they do not need the protective tariff to enable them to pay the present prices for labor and to compete in the markets at home and in the markets of the world, should at least have a fair proportion of these taxes, and burdens which have hitherto been borne by the people taken away, and that the people should for once be considered by the House of Representatives.

And when he was asked the question whether or not he needed the tariff in order to produce the articles as cheaply here as they could be produced abroad he said this: That taking into consideration the low scale of wages paid in Germany, England, and other countries that corporation nevertheless could manufacture iron and steel products more cheaply than could any other country on the face of the earth.

That was so startling to Republican members of that committee that they thought he had made a mistake, although Mr. Carnegie had time and time again given evidence to the same effect, and although he had stated previously, when pressed by a Republican member of that committee—he thought he would ask the question and lead the witness into retracting it—whether he could do it even with the added load of labor, Mr. Schwab said:

Yes; I think the reason for that is because we manufacture in such large quantities; we manufacture under the economic conditions that I speak of.

He said they did not need that year before last and would never need it unless, perchance, European manufacturers should by some means become so educated and progressed in the skill of manufacture that they could compete with the American manufacturers in these articles.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

Quoting from the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, which reported this bill:

INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING.

Probably the most striking economic change since 1897 has been the tremendous increase in the cost of living—a situation which has attracted the anxious attention of economists the world over. The following figures represent the relative advance in living costs that has taken place during the critical part of the period in question in the United States:

Relative wholesale prices, and per cent of increase over 1897.

Commodity.	Price, 1897.	Price, 1900.	Increase over 1897.	Price, 1910.	Increase over 1897.
			Per cent.		*Per cent.*
Farm products	85.2	109.5	28.5	164.6	93.2
Food	87.7	104.2	18.8	128.7	46.7
Clothing	91.1	106.8	17.2	123.7	35.8
Metals and implements	86.6	120.5	39.1	128.5	48.2
Drugs and chemicals	94.4	115.7	22.5	117.0	23.9
House furnishing goods	89.8	106.1	18.1	111.6	24.2
Miscellaneous	92.1	109.8	19.2	133.1	44.5
All commodities	89.7	110.5	23.1	131.6	46.7

From this table it will appear that the wholesale prices of metals and implements, such as are embraced in this schedule, have increased from 86.6 in 1897 to 120.5 in 1900, or 39.1 per cent; and to 128.5 in 1910, or 48.2 per cent over the prices of 1897.

Now how have wages increased in the corresponding period?

The following table, taken from Bulletin No. 77, from the Bureau of Labor, published in 1908, will in a measure show the per cent of increase in wages up to 1908. These are the latest available, but my information is that wages since 1907 do not show any considerable increase.

Per cent of increase in wages per hour in 1907 as compared with the average for 1890–1899, by industries.

Agricultural implements	30.9
Bakery, bread	28.9
Blacksmithing and horseshoeing	26.4
Boots and shoes	24.3
Brick	22.7
Building trades	44.6
Candy	24.4
Carpets	17.1
Carriages and wagons	18.3
Cars, steam railroad	24.4
Clothing, factory product	15.8
Cotton goods	57.5
Dyeing, finishing, and printing textiles	11.3
Electrical apparatus and supplies	22.6
Flour	16.0
Foundry and machine shop	21.4
Furniture	27.1
Gas	7.7
Glass	29.4
Harness	23.5
Hats, fur	26.4
Hosiery and knit goods	33.4
Iron and steel, bar	40.4
Iron and steel, Bessemer converting	32.6
Iron and steel, blast furnace	19.8
Leather	11.8
Liquors, malt	32.9
Lumber	27.6
Marble and stone work	25.7

Paper and wood pulp	33.3
Planing mill	24.6
Pottery	13.8
Printing and binding, book and job	31.0
Printing, newspaper	22.6
Shipbuilding	20.9
Silk goods	16.9
Slaughtering and meat packing	16.0
Streets and sewers, contract work	45.7
Streets and sewers, municipal work	21.6
Tobacco, cigars	32.4
Woolen and worsted goods	31.9
All industries	28.8

It will be observed that this table merely shows the per cent of increase in wages per hour, not the per cent of increase per day or week.

From this table it will appear that in the iron and steel business from 1897 to 1907 the increase has been as follows: Iron and steel, bar, 33.4 per cent per hour; iron and steel, Bessemer converting, 40.4 per cent; iron and steel, blast furnace, 19.8 per cent. So in no case has the increase of wages kept pace with the increase in prices.

I call attention to a recent report of the Bureau of Labor just published showing the cost of living in 1912 as compared with the years 1890 and 1896, which is found in the New York World of May 1, 1913, and is as follows:

COST OF LIVING REACHED HIGHEST POINT IN 1912.

WASHINGTON, *April 30.*

During the latter part of 1912 the cost of living in the United States was higher than at any other time during the last 23 years. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has just issued a report on retail prices from 1890 to 1913.

The lowest cost was reached in each of the geographical divisions and in the United States as a whole in 1896. From that date to 1912 the total increase in the cost of living per year for a workingman's family, by geographical divisions, was: North Atlantic, $166; South Atlantic, $152; North Central, $187; South Central, $186; and Western, $152.

The approximate cost of a year's food supply for an average workingman's family at average prices of each year, by geographical divisions, for 1890, 1896 (the low year), and 1912 was:

Divisions.	1890	1896	1912
North Atlantic	$319	$300	$466
South Atlantic	274	265	417
North Central	299	276	463
South Central	269	255	441
Western	309	277	429

I have taken the pains to present in a concise form the great business done in the iron and steel manufacture during the last year, showing the immense amount of export to foreign countries and the inconsiderable imports from foreign countries; also a table showing, article by article, the difference in the rates in the Dingley bill and the Payne bill and the bill now under consideration. I do that so that the country can see the great reduction made in the rates in these articles and that the people of America shall get what they are entitled to—relief from these unnecessary burdens of taxation which for years and years have been placed upon the importation of these articles, not for the purpose of bringing revenue to the Government but for no purpose in the world but to add to the already full and overflowing coffers of the men in this industry. In my judgment this tariff bill on this particular schedule—and I do not believe upon any other—will not have any deleterious effect upon the men engaged in it, because the chief head of this great industry, the men who have organized the Steel Corporation and know more than anybody else about it, have said under oath that they did not need a tariff of any sort upon these articles in order to manufacture more cheaply than they can abroad, or to enable them to successfully compete with the world; and then when they pay the wages they do in comparison with the low wages at home and abroad. I present the following analysis of the iron and steel trade for the past year, as shown by the imports and exports, and a comparison of the rates contained in the Dingley, Payne, and the pending bill. From these I am confident it can not be truthfully maintained that this industry needs any protective tariff, and that rates fixed by this bill are both just and fair to the manufacturer and, at the same time, will bring relief to the American consumer from unjust and burdensome taxation, which has heretofore been imposed mainly for the benefit of those who did not and do not now need it, and under which the most gigantic financial corporation and trust in the world has been organized, flourished, and prospered. [Applause.]

Our export trade of iron and steel and manufactures in 1911 and 1912, as taken from the Monthly Reports of Commerce and Finance and Imported Merchandise entered for Consumption in the United States, issued by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Exports of iron and steel.

Items.	1911	1912
Iron ore	$2,496,291	$2,806,636
Pig iron	2,475,000	2,658,428
Scrap and old iron	794,686	1,196,409
Bar iron	691,770	577,898
Wire rods	529,204	1,416,271
All other bars of steel	4,486,705	5,395,652
Billets, ingots, and blooms of steel:		
To England	2,983,876	3,939,099
To Canada	1,113,957	1,200,710
To other countries	1,739	14,412
Steel rails for railways:		
To Canada	1,168,000	3,369,894
To Central America	460,000	416,011
To Mexico	1,854,484	893,758
To West Indies	962,000	1,260,691
To South America	2,699,099	3,882,126
To Japan	1,467,337	1,118,942
To other Asia	2,341,650	866,155
To other countries	424,139	326,869
Total steel rails	11,377,444	12,134,446

In 1911 we imported $107,567 and exported a value of $11,377,444. In 1912 we imported $87,392 and exported $12,134,446. The present bill is right in placing steel rails on the free list.

Sheets and plates.

	1911	1912
Iron	$6,545,585	$11,320,829
Steel	8,563,840	12,327,561
Tin	2,489,094	6,269,325

In 1912 we imported $277,805 worth of sheets and plates of iron and steel and $288,014 worth of tin plate and exported $29,916,715 worth of the three sorts combined.

Structural iron and steel.

	1911	1912
To Canada	$3,096,033	$5,150,353
To Mexico	1,653,228	358,716
To Panama		2,416,388
To Cuba	814,697	548,568
To South America	664,645	787,955
To Japan	476,727	807,803
To British Oceania	288,774	184,857
To Philippine Islands	185,746	107,890
To other countries	1,104,001	719,602
Total	8,683,851	11,082,133

In 1912 we imported a value of $123,642 of building forms at from 23 to 35 per cent tax.

Wire.

	1911	1912
Barbed	$4,643,391	$5,469,398
All other	5,556,577	6,511,490
Total	10,199,968	11,980,888

We imported in 1911 and 1912 as follows: Barbed wire, 1911, $4; 1912, $7. All other wire, 1911, $1,166,277; 1912, $1,401,793.

Builders' hardware and tools.

	1911	1912
Locks, hinges, and other builders' hardware	$7,759,509	$5,703,223
Saws	1,137,787	1,471,384
All other tools	8,167,517	10,430,434
Total	17,064,813	17,610,041

In 1912 we imported $1,992 worth of hammers; files, $62,094; nippers, $67,410; saws, $37,040, against an export of $17,610,041.

	1911	1912
Car wheels	$367,453	$327,285
Castings	3,213,737	2,964,471
Cutlery	1,083,891	1,162,203
Firearms	2,916,217	3,358,419

Machinery, machines and parts.

	1911	1912
Adding machines	$845,802	$928,878
Brewers' machinery	175,461	321,955
Cash registers	3,224,886	3,585,192
Electrical machinery	8,024,628	8,444,863
Metal-working machinery	9,626,965	12,151,819
Laundry machinery	1,233,613	1,132,782
Mining machinery	7,017,486	6,869,591
Printing presses	2,854,210	3,050,372
Pumps and pumping machinery	3,562,438	4,031,933
Ice-making machinery	616,187	830,678
Sewing machines	9,039,840	9,947,312
Shoe machinery	1,633,670	1,911,824
Steam engines, locomotives	3,953,648	3,298,182
Stationary engines	4,042,793	750,581
Traction engines	3,627,837	906,882
All other engines	4,424,303	4,256,371
Sugar mills	2,590,739	1,782,504
Electric locomotives	.....	88,902
Stationary gas engines	.....	393,683
Gasoline engines	.....	9,014,665
Typewriters	9,778,498	11,423,691
Wind mills	1,929,991	1,876,164
Woodworking machinery	1,827,963	2,368,578
All other machinery	24,497,774	25,913,213
Total machinery	104,528,732	115,406,132

In 1912 our imports of machinery were:

Cash registers, at 30 per cent	$4,836
Embroidery and lace machines, at 45 per cent	494,720
Other embroidery machines, free	125,016
Linen-making machines, free	11,628
Jute machinery, at 30 per cent	51,514
Machine tools, at 30 per cent	154,786
Printing presses, at 30 per cent	31,399
Sewing machines, at 30 per cent	70,146
Steam engines, at 30 per cent	183,539
Typesetting and linotype machines, at 30 per cent	148
Typewriters, at 30 per cent	401
All other machinery, at 45 per cent	6,025,149

Thus we have a total import of machinery having a value of $7,129,977, against an export of $115,406,132. In other words, our exports are 16 times our imports and, as will be seen from the comparative table following this, many of these items of machinery have been very properly placed on the free list in the Underwood bill.

Nails and spikes.

	1911	1912
Cut	$434,788	$472,217
Wire	2,363,671	2,865,980
All other	737,131	811,751

All these have been carrying a duty of about 15 per cent, but in the present bill are carried to the free list.

	1911	1912
Pipes and fittings	$10,735,167	$13,063,737
Radiators	268,654	306,885
Safes	496,437	481,531
Scales and balances	1,061,388	1,074,630
Stoves and ranges	1,582,387	1,862,732
All other manufactures	22,962,480	24,506,663
Grand total of all iron and steel manufactures exported	230,725,352	268,154,262
To which add agricultural machinery	35,973,398	35,640,005
Our entire imports were	34,205,968	26,551,040

Our imports are a mere bagatelle compared with the immense value of our exports, and justify every reduction shown in the following comparative table:

Comparison of the Dingley and Payne laws with the Underwood bill on iron and steel.

	Dingley.	Payne.	Underwood.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
Iron ore	17.84	5.72	Free.
Pig iron	27.95	16.87	8
Spiegeleisen	16.72	12.44	8
Both together	23.36	15.64	8
Wrought and scrap iron	28.94	8.72	8
Ferromanganese	12.28	6.97	15
Chrome metals	20	20.26	15
Ferrosilicon	8.17	19.59	15
All other pigs	23.29	16.44	15
Slabs, blooms, etc.	15.62	23.66	8
Muck bars	.....	14.74	8
Bar iron	14.80	10.64	8
Bars or shapes of rolled or hammered iron	11.93	11.20	8
Round iron	20.47	15.67	8
Square iron	16.42	10.39	8
Charcoal bars	32.89	20.76	8
Beams, girders, etc.	32.78	31.72	12

Comparison of the Dingley and Payne laws with the Underwood bill on iron and steel—Continued.

	Dingley.	Payne.	Underwood.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
All building shapes	32.78	32.75	12
Boiler plate	43.11	42.99	15
Sheets	40.52	28.53	15
Sheets, cold rolled	40.67	33.36	20
Crucible plate steel	.....	.....	15
Circular saw plates	27.89	23.08	15
Anchors	38.18	27.47	15
Forgings	35	30.47	15
Antifriction balls	36.04	42.21	35
Hoop iron	30.35	25.01	12
Barrel hoops	.....	29	Free.
Cotton bands	.....	.....	Free.
Bands, cut to lengths for hay, etc.	60.32	36.26	Free.
Railway bars	34.73	17.40	Free.
Railway fishplates	35.52	21.23	10
Galvanized plates, sheets, or strips	23.48	34.37	20
Galvanized hoop, band or scroll	28.95	38.36	20
Layered sheets	34.33	33.70	20
Pickled sheets or plates	37.06	24.98	20
Bands or sheets, cold rolled	.....	35.84	20
Plates or sheets, hammered	57.58	30.24	20
Tin and terne plate	53.12	43.20	20
Steel ingots, blooms, or slabs	20.37	21.77	10
Mill shafting	20.37	21.77	10
Other sheets and plates	22.67	20.86	15
Steel wool	.....	40.00	20
Grit, shot, and sand	.....	75.01	30
Iron and steel wire rods	20.51	14	10
Round wire of iron or steel	42.31	38.43	20
Iron bars, cold rolled	17.41	14.96	10
Wire covered with cotton, silk, etc.	44.99	35.42	20
Wire tempered cold	50.56	36.92	20
Barbed wire	.....	7.77	Free.
Wire coated	16.84	37.92	20
Heddles of wire	.....	85	20
Manufactures of wire	46.11	43.81	20
Telegraph and telephone wire	40	40	20
Wire rope	50.64	46.10	30
Anvils	30.33	30.88	15
Galvanized wire for fencing	.....	.....	Free.
Wire for baling hay	.....	.....	Free.
Automobiles, finished	45	45	45
Automobile chasses	.....	.....	30
Bicycles	45	45	25
Motor cycles	45	45	40
Axles	20.83	15.30	10
Tools	19.05	17.66	10
Bolts, nuts, etc.	23.73	19.21	15
Spiral nut, locks, and washers	.....	.....	35
Card clothing	64.09	60.06	40
Cast-iron pipe	18.52	18.10	12
Cast-iron andirons, etc.	15.42	10.87	10
Castings of iron	.....	26.16	10
Castings of malleable iron	18.67	13.76	10
Cast hollow ware, coated or otherwise	35.71	20.01	10
Chain	46.93	48.85	20
Tubes, pipes, flues, or stays	34.81	29.97	20
Furnaces	36.01	44.98	20
Pen knives, pruning knives, etc.	79.50	76.51	35 to 55
Razors	54.54	71.34	35 to 55
Scissors and shears	52.53	52.10	30
Sword blades	34.98	46.35	30
Table knives, etc., without handles	50.20	43.26	25
Table knives, etc., with handles	50.20	43.26	30
Files	67.93	68.06	25
Muskets, shotguns, and rifles	25	25	15
Breech-loading guns	51.01	46.53	35
Table utensils, enameled or glazed	40	40	25
Needles	34.71	41.93	25
Fishhooks, rods, reels and baits	45	45	30
Engraved plates, electrotype, etc.	25	20.60	15
Lithographic plates of stone	.....	.....	25
Rivets, studs, and steel points	27.58	39.95	20
Cross-cut saws, mill saws, etc.	25	20	12
Band saws	30	25	12
Screws	63.01	54.76	25
Umbrella ribs	50	50	35
Wheels for railways	55.85	48.80	25
Aluminum scrap	33.36	47.56	25
Antimony	11.05	22.61	10
German silver	25	25	15
Bronze powder	41.36	39.95	25
Copper plates	11.28	9.68	5
Sheathing copper	14.74	10.97	5
Gold leaf	38.71	39.61	35
Silver leaf	126.83	94.50	30
Tinsel wire	12.41	10.28	10
Bullions and metal thread	.....	.....	30
Manufactures of tinsel ware	.....	.....	40
Hooks and eyes	46.85	36.94	15
Lead-bearing ore	88.18	63.12	(1)
Lead sheets, pigs, or bars	58.99	46.88	25
Gas mantles	36.75	40	25
Crude metallic minerals	.....	.....	10
Nickel	17.20	15.41	10
Pens, metallic	49.50	49.19	(2)
Pens, with nib and barrel in one piece	.....	.....	(3)
Penholder tips	25	23.85	25
Gold pens	25	25	25
Fountain pens	30	30	25
Pins	38	35	20

[1] One-half cent per pound. [2] Eight cents gross. [3] Twelve cents gross.

Comparison of the Dingley and Payne laws with the Underwood bill on iron and steel—Continued.

	Dingley.	Payne.	Underwood.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
Quicksilver	13.07	12.95	10
Type metal	42.90	36.40	15
New type	25	25	15
Watch movements	53.36	53.51	30
Jewels for watches and clocks			10
Enameled dials			30
Zinc in blocks	29.15	32.44	10
Zinc in sheets	28.08	25.45	10
Zinc ore		36.37	10
Bottle caps	49.70	50.24	30
Decorated bottle caps			40
Steam engines and locomotives	28.93	29.96	15
Printing presses and machine tools	45	30	15
Embroidery machines	45	45	25
Nippers and pliers	58.04	59.74	30
Other machinery	45	45	25
Carriages	45	45	25
Aeroplanes	45	45	25
Jute machinery	30	30	25
All other iron	44.95	45	25
Hoop iron cut to lengths	36.09	15.96	Free.
Barbed wire and all other fence wire		7.77	Free.
Cut nails	17.74	17.76	Free.
Horseshoe nails	12.88	12.03	Free.
Wire nails	6.64	17.70	Free.
Spikes	16.64	25.87	Free.
Nuts and washers	21.02	4.34	Free.
Horse and mule shoes	17.91	4.72	Free.
Cut tacks and brads	14.68	14.68	Free.
Tungsten ores		10	Free.
Cash registers	45	30	Free.
Linotype machines	45	30	Free.
Typesetting machines	45	30	Free.
Sewing machines	45	30	Free.
Typewriters	45	30	Free.
Tar and oil spreading machines		Free.	Free.
Bauxite	29.10	21.69	Free.
Shoe machinery	45	45	Free.
Shotgun barrels	Free.	Free.	Free.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that Mr. Schwab could not have had the making of pumps and pumping machinery under consideration when he stated, as is alleged by the gentleman from Georgia, that we could make these articles and sell them against foreign competition without the tariff. The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee indicated that the cost of materials is about the same in foreign countries as it is here. The cost in the making of pumps in this country is in the labor, that amounts to 77 per cent of the cost of the product as against one-half of that in foreign countries. We have an industry of this kind in the city of Scranton, and I know that to-day it is in financial distress, and if the tariff is lowered it will greatly lessen the chance to reorganize the works and give their workmen an opportunity to earn their livelihood.

I simply want to quote the deadly parallel as regards the wages of the two countries. I will not do that in detail now, except to say that where men in Germany, France, England, and Belgium get $8 or $9, our men, for similar work, get twice and sometimes two and a half times.

All over this country we see along railway lines—notwithstanding the feeling shown on the majority side against manufacturers—great signs asking manufacturers to locate in towns, sites free. I know in Scranton our anxiety is to have more manufactories, and particularly those industries employing male help. All through this Schedule C, my friends, you are displacing male workers. Reference yesterday was made to the clause covering tires for wheels for railways, which will displace male workmen.

And so will this section, with respect to ironworkers, displace large numbers of male help in many of the States of this Union. In many cities in those States are industries making pumps and pumping machinery; and where we have been able to sell abroad it has been largely due to some specialized machine whose merits for particular purposes create a demand.

Now, we talk a great deal here about human welfare, and about our interest in the welfare of women, and shorter hours of work for the women, and better conditions for them, and against child labor. I agree fully on these propositions, and no country is doing quite so much for its women and children as this country is doing. But here you propose to legislate out of existence industries that employ male labor. I ask the gentlemen on that side this question: With the men out of work, what are we going to do for the women and children? [Applause on the Republican side.]

I now ask your attention to this detailed statement of wages paid in pump works in this country and foreign countries:

Comparative statement of wages per week.

	Laidlaw, Cincinnati, Ohio.		Snow, Buffalo, N. Y.		Worthington, Harrison, N. J.		Blake, East Cambridge, Mass.	
	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.
Fitters (bench department)	$16.50	$18.00	$15.40	$20.62	$10.80	$17.28	$13.75	$20.90
Turners	15.00	18.00	13.75	20.62	10.80	19.98	13.75	23.65
Pattern makers (wood)	17.70	21.90	16.50	23.37	15.10	27.00	16.50	22.55
Blacksmiths	17.10	21.00	18.25	22.00	20.25	25.12	16.50	24.20
Laborers	9.60	14.40	9.07	10.45	9.10	10.80	9.35	9.35

	England and Wales.[1] [2]		Germany.[3]		France.[4]		Belgium.[5]	
	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.
Fitters (bench department)	$8.00	$9.00	$6.50	$8.00	$6.00	$7.20	$4.93	$5.70
Turners	8.00	9.00	6.75	8.25	6.00	7.62	5.12	6.08
Pattern makers (wood)	8.50	9.50	6.37	7.50	6.37	7.43	4.89	6.00
Blacksmiths	8.00	9.00	7.12	8.25	6.29	7.93	5.02	6.12
Laborers	4.50	5.50	4.50	5.50	3.89	4.79	3.22	4.06

[1] British Board of Trade Report Cd. 5609, 1911.
[2] The wages in England in February, 1909, were about 1½ per cent higher than in 1905.
[3] British Board of Trade Report Cd. 4032, 1910.
[4] British Board of Trade Report Cd. 4512, 1909.
[5] British Board of Trade Report Cd. 5055, 1910.

I shall include in my remarks the following communication:

HAZLETON, PA., *April 2, 1913.*

Hon. J. R. FARR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We understand that the tariff will be the principal business taken up at the present session of Congress, and as manufacturers of machinery here in Pennsylvania we are very much concerned regarding any reduction in the present tariff on machinery such as we manufacture, which at the present time carries a duty of 45 per cent, and is under the basket or omnibus clause of Schedule C, "Metals and manufactures of." In the tariff bill passed by the House and Senate last year the duty on steam pumps and other machinery such as we manufacture was reduced from 45 to 25 per cent. This bill was vetoed by the President, and we are fearful that the new tariff bill proposed will carry the same reduction.

At the hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on the 14th of last January Mr. Walter Laidlaw, a representative of our company, appeared and presented data and endeavored by his testimony to show the Ways and Means Committee that no reduction in the duty on machinery such as we manufacture should be made. By consulting his testimony, which can be found in "Tariff schedule 8½, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, on Schedule C, metals and manufactures of," January 14, 1913, you will find that Mr. Laidlaw presented exemples showing that on machinery such as we manufacture the percentage of labor to shop cost is as high as 77 per cent, and that the duty in some cases should be as much as 62 per cent, and that it is necessary to maintain the present duty on machinery such as we manufacture in order that we may keep the wages of our workmen up to the present high standard and that the standard of living of the American workmen will not be reduced.

We find from our own investigation, and from reference to official Government reports, that European manufacturers of machinery similar to that manufactured by our company pay at the most one-half the rate of wages that we pay to the same class of workmen here in Pennsylvania, and in several of the European countries less than one-half of our wage rate, notwithstanding the fact that in some of the European countries, particularly in Germany, the efficiency of the workman is fully as high as that of the workman in this country. Prices of material in Europe and material in this country are practically the same, so that the only protection we need is for the benefit of the American workmen.

A reduction in the tariff will enable the European manufacturer to take the business in our home markets, and in order to protect our investment we would then be obliged to reduce the wages of our workmen so that we can hold the business in this country.

Therefore, as manufacturers of machinery from the State of Pennsylvania our purpose in writing to you is to endeavor to enlist your support in preventing any reduction in the tariff on machinery such as we manufacture, so that the wages of our workmen will not be reduced and that the standard of living of our American workmen will be maintained.

Thanking you in advance for your assistance in connection with this matter, we remain,

Yours, very truly,

THE JEANESVILLE IRON WORKS CO.,
A. B. JENNINGS,
Vice President and General Manager.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention again to the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] last evening in behalf of an industry in his district. I stand alike for all the industries of Massachusetts, and therefore I wish to ask the adoption of the amend-

ment which he offered in behalf of jewelry employees, whom you will recognize, from the petitions he presented and the introductory remarks he made, as good and regular members of the Democratic Party. I particularly want to urge the adoption of that amendment because it is directly along the line affecting the particular industry of which I wish to speak, and for which I offered an amendment yesterday afternoon.

Now, we have heard a good deal said here by the distinguished leader on the opposite side of the aisle in reference to "special interests." I do stand for just such a special interest as I referred to here yesterday, namely, the workingman. At this time I particularly speak in behalf of the workingmen in the wire mills of my district who have asked me to urge a continuance of the present tariff rates affecting their industry. This same purpose will be accomplished if you adopt the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. GREENE], increasing the rate in the basket clause from 25 per cent to 45 per cent.

Now, that kind of a "special interest" is one which it seems should not be advocated by a Representative in Congress, if I correctly understand the attitude taken by the gentlemen on the other side. We tried to get an explanation last evening through the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] as to just what "special interests" are. But I consider a proper special interest in my district to be especially the employees in that district. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, just another word, my friends. I realize that I am a new Member of this body, and I do not wish to intrude either personally or officially on our friends on the other side, who are in the great majority over there and who are against us here, but I do stand for the workingmen in my district, and I think when I put a clean-cut proposition to the leader of the committee who was in charge of this matter yesterday, I should have received at least the courtesy of a reply as to why the duty on Fourdrinier wire or bronze wire cloth was reduced from 45 per cent to 25 per cent. There was no kind of a reply vouchsafed in any shape or manner. I do ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] extend at least that courtesy to me, not personally but as representing an industry in my district, as to why that change was made. And in that connection I want to say that I stand here for the preservation of that industry as well as other local and general industries.

In reply to the gentleman whom he designated as coming "from Philadelphia," which is an honor in itself, although it would be a still greater honor if he were designated as coming from the State of Pennsylvania, he answered last evening in these words—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 731:

> Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I will say in answer to that that if the gentleman from Philadelphia could say that he was here trying to save an industry from destruction there might be some logic in his position.

That is exactly the logic for which I stand here to-day.

I am trying to the best of my ability as a representative of that industry to save it from destruction, and we want to save it from destruction for the benefit of the employees in that line of industry. If the votes on this side will do it, and will save, likewise, from destruction the industries represented by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] and the rest of the industries of Massachusetts, then I know these industries will be saved. That is the logic of the situation in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], and that is the logic of our attitude toward all our industries. [Applause.]

The words of the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore last year, and the further explanation by the Democratic candidate, now President, made in a speech at Pittsburgh on October 18 last, although they have already appeared in a speech by a Republican Member during this debate, are especially appropriate at this time as directly bearing upon my argument.

The platform says:

> We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

Mr. Wilson said:

> I welcome the opportunity of stating what I believe to be the well-considered position of the Democratic Party with regard to the tariff. It is absolutely essential that we should be entirely frank with one another in the discussion of this fundamental question. The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade. We favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

I respectfully ask, How do these statements made before the election harmonize with the conditions to-day, six months after election, in this very industry, as evidenced by the testimony of the wire weavers of Massachusetts? I submit similar evidence is available from the workingmen in many other industries, not only in Massachusetts but throughout the United States.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, this is the basket clause of the metal schedule and carries a rate of 25 per cent. In the Underwood bill of last year the basket clause carried in it shoe machinery, made almost exclusively by the United Shoe Machinery Co. When the bill was up for consideration last year I made some inquiries of the gentleman from Alabama as to why shoe machinery, the product of a trust, was put into this basket clause and carried a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem, and at that time the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] gave an explanation of why this shoe machinery carried that duty of 25 per cent, and this was the explanation. He said:

> Now, as to not putting this machinery on the free list, the reason it was not put on the free list was because it would have been of no avail. It is a patented article; it is a monopoly by reason of the patent rights. It can only be made where the owners of the patent desire it to be made. A tariff will not protect it, because the patent protects it. A reduction of the tariff would not have helped anybody, because the patent protects the owners of the article, so that it would simply have been a matter of absurdity to take that article out of the basket clause, where it happens to fall, because it is not fixed in the bill, and place it on the free list, and then gone to the country and said we had done something. That would be merely fooling the country, and we did not want to do that.

That is what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said about shoe machinery being put upon the free list last year, that if they did it they would be merely fooling the country. I am sorry the gentleman is not in the room, because I would like to ask him whether in putting this machinery upon the free list now they are fooling the country, as they said they would be doing if they had done a year ago what they have now done in this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] last night stated with dramatic gesture and still more dramatic effect that his colleague, Mr. MOORE, had been guilty of such conduct in proposing protective duties on some of the articles mentioned in this schedule that he blushed for shame for the people of his State. If there is any occasion for anyone in the State of Pennsylvania blushing for shame with reference to the conduct of any of her Representatives—and I say it not in any invidious sense, but merely by way of comparison—if there is any occasion for any blushes here, it is because a Representative of the State of Pennsylvania, in making up this schedule, has so prepared it that it will drive out the small manufacturer or put him entirely at the mercy of the trusts.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. If under American policy, as we understand it, as it is taught in the common schools of the land and as it is authorized by law, it is proper for a man to engage in an industrial enterprise, in the construction of a building or a mill, would not the gentleman "blush for shame" if a lawmaker in Congress should undertake by an act of Congress to drive that man out of business without any consideration whatever?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for just one more question? I have been bowled out of time this morning, and on behalf of one of my constituents who employs a large number of people I should like, in the gentleman's time, to introduce a letter showing the effect on labor of the policy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. May I introduce the letter in the gentleman's time?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman may.

The letter referred to is as follows:

R. H. HOOD CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 30, 1913.

The Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: I desire most earnestly to protest against the tariff bill now before Congress. If it should pass, it will ruin my business and throw my men out of employment. If this is not the result, my men will have to consent to work at a greatly reduced rate of wages.

The proposed bill reduces the tariff on manufactures of metal from 45 to 25 per cent. While the tariff may have been too high on some commodities, it certainly never was too high on machinery.

I make fine comb circles for machine wool combs, also faller comb bars, which work in connection with the same machinery. These are all fine machine parts, involving a great deal of skill and a high labor cost. I submitted a small sample of our work to the Ways and Means Committee and filed a brief.

I think it is a shame that men in my business, whose mechanics are far superior in skill than, say, the building trades mechanics, do not receive anywhere as large wages. No builder in this country, were he subject to foreign competition, could maintain such a standard of wages unless he had a tariff of over 100 per cent.

Even postmen in America receive three times the wages that the same men do in England; yet our Congress wants to reduce men employed in the machinery trades away below the wages of the postman or hod carrier.

Everyone knows who knows anything about Europe that mechanics are cheap there. I have English and Italian mechanics in my employ who acknowledge that they receive wages here from two to three times as much as what they received in the old countries. Yet the proposed

bill is giving us only 25 per cent to compensate for this vast difference in wages.

However slow Europe may be on other lines they are not slow in the manufacture of machinery. They make good machinery, and make it very cheaply, and 25 per cent will not even make competition, but it will surrender our market to them.

If it were possible for us to make machinery in competition with Europe on this 25 per cent basis, no one would be more delighted than I to do so; but it is a physical impossibility, unless, as I have said before, there occurs a sweeping reduction in the price of labor.

On going over the various schedules of the proposed tariff I find on certain goods a tariff of 40 per cent. These goods do not have anywhere near as large a labor cost as the goods which we manufacture. I will instance one class of goods as an illustration. The one I have reference to is card clothing, which cards the wool on the machine, while the goods which I manufacture combs the wool after it is carded preparatory to spinning it into worsted yarns. I am prepared to prove to anyone that the labor cost on the goods that I make is greatly in excess of the labor cost on card clothing. Yet in the old tariff they had 65 per cent, while we had 45 per cent, and a discrimination equally as gross is proposed in the new.

Trusting you will use your influence in an endeavor to defeat this bill, I remain,

Ever truly, one of your constituents,

R. H. HOOD.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the manufacturers of brads, of tacks, of cut nails, of wire nails, of barbed wire, or galvanized fence wire find, when they come to purchase the materials they must use in their factories, that a tariff has been put upon them and that the Steel Trust holds control over those substances.

When they come to sell their products, after they have taken them into their factories and put the work of American laborers upon them, they find they must market them in a market which is entirely unprotected, for all of those articles are put upon the free list. And why are these articles upon the free list? Is there any scientific reason that can be given therefor? No. No matter what you say about how this tariff schedule ought to be prepared, nobody would claim anything of the kind. It is simply economic blundering. They are put there solely for political effect. As the gentleman from Wisconsin has intimated with reference to some other items, they were put there for the purpose of fooling the farmer and the producer, and that is the reason why this schedule is made up in this manner. And yet they will not fool the farmer nor will they fool the producer; they will find simply that the small manufacturer will be compelled to go out of business and that the trust is enabled to keep up its prices. The consumer will gain nothing by having these articles put upon the free list. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania said something about platforms. Neither the gentleman from Pennsylvania nor any of his party is in a position to talk about platforms in connection with this tariff schedule. Why, the Democratic platform declares a protective tariff to be unconstitutional. Will the gentleman think when he comes to vote for a protective tariff upon wool and hair of the Angora goat, and cloth made from it, that it is in accordance with his platform? Does the gentleman think, when he puts a tariff on raw material and makes the finished product free of duty, that it is in accordance with his platform? Does he think, when he puts a duty upon the partly finished product that must be used in a certain line of manufacture and takes it off or makes it lower upon the completed product, that that is in accordance with the provisions of the platform that say they intend to injure no legitimate industry? If that is so, what are legitimate industries? I leave it for the gentlemen to answer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has taken unnecessary pains in his expression of the thought that I, as a Pennsylvanian, should blush for shame for anything that has been done in this steel and iron schedule. I want to say to him that I have been as deeply in the fight for tariff reform in Pennsylvania during the last four years as has any man in that State. I think I know the feeling of our people in the great industrial State of Pennsylvania upon this tariff question, and I assert it as my deliberate judgment that there is no State in the Union where the demand for a reduction in the burdens of tariff taxation is greater or louder to-day than in our State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is evidenced by the fact that in the year 1912 no political party in our State had the nerve to write into its platform a demand for a continuance of the high protective rates. Every political party which wrote a platform in our State that year contained a demand for a reduction of the Payne rates and a demand for the lightening of the burden of tariff taxation. I come from one of the great industrial districts of the country. We have some of the largest industrial plants in the United States within that district. We have the greatest cement mill in the world, the great Atlas Portland Cement Mill, at Northampton, which took the enormous contract for nearly 5,000,000 barrels of cement for the Panama Canal. We have the Bethlehem Steel Works, employing nearly 15,000 men. We have 90 per cent of the slate mined, manufactured, and produced in the United States. All of these things have been highly protected in the Payne law as in previous laws. We have gone into that district with the fight for lower tariff taxes. This tariff question has been the issue in many a hard-fought battle, waged from corner to corner of that district, and upon that issue the present Representative has been returned by such majorities as conclusively prove that our people believe in a reduction of these tariff taxes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes seemed to have it.

Upon a division (demanded by Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 54, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE D—WOOD AND MANUFACTURES OF.

170. Briar root or briar wood, ivy or laurel root, and similar wood unmanufactured, or not further advanced than cut into blocks suitable for the articles into which they are intended to be converted, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill where briar root or briar wood or laurel root are obtained in the United States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My information is that this wood is almost entirely, if not entirely, grown in foreign countries. I can give the gentleman the information as far as I have it:

Briar root or briar wood is the root of white heath, which often grows to large size. The roots are gathered extensively in the south of France and in Corsica for the purpose of being made into tobacco pipes commonly called briar-wood pipes.

Mr. MOORE. That is the foreign wood. But I was asking where it is obtained in the United States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is imported.

Mr. MOORE. There is none in the United States?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. None of which I know.

Mr. MOORE. I have been advised that in North Carolina they undertake to develop brierwood.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman's information is entirely incorrect. I never heard of it.

Mr. MOORE. You think my information is entirely incorrect?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman will find it in his hearings of four years ago.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I was reading from the notes on the Payne bill, to give the gentleman the information. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. That was before we had the hearings. When we had hearings we paid attention to them. That was made up a year before the hearings.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman ought not to deny his own authority.

Mr. PAYNE. You will catch up in five years.

Mr. MOORE. What I want to say in connection with this question of duty on brierwood is this: It is in the interest of brierwood raisers in North Carolina, and I am glad of it. Ten per cent is imposed; and in addition, unmanufactured amber and amberoid, which enter into the manufacture of pipes, are taken from the free list and put on the dutiable list, the apparent purpose being to raise revenue. I would say that most of the users of the pipes made from brier root and brierwood are of the poorer classes. Many of them are from the South, and some of them being Congressmen, smoke their brierwood pipes here in Washington with a great deal of pleasure. Hereafter, instead of obtaining the pipes as cheaply as before, the users of the pipes in the United States will pay the duty, and the price to the consumer, who likes to smoke his old-fashioned pipe, will not be reduced. In other words, in this particular instance the committee has raised the price to the consumer rather than to reduce the cost.

The Clerk read as follows:

171. Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all forms of sawed cedar, lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods not further manufactured than sawed, 10 per cent ad valorem; veneers of wood, 15 per cent ad valorem; and wood unmanufactured, not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 3, strike out the word "other."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 7, after the words "ad valorem," insert the words, "shingles, 50 cents per thousand."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the present duty upon shingles—shingles being on the free list in this bill.

There are about 440 shingle mills in the State of Washington that cut shingles alone. A large number of shingles are also cut in the mills that cut lumber as well. The 440 straight mills are mostly small and mostly situated in the country. The shingle mills in the State of Washington employ about 15,000 men and pay them about $15,000,000 annually in wages. These men are all white and nearly all American citizens.

Their direct competitors, separated from them only by an imaginary line, are the orientals working in the shingle mills of British Columbia. More than 75 per cent of the labor employed in the shingle mills of British Columbia are Hindus, Chinese, and Japanese. This oriental labor works for far less than the white labor of Washington. They live differently from the white labor of Washington.

Yesterday I received an affidavit, which I hold in my hand, from a man who has recently inspected 16 shingle mills in British Columbia. These mills are typical of all the mills in this Province. This affidavit shows that 75 per cent of the men employed in those mills are Chinese and 5 per cent are Hindus; or, in other words, 80 per cent of the labor working in the shingle mills of British Columbia is oriental.

Here are the latest figures that I have been able to obtain showing the difference in wages in British Columbia and my State:

	Cents.
Sawing, per 1,000, in British Columbia	12
Sawing, per 1,000, in Washington	19
Packing, per 1,000, in British Columbia	7
Packing, per 1,000, in Washington	10

A common laborer in British Columbia receives $1.50 a day.
A common laborer in Washington receives $2.50 to $3.25 a day.
Filers in British Columbia, $6 per day.
Filers in Washington, $9 per day.
Price of logs in British Columbia, $8 to $9 per 1,000.
Price of logs in Washington, $11 to $14 per 1,000.

Owing to the character of the timber, it also costs more to work it than it does the timber of British Columbia. Mr. J. H. Bloedel, who is one of the foremost millmen of the State of Washington and who owns shingle mills both in British Columbia and the State of Washington, has testified that the labor cost in British Columbia is 25 cents a thousand. In the State of Washington it is 55 cents a thousand.

Is it expected that American labor shall compete with this oriental labor, or shall the shingle mills of Washington close? One result or the other is inevitable.

In the State of Washington the shingle mill is largely the scavenger of the forest. It cuts what the sawmills leave. It takes the stumps and pieces of logs generally charred and blackened by fire. In British Columbia the oriental labor cuts mostly clean and green timber. Not only does the shingle mill in the State of Washington give employment to labor at high and living wages but it also conserves our forests by largely cutting timber stumps, tops, and parts of logs that would otherwise rot or be burned clearing the land.

In order that the House may understand more fully the character of the labor in British Columbia that the Democratic Party proposes that American labor should directly compete with, I will show a few pictures taken at the mills in British Columbia.

Here are the photographs of British Columbia mills taken only a few days ago. [Exhibiting pictures.] In this photograph you see the Chinaman and in this one you see the Hindu. I ask the Democratic majority, Do you intend to bring American labor in the State of Washington into direct competition with this oriental labor, with the Hindus and the Chinese? And that is precisely what this bill will do if you pass it. If you pass this bill and compel American labor in the State of Washington to compete with oriental labor just across the national border, then I hope no gentleman on the Democratic side will again attempt to mislead the House and the country by making speeches against oriental labor, as has recently been done by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

The Democratic Party is welcome to any glory that it can obtain by bringing American labor into contact with this oriental labor. And what reply has the Democratic Party made to the American laborer working in the shingle mills in the State of Washington? What consolation has been given him? The Democratic Party, speaking through President Wilson, tells the American workman in the State of Washington that he will have the high privilege of whetting his wits in competition with oriental labor.

The Democratic Party gives the American workingman in my State the privilege of whetting his wits until he can live as the Japanese live, until he can live on the pay that the Japanese receives. The Democratic Party gives him the privilege of whetting his wits until he can live as the heathen Hindu lives. The Democratic Party gives the American workingman the high privilege of whetting his wits until he can live as cheaply as the Chinaman lives. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There are 300,000 voters in my State that live directly upon wages earned in the forests that, by this competition with oriental labor will have their wits so sharpened that they will demonstrate at the next opportunity that they are not so stupid as to vote the Democratic ticket. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Admitting shingles free into the State of Washington will not lower the price to the consumer. In Canada they have a Shingle Trust. No attempt is made to conceal the fact. The Government does not attempt to prohibit it. They permit only so many machines to be run. Each community is allotted its number, and can not operate any more. This is avowedly done for the purpose of keeping up the prices. When we have free shingles, the prices will only be lowered sufficiently to get into our market. As soon as our mills close prices will be increased. The Canadian is selling his shingles in our country not for our advantage but for his own. We know by experience what they will do. We do not have to guess. At one time Canada sold to us 5,000 carloads in a single year; but the American consumer did not get his shingles for any less. Our mills were closing six months in the year, while the mills across the line were busy. The work and wages were simply transferred from Washington to British Columbia—from the American workman to the oriental. But the American consumer still paid the same price for his shingles.

The history of the shingle industry is the history of every industry in America that has been protected from the destruction of cheap foreign labor. Every time we buy a bale of shingles from British Columbia we take just that much work and that much labor from the Americans and give it to the foreigners.

The result of this bill will be to again largely transfer the shingle industry from the State of Washington to British Columbia. It will mean that $10,000,000 annually in work and wages will be taken from American labor in the State of Washington and given to the oriental labor across the line. It means that the Democratic Party will take the daily bread from 60,000 men, women, and children in the State of Washington, and in the name of free trade, low prices, and college statesmanship give it to the Hindu and the Chinaman and the Japanese.

They may give us cheap prices. They did once before. We had a "Prof. Wilson" then as we have a "Prof. Wilson" now that was the high priest of Democracy and the anointed prophet of free trade. Yes; prices were low—so low that you could get a good meal in many cities of the United States for 5 cents. That this bill may bring again those splendid days of Democratic cheapness I admit. There is no reason for placing shingles upon the free list but a sectional one and a political one. If it were a little peanut industry in the South, it would be protected as rice and peanuts are protected. If the shingle industry was located in Pennsylvania or Indiana or Minnesota or in any State that had a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee, it would have been protected. It is sacrificed for political purposes only, because it is a Pacific coast industry. This bill will destroy this industry as it will many others, but there is no hope of amending it, so let it be enacted quickly. Let the tragedy be perpetrated at once in order that the people may the more quickly have the experience and the more quickly determine, as they will, to wipe the sectional monstrosity from the statute books.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this schedule—I understand that gentlemen all want to talk about lumber—close in 35 minutes, and that 25 minutes of that time go to the other side.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER] wishes to talk on an amendment that he will offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to agree about the length of the debate on this schedule, but I do not want a prolonged debate.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not wish to cut off Members who desire to offer amendments to the lumber schedule?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; all gentlemen who desire to do so can offer amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The Asiatic, oriental proposition that is involved in admitting the lumber of British Columbia is the most important question now before the people of the United States. It overshadows the whole tariff bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am going to object to the limitation of time suggested by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I shall be very glad to see if we can make an arrangement with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if other gentlemen will keep quiet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the matter can be accommodated much more readily if gentlemen will be in order. All gentlemen will please be seated.

Mr. MANN. Now, let us see if we can come to an agreement. How many gentlemen on this side desire time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire time.

Mr. MANN. That will be 5 minutes.

Mr. POWERS. I desire time.

Mr. MANN. That will be 10 minutes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That makes 15.

Mr. FALCONER. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That makes 20.

Mr. FORDNEY. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That makes 25.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That makes 30.

Mr. MOORE. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That makes 35.

Mr. LANGLEY. I desire 5 minutes

Mr. MANN. That makes 40. On this side there are gentlemen who desire a total of 40 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Make it an hour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on Schedule D—the lumber schedule—conclude in 50 minutes—40 minutes to go to that side of the House and 10 minutes to this side of the House—and that all amendments may be pending and voted on at the conclusion of the debate.

Mr. MANN. Make it so that gentlemen may offer their amendments to be voted on when the paragraphs are read.

Mr. FORDNEY. You will have to dispose of a million dollars a minute. There is $40,000,000 involved in this.

Mr. GARNER. We can do that. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on Schedule D close in 50 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I understand there will be 50 minutes' debate. The 50 minutes does not include the reading of the paragraph or the offering of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. No; 50 minutes' debate—40 minutes to go to the minority side of the House and 10 minutes to the majority, the time to be controlled by the Chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Chair may make the recognitions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, 65 per cent of all the wooden shingles consumed in the United States are made in the State of Washington. One-fourth of all the men in British Columbia are orientals, and there are few oriental women. Nearly 80 per cent of all the workingmen in British Columbia are either Chinese, Japanese, or Hindu. The shingle industry in the State of Washington can not go against this competition. I desire to read to you a short telegraphic dispatch printed in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer under date of April 22, this year:

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA,
Monday, April 21, 1913.

Under the terms of the Anglo-Japanese treaty, recently ratified by the Canadian Government, and going into effect May 1, 1913, the Japanese have practically an open door to Canada.

Prominent Japanese recently in Vancouver are authority for the above statement. The McBride government has recently ratified the action of the Dominion Government.

The Anglo-Japanese treaty prohibits any action being taken by the provincial governments.

Now, then, in order that this may be thoroughly understood, I desire to make a few explanatory statements of the immigration laws of Canada.

First. Natives of India—that is, Hindus—are British subjects, and under the law of Great Britain and Canada have the right to enter the latter Provinces and work there, provided that they pass a medical examination and have sufficient money on their person at the time of entering the country to insure their not becoming a public charge until they have had reasonable time to find employment. The sum of $25 on his person is a passport for the Hindu into British Columbia.

Second. The Chinese are permitted to enter and work in British Columbia on payment of a head tax of $500 in each case and the passage of a medical examination.

Let me say here that I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] for the introduction into the RECORD of the paragraphs from President Wilson's books, showing the mechanical ability of the Chinese, and I propose to place in the RECORD, if my searchers now at work in the Congressional Library can find copies of the speeches made by the present Secretary of State, William J. Bryan, concerning the Japanese, at the time when he declared that imperialism was the paramount issue.

To revert to the head tax, and treat it from an economical standpoint, it costs $500 and traveling expenses to put a Chinese workman into a lumber job in British Columbia. That $500, borrowed at 6 per cent interest, amounts to a yearly cost of $30, or about 10 cents per working day. Therefore the present difference between the cost of obtaining Chinese labor and other labor in British Columbia is fundamentally 10 cents per day.

Third. Under a treaty between Great Britain and Japan, which goes into effect May 1, Japanese subjects have a right to freely enter British Columbia and to work therein in the shingle industry, the lumber industry, the lime industry, and nearly every other industry. Perhaps Vancouver, British Columbia, will become the shoe center of the United States.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman state how he accounts for the fact that 50,000 American farmers have crossed the line to Canada, seeking homes, if this horde of laborers is about to deluge Canada?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. These hordes have not crossed the divide yet; they are still west of the Cascades clearing timber, grubbing 2 feet to get to the ground before they can get to agriculture. This shingle bill will stop our people from clearing the land that they are going to live on.

Mr. KEATING. It will keep our people at home, will it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not yield any further. The gentleman and myself can talk it over when we reach the schedule of agriculture.

Vancouver, British Columbia, lies close to our territory, and if the old "fifty-four forty or fight" had prevailed, as our fathers hoped for, Vancouver should now be an American city, with, thank God, the Chinese barred and the Japanese restricted, while the Hindus could be run out of there just as we ran them out of Grays Harbor, my home.

Fourth. While Japanese may enter British Columbia freely, there is, however, what might be termed a gentleman's agreement between some of the officials of the Dominion of Canada and those of the Japanese Empire, by which Japanese immigration is limited as occasion requires. A similar policy prevails as to the Chinese.

The Chinese head tax is used as a sliding scale, letting Chinese coolies in when there are openings for them and excluding them by raising the head tax when there are no labor opportunities. In other words, the Dominion lets Chinese labor in or shuts them out just as it regulates the shipment of wood pulp into the United States. I have very little time in which to go into the dangers of Asiatic immigration across the boundaries of the State of Washington. Bubonic plague, riots, and all those troubles are with us. In the city of Bellingham, Wash., the white race recently lined up against the Asiatics. The papers are full of California's struggle against the Japanese. In passing I would like to say, "How would you like to have your little 6-year-old daughter sit in school beside a 25-year-old Japanese fresh from the manure pile?"

Mr. Chairman, I desire to reintroduce into the RECORD some remarks on the necessity for lumber and shingle duties made a few years ago by my illustrious and honored predecessor, Francis W. Cushman, who on this floor sacrificed his life as truly as any soldier on any battle field to the cause of the Constitution, the flag, and the state. [Applause.]

I will also introduce the timber laws of British Columbia, showing the terms by which that Province gives Crown grants, special leases, and how they print the United States tariff schedules on lumber in their Timberman's Guide for the benefit of their lumbermen. Oh, if we had only had a tariff commission to do as much for us. Then perhaps we new politicians

would not be obliged to dodge the name of Payne as if he were the ghost that pursued Tam O'Shanter.

I desire to introduce into the RECORD the text of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, and I commend to every member of the majority this book, The Valor of Ignorance, by Homer Lea.

I want to also introduce into the RECORD the protest of the Shingle Weavers' Union and statements against reduction on shingles and protests from many civic organizations with regard to the jeopardizing of our industries in the West by continuing the lax so-called gentleman's agreement between the high officials of the United States and those of Japan.

I want to prove to you by actual reports that British Columbia shingles, after paying a duty of 50 cents a thousand, sell in the New York market to-day at just exactly 10 cents higher than our shingles.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a district which has a thousand miles of shore line—enough to reach from Boston, Mass., to Charleston, S. C. I have an interest in that shore line. My district has two great forest reserves, two gigantic national parks; one-half of the district is conserved, and in the remaining territory there are about 60,000 Republican voters of all varieties, and I represent them. There are about 15,000 Democratic voters in all of that great district of 20,000 square miles, and I represent them, as well as 60,000 Republicans of various degrees. There are about 200 shingle mills in my district, and I represent them, although I have no interest in any one of them, and after this bill is passed I would not accept the whole 200 as a gift.

I can almost regret that in all the great Northwest not a single Democrat came to Congress to sit in that secret "caucus Congress" which framed this bill. A single Democrat from our great section could have told that caucus some startling things. But I need not worry, for your great Democrat, your peerless leader, W. J. Bryan, the Secretary of State, will come back from the Pacific in a few days with information that will startle the President of the United States, who wants to match wits with the world.

How can the sizzling solon from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] in the last month of the last session of Congress vote against a battleship program, and in the first month of this Congress cry out on the floor these words: "If we must have war or submit to this indignity, I am for war." How can he vote for this tariff bill in view of this statement?

And my far-sighted friend, the gentleman from Alabama, Capt. HOBSON, who knows all these facts, how can he vote for this bill? Will the income tax alone be enough to build the battleships that he knows we must have? [Applause.]

I will print as a part of my remarks the following:

To the CONGRESSMAN SECOND DISTRICT, WASHINGTON:

Twenty-five thousand organized workmen in State of Washington vigorously protest against reduction of tariff on lumber. We do not want our wages reduced.

CHAS. PERRY TAYLOR,
Secretary Washington Federation of Labor.

Also the following telegrams:

ROCKPORT MILL CO.,
Seattle, Wash., April 15, 1913.

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If you want to put the hundreds of little shingle mills, that give employment to thousands, out of business, then help take off the tariff on shingles.

It is absolutely a question of a living with us, and we should be protected and for at least 50 cents a thousand.

We use timber that would be a complete waste were it not for this industry.

Now, all we can do is to ask your help in our protection.

Yours, very truly,

ROCKPORT MILL CO.,
By GEO. C. LEMCKE, *President.*

ABERDEEN, WASH., *April 15, 1913.*

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, *Washington, D. C.:*

Realizing that any material reduction of the duty on shingles would throw vast quantities of British Columbia shingles, manufactured by cheap oriental labor, into competition with our shingles, and thus practically kill this industry in Washington, the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce earnestly request you to exert your utmost power in procuring the same provision in the new tariff law as is now in effect.

N. P. BRYAN.

HOQUIAM, WASH., *April 16, 1913.*

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

One thousand men living in Chehalis County, earning $4,000 per day, and $6,500,000 invested in cedar mills and timber, demand protection from cheap oriental timber and oriental labor. If you remove shingle tariff you kill American shingle business.

HOQUIAM COMMERCIAL CLUB.
W. L. ADAMS.
J. A. LEWIS.
THOS. HUTCHINSON.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 9, 1913.*

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, *Washington, D. C.:*

When we had a 30-cent duty on shingles British Columbia mills with oriental labor shipped 5,000 cars annually into United States. Western Washington mills now cut and ship 35,000 cars a year, supplying 65 per cent of shingles consumed in United States; most of these shingles are cut from low-grade cedar from stumps, broken and burned cedar, and windfalls by white labor. Much of the credit for the agricultural development of Washington is due to the small Washington shingle mills utilizing what would otherwise be an economical waste. Free shingles will give British Columbia mills our American markets and cause great suffering and loss to citizens of Washington. We should at least have a 30-cent duty, and we urge and expect your untiring efforts to that end.

PACIFIC COAST SHIPPERS' ASSOCIATION.

RAYMOND COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Raymond, Wash., April 18, 1913.

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As the tariff revision is to be undertaken by the present Congress, and as this section of the country depends upon the lumber industry almost entirely for its prosperity, we earnestly urge that the duty on lumber and shingles be at least maintained and if possible advanced.

We believe that by voting for the protective tariff on lumber and shingles that you will be carrying out the wishes of the majority of your constituents.

Very truly, yours,

RAYMOND COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Per W. W. HAYS, *Secretary.*

Mr. Chairman, I have hundreds of other protests, with which I will not burden the RECORD. I thank you.

STATEMENT NO. 1.

As an appendix to the book of Homer Lea, entitled "The Valor of Ignorance," will be found the Anglo-Japanese alliance, adopted at the time of Japan's war with Russia. A copy of the new Anglo-Japanese alliance, by which the Japanese receive additional favors in Canada, will soon be available for this record. In this connection read Homer Lea's The Day of the Saxon.

STATEMENT NO. 2.

I desire to take from the appendix of the book of Homer Lea, entitled "The Valor of Ignorance," the following statements concerning the first expression of the anti-Japanese sentiment in California, and I desire to add that an anti-Chinese sentiment has existed in the State of Washington since before the State was admitted to the Union in 1889 and prevailed to such an extent that Chinese were not allowed to remain among us:

The first expression of anti-Japanese sentiment did not occur until 1900, when a mass meeting was held in San Francisco.

In 1904, at the twenty-fourth annual session of the American Federation of Labor (2,500,000 members), resolutions were passed to permanently exclude the Japanese from the United States and its insular Territories. These resolutions were reaffirmed at the annual sessions in 1905 and 1906. During 1905, 12 great national conventions indorsed and adopted the same resolutions, as did 539 other organizations, comprising civic, fraternal, political, and labor associations.

* * * * * * *

In 1908 there was established in general convention the Asiatic Exclusion League of North America, the outgrowth of the Japanese-Korean Exclusion League of 1906. This league has branches in all of the Western States.

STATEMENT NO. 3.

Memorial of the First Convention of the Asiatic Exclusion League of North America in a regular session held in Seattle, Wash. They entered requests and protests as follows:

Request the immediate passage of a law which will exclude, absolutely and emphatically, all Asiatics from the mainland and insular possessions of the United States; and your memorialists do hereby emphatically

Protest against the administrative and executive officers of the United States entering into any agreement which will permit the ruler of any foreign country to make stipulations as to what class of persons, and in what numbers, shall leave said foreign country for the purpose of immigrating to the United States; and your memorialists

Declare that any such agreement with a foreign power is a subversion of the traditions and policies of the United States and a betrayal of the rights of American citizens. Your memorialists further

Protest against the employment of Asiatics on board vessels flying the American flag to the exclusion of American seamen and in violation of American law; therefore, your memorialists

Pray for the speedy enactment of a law which will prohibit the employment of Asiatics upon all vessels flying the American flag, or in any branch or department of the public service; your memorialists again emphatically

Protest against the continuance of Asiatic immigration upon the exalted grounds of American patriotism, for the reasons—

First. That these Asiatics come to the United States entirely ignorant of our sentiments of nativity and patriotism, and utterly unfit and incapable of discharging the duties of American citizenship.

Second. The introduction of this incongruous and nonassimilable element into our national life will inevitably impair and degrade, if not effectually destroy, our cherished institutions and our American life.

Third. These Asiatics are alien to our ideas of patriotism, morality, loyalty, and the highest conception of Christian civilization.

Fourth. Their presence here is a degrading and contaminating influence to the best phases of American life.

Fifth. With their low standard of living, immoral surroundings, and cheap labor, they constitute a formidable and fierce competition against our American system—the pride and glory of our civilization—and unless prohibited by effective legislation will result in the irreparable deterioration of American labor.

Sixth. The living in our midst of a large body of Asiatics, the greatest number of whom are armed, loyal to their Government, enter-

taining feelings of distrust, if not of hostility, to our people, without any allegiance to our Government or our institutions, not sustaining American life in times of peace, and ever ready to respond to the cause of their own nations in times of war, make these Asiatics an appalling menace to the American Republic, the splendid achievements wrought by the strong arms and loyal hearts of Caucasian toilers, patriots, and heroes in every walk of life.

I desire to quote Senator LODGE in commenting upon the anti-Japanese movement in a speech at Boston as saying:

Such a movement of people as this is in itself a historic event of great magnitude, deserving the most careful consideration; but what we are concerned with is its effect upon and its meaning to the people of the United States and the future of our country.

STATEMENT NO. 4.

I wish to present a statement prepared and presented to the House of Representatives by my lamented and honored predecessor, Francis W. Cushman, as to the position of our lumber industry in relation to Canada:

Look at that part of the chart that deals with shingles. In the year 1908 Canada sent into the United States 329 times as many shingles as we sent into Canada in the same year. And yet we boast that we believe in protecting home industries and home labor. Any American who has any red corpuscles left in him can not look at that chart and not blush. The American tariff on shingles ought to be raised from 30 cents to 60 cents a thousand, and then we would begin to manufacture our own shingles at home, and the price to the consumer would be little, if any, greater than it is now.

I will add another table of figures showing the shingles and lumber exported and imported between the United States and Canada during the past five years:

Shingles imported into the United States from Canada and exported from the United States to Canada.

	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908
Imported...	770,372,000	758,725,000	900,806,000	880,903,000	987,266,000
Exported...	7,069,000	6,867,000	8,905,000	2,013,000	2,955,000

Total imports shingles for 5 years from Canada..... 4,298,072,000
Total exports shingles for 5 years to Canada..... 27,809,000

Excess imports over exports..... 4,270,263,000

In 5 years 158 times as many.

Valuation of shingles imported and exported between the United States and Canada.

	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908
Imported...	$1,602,998	$1,581,421	$1,852,512	$1,939,791	$2,376,394
Exported...	14,186	13,212	16,377	4,265	8,873

Total value shingles imported 5 years from Canada..... $9,353,071
Total value shingles exported 5 years to Canada..... 56,913

Excess imports over exports..... 9,296,158

In five years value one hundred and sixty-four times as much.

Please note the steady increase in the quantities of the stuff that Canada is sending to us and the steady decrease of similar products we are sending to her. If that chart were a little wider and contained the record of a few more years, the United States would be clear off the commercial map.

STATEMENT NO. 5.

I also desire to present the following affidavit of Charles C. Hone, who was employed by the Pacific Coast Shippers' Association, of Seattle, Wash., and the Red Cedar Manufacturers' Association, also of Seattle, in which is set forth the relative number of Chinese, Hindus, and whites employed in the shingle mills of British Columbia which he investigated. I would like to direct particular attention to the wages paid Asiatic employees working in these shingle mills.

The statement of Fred A. Traill, treasurer and manager of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, sets forth the scale of wages of the white employees in the shingle mills of the State of Washington. This statement follows the statement of Mr. Hone.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

Charles C. Hone, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says:

That he was employed by the Pacific Coast Shippers' Association, of Seattle, Wash., and the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, of Seattle, Wash., to inspect shingle-manufacturing plants in western British Columbia, and to investigate and determine the capacity of said plants and the number and races of the employees of each of said plants.

That he personally inspected, from April 15, 1913, to April 18, 1913, inclusive, plants of the following concerns:

Robertson & Hackett, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Robert McNair Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Albert Cotton, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Thomas Kirkpatrick, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Imperial Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Joseph Chew Lumber & Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Lulu Shingle Co., Eburne, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Westminster Mill Co., New Westminster, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.

Royal City Lumber & Shingle Co., New Westminster, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.

Brunette Saw Mill Co., Sapperton, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.

Cascade Mills (Ltd.), Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.

Thurston Flavelle Lumber Co., Port Moody, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.

Port Moody Shingle Co., Port Moody, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.

New Ladysmith Lumber Co., Nanaimo, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.

Victoria Lumber & Manufacturing Co., Chemanius, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.

Victoria Shingle Co., Victoria, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.

As the result of my personal investigation and inspection I found that the number and races of the employees engaged in and about the plants of the above-named concerns were as follows:

	Chinese.	Hindus.	White.	Total.
Sawyers	58	.....	12	70
Packers	69	.....	.....	69
All other employees [1]	94	5	53	152
Total	221	5	65	291

[1] Covers bolt passers, cut-off men, block pilers, hand sawyers, clipper men, refuse movers, band nailers, car loaders, and common laborers.

From these figures the percentage of white employees compared with the percentage of oriental employees engaged is as follows: Asiatic employees, 80 per cent; white employees, 20 per cent.

On inquiry as to the wages paid Asiatic employees by the above-mentioned concerns, I have arrived at the following averages:

Shingle sawyers (Asiatic employees), 12 cents to 13 cents per thousand.

Shingle packers (Asiatic employees), 6 cents to 7½ cents per thousand.

All other (Asiatic employees), $1.40 to $1.70 per day.

CHAS. C. HONE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, Residing at Seattle.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

Fred A. Traill, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he is treasurer and manager of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, an organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington, composed of about 200 shingle manufacturers who manufacture about 65 per cent of the shingle output of the State of Washington.

That I am entirely familiar with the wages paid shingle sawyers (white employees), shingle packers (white employees), and all others (white employees) in the shingle manufacturing plants on the Puget Sound, State of Washington.

The following is the scale of wages:

Shingle sawyers (white employees), 16 cents to 19 cents per thousand.
Shingle packers (white employees), 9 cents to 10 cents per thousand.
Knee bolters (white employees), $3.50 to $4.50 per day.
Drag sawyers (white employees), $3.50 to $5 per day.
Common laborers (white employees), $2 to $2.50 per day.

F. A. TRAILL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, Residing at Seattle.

I am in possession of fully 1,000 letters and telegrams protesting against the destruction of the shingle industry, but as no opportunity has been given to present these in a hearing on the lumber schedule, and as no Democrat has voted otherwise than directed by his leaders, it seems useless to carry them in the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let me, in conclusion, add a condensation of the British Columbia timber laws and taxation rules. Notice the simplicity and the low price for leasing:

STATEMENT NO. 6.

All land in the Province of British Columbia not the subject of private ownership is subject to the disposal of the provincial authorities, save the lands in the railway belt. The railway belt is a strip of about 20 miles on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway as far west as Port Moody, the statutory terminus. The timber on provincial lands up to the present time has been disposed of either by Crown grant, lease, or license.

Crown grant or patent gives absolute ownership in fee simple to land and timber thereon, and on the timber taken from land covered by deeds issued prior to the 7th of April, 1887, there is a tax of from $1 to $4 per 1,000, which is refunded if the logs are manufactured into lumber in Canada. On all timber cut on deeded Crown-grant lands issued since the 7th of April, 1887, and prior to the 12th of March, 1906, there is a royalty of 50 cents per thousand and no tax. Both these classes are exportable.

On any timber cut from Crown lands or from Crown-granted lands deeded since the 12th of March, 1906, there is a royalty of 50 cents per thousand, but the logs are not exportable until manufactured.

Dominion leases give the holder the right of all the timber on the land held under lease until cut. The charges on the same are as follows: A ground rent of 5 cents per acre per year in advance and a stumpage or royalty of 50 cents per thousand when cut. There is a charge for fire dues, which is too small to take into consideration.

Prior to 1905 the provincial government, which controls all the timber of British Columbia outside of the Canadian Pacific Railway belt, issued leases covering timberlands, which gave the holder of such leases the right to all the timber on the lands covered by the lease for a period of 21 years, with a ground rent of 10 cents per acre per year and 50 cents per thousand stumpage when cut. These leases can be surrendered at any time and renewed for another 21 years under existing laws in force at time of surrendering.

The provincial government up to 1908 issued special provincial licenses for 21 years from date of issue, which gave the holder the right

to all the timber on the land for 21 years, at a ground rent of $140 per annum per section of 640 acres and 50 cents per thousand stumpage when cut.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the committee's attention to the fact that on page 46 cedar lumber is put on the protected list at 10 per cent ad valorem, and on page 128 cedar shingles are put on the free list. It costs twice as much in labor and other expenses to convert a thousand feet of cedar logs into shingles as it does to convert a thousand feet of logs into lumber. You have therefore put a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on lumber when imported into this country which sells at about $25 per thousand feet, or $2.50 a thousand feet protection, and you can not truthfully call it anything else, and you have put the product of that thousand feet of logs in shingles on the free list. Shingles are made out of many kinds of wood—cedar, redwood, cypress, pine, fir, and many other kinds of timber.

The gentleman will say that this is cabinet wood. You have made no distinction between Spanish cedar and British Columbia cedar, or any other cedar; so that cedar lumber will come in under that paragraph and pay a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem, and you put shingles on the free list. Show me the consistency between the two when one costs twice as much as the other.

Again, gentlemen, you forget. Remember now this is a special interest. I have got some personal interest and therefore I should not be permitted to talk on the subject. If I do I may be subjected to severe criticism as was my friend from Pennsylvania yesterday when he talked about shoe eyelets. I am a lumberman; I am not a shingle manufacturer. My wife had an uncle whose cousin had a brother married to a girl whose uncle was in the shingle business. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What relation are you to her?

Mr. PALMER. Can the gentleman describe that again and get it the same way? [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. There are 49,000 saw and shingle mills in the United States, employing 800,000 laboring men. These men and their families get their bread and butter from that industry. Talk about monopoly! The Bureau of Corporations spent half a million dollars and five years time in trying to find a monopoly or a trust in the manufacture of lumber and shingles in this country, and then reported their absolute failure to do so. My friends, you are striking a blow at an industry the product of which last year amounted to $40,000,000, one-half of which went into the pockets of the men who were employed in that industry, not including the men in the lumber camps. I am speaking of the men in the saw and shingle mills of this country. You are going to do this. You are going to put shingles on the free list and lumber on the free list. Lumber is now on the protected list and pays the smallest rate of duty of anything mentioned in the protective law, with the single exception of fish. You are going to take away that little morsel of protection, when everything that the manufacturer of lumber and shingles uses in the way of tools, machinery, clothing, food supply, everything that is used in the sawmill or in the lumber camp, is on the protected list. You propose now to give them free potatoes and free pork——

Mr. RAKER. And free beef?

Mr. FORDNEY. Beef! Oh, granny's nightcap! Cattle on the protective list and beef on the free list! Another inconsistency from the Democratic side of the House—raw material on the protective list and the finished product on the free list. Not protection. Do not use the word "protection," for your life. Revenue, revenue—cattle on the protective list because we need the revenue, and we are going to get it, too. So it goes all down the line. But gentlemen on that side of the House forget when putting shingles on the free list that the industry in the Northwest, where the great bulk of the shingles come from, needs that protection.

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

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to offer an amendment to the amendment; but when this Ways and Means Committee can dispose of $40,000,000 in 40 minutes, I will say that they are moving too rapidly for me, and I will not offer the amendment.

I want to submit, however, that 54 per cent of the standing timber in the United States is in the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, and Montana, and yet the men who are at the head of affairs in this House have not seen fit to put one man from any of these States on the Committee on Ways and Means.

In your reckless revelry of tariff tinkering you are putting an industry in the State of Washington out of business. I am not here to talk for a duty on lumber; that is a different matter. But I do say that any man who stands up on the floor of this House and says that shingles should be put on the free list has a very crazy idea of the economics that affect much of the territory in the northwestern part of the United States.

Labor! You Japanese, Chinese, Hindu lovers! [Laughter on the Republican side.] I hope the gentleman from Illinois who talked for the laboring man yesterday will vote right this morning. He says he is a man who was elected for the welfare of and to protect the labor interests. Any man who has an ounce of brains in his cranium knows that he is putting the labor interest in the shingle industry in this country to the bad, and so far to the bad that men engaged in it will be looking for other employment inside of the next two years. What are the conditions obtaining in the shingle industry?

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

Mr. FALCONER. Yes; briefly.

Mr. RAKER. Does the gentleman know what percentage of Japanese, Hindu, and Chinese——

Mr. FALCONER. Yes; 80 per cent are working in the shingle mills of British Columbia, and I will file an affidavit of an investigation showing that.

Mr. RAKER. I mean in Oregon and Washington.

Mr. FALCONER. Less than 1 per cent. [Applause on the Progressive side.] More than 99 per cent of the men in the shingle industry in the States of Washington, Oregon, Montana, and Idaho are American citizens, or eligible to be so.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman from California will vote for the Chinese, Japanese, and Hindus who work in British Columbia.

Mr. FALCONER. I have not time to yield more.

Mr. RAKER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is the Republican Party that is responsible for the Chinese, Japanese, and Hindus up to the present time.

Mr. FALCONER. The gentleman and his party are trying to let in the Japanese now.

Mr. RAKER. And you have never raised your voice——

Mr. FALCONER. Your party is trying to put them in California—you and your President, who is a master of fine phraseology, but who knows nothing about the economics involving the shingle industry——

Mr. RAKER. Your President recommended that——

Mr. FALCONER. This is not a question of anyone's President or party. I am dealing with the item involving the shingle industry. Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen who are so enthusiastic in protecting the Chinese, Hindus, and Japanese, are the men who are working for the special interests; special interests that control certain lines of industry and who make a vast amount of money importing just this kind of labor, and you know it and the gentleman from Chicago who spoke yesterday knows it.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FALCONER. I am not going to yield. We do not allow Chinese to stay in Snohomish County or any of those counties in Washington where shingles are made. With regard to the gentleman from California who persists in interrupting, I will say that he demonstrates the fact that when you get a Democrat started on the wrong road—and he is wrong on this subject—he does not know when to stop, and he exhibits his inconsistency now on the floor of this House.

What does it mean to labor? You talk of the exclusion of the Chinese. Eight thousand Chinese went into British Columbia in two years. There is supposed to be a tax of $500 per capita to enter. They do not pay $500 per capita. The Dominion of Canada has a "gentleman's" agreement with the Japanese Government that only 500 a year shall have passports to British Columbia, and the fact of the matter is that 11,000 came in 1907 and 1908.

I have been in the shingle business, not, however, for 10 years. I now have no interest, either directly or indirectly, but I do know the business, gentlemen, and I want to say that I or anyone, if shingles are placed on the free list, together with the opening of the Panama Canal, can ship shingles from British Columbia, in foreign ships through the canal, to every seaport city in the United States. Under the present conditions of 50 cents duty, Canada has imported about 6 per cent of the shingles used in the United States. Why take the duty off now? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER] has expired.

Mr. FALCONER. I wish to extend my remarks and include a clipping from the Everett Morning Tribune of April 22, and the following affidavits:

[From the Everett Morning Tribune, Apr. 22.]

JAPANESE NOW HAVE OPEN DOOR TO CANADA.

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA, *April 21, 1913.*

Under the terms of the Anglo-Japanese treaty, recently ratified by the Canadian Government and going into effect May 1, 1913, the Japanese have practically an open door to Canada.

Prominent Japanese recently in Vancouver are authority for the above statement. The policy of the McBride government has apparently been against oriental immigration, but only recently it ratified the action of the Dominion government.

The Anglo-Japanese treaty prohibits any action being taken by the provincial governments.

—

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

Charles C. Hone, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he was employed by the Pacific Coast Shippers' Association of Seattle, Wash., and the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association of Seattle, Wash., to inspect shingle manufacturing plants in western British Columbia and to investigate and determine the capacity of said plants and the number and races of the employees of each of said plants.

That he personally inspected from April 15, 1913, to April 18, 1913, inclusive, plants of the following concerns:

Robertson & Hackett, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Robt. McNair Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Albert Cotton, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Thos. Kirkpatrick, Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Imperial Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Jos. Chew Lumber & Shingle Co., Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Lulu Shingle Co., Eburne, British Columbia, on April 15, 1913.

Westminster Mill Co., New Westminster, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.

Royal City Lumber & Shingle Co., New Westminster, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.

Brunette Saw Mill Co., Sapperton, British Columbia, on April 16, 1913.

Cascade Mills (Ltd.), Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.

Thurston Flavelle Lumber Co., Port Moody, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.

Port Moody Shingle Co., Port Moody, British Columbia, on April 17, 1913.

New Ladysmith Lumber Co., Nanaimo, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.

Victoria Lumber & Manufacturing Co., Chemanius, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.

Victoria Shingle Co., Victoria, British Columbia, on April 18, 1913.

As the result of my personal investigation and inspection, I found that the number and races of the employees engaged in and about the plants of the above-named concerns were as follows:

	Chinese.	Hindus.	White.	Total.
Sawyers	58	----	12	70
Packers	69	----	----	69
All other employees [1]	94	5	53	152
Total	221	5	65	291

[1] Covers bolt passers, cut-off men, block pilers, hand sawyers, clippermen, refuse movers, band nailers, car loaders, and common laborers.

From these figures the percentage of white employees compared with the percentage of oriental employees engaged is as follows: Asiatic employees, 80 per cent; white employees, 20 per cent.

On inquiry as to the wages paid Asiatic employees by the above-mentioned concerns, I have arrived at the following averages:

Shingle sawyers, 12 cents to 13 cents per thousand.

Shingle packers, 6 cents to 7½ cents per thousand.

All others, $1.40 to $1.70 per day.

CHAS. C. HONE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington,
Residing at Seattle.

—

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

I, Fred A. Traill, being first duly sworn, on oath depose and say:

That I am treasurer and manager of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, an organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington, composed of about 200 shingle manufacturers, who manufacture about 65 per cent of the shingle output of the State of Washington.

That I am entirely familiar with the wages paid shingle sawyers (white employees), shingle packers (white employees), and all others (white employees) in the shingle manufacturing plants on the Puget Sound, State of Washington.

The following is a scale of wages:

Shingle sawyers (white employees), 16 cents to 19 cents per thousand.

Shingle packers (white employees), 9 cents to 10 cents per thousand.

Knee bolters (white employees), $3.50 to $4.50 per day.

Drag sawyers (white employees), $3.50 to $5 per day.

Common laborers (white employees), $2 to $2.50 per day.

F. A. TRAILL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington,
Residing at Seattle.

—

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

I, F. D. Becker, being first duly sworn, on oath depose and say:

That I am secretary and manager of the Pacific Coast Shippers' Association, an organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington, composed of wholesalers and manufacturers of lumber and shingles, whose combined output is approximately 70 per cent of the rail lumber trade of western Washington, and about 80 per cent of the rail shingle trade of western Washington.

That I employed Mr. Charles C. Hone on April 14, 1913, to inspect British Columbia manufacturing plants; that the said Charles C. Hone is the same person who has testified to the foregoing affidavit.

F. D. BECKER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington,
Residing at Seattle.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, *County of King, ss:*

I, Fred A. Traill, being first duly sworn, on oath depose and say:

That I am treasurer and manager of the Red Cedar Shingle Manufacturers' Association, an organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington, composed of about 200 shingle manufacturers, who manufacture about 65 per cent of the shingle output of the State of Washington.

That I employed Charles C. Hone on April 14 to inspect British Columbia shingle manufacturing plants, and that the said Charles C. Hone is the same person who testified to the foregoing affidavit.

F. A. TRAILL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1913.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. ALEXANDER,
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington,
Residing at Seattle.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Par. 172½. Rough lumber, $1.25 per thousand feet board measure.
Par. 172¾. Railroad ties, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be heard upon this amendment at any great length. The Democratic Party has determined to pass the Underwood bill without amendment, and for the purpose of putting before the general public one of the ablest speeches I have read for a good while I shall read into my remarks a speech made by former Senator Chauncey M. Depew before the Montauk Club, of Brooklyn, at a dinner given in celebration of the seventy-ninth birthday of Mr. Depew. His speech, published in the New York Evening Mail in its issue of April 28, 1913, is as follows:

"MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN: With each recurrence of these anniversaries I am more impressed with the permanence of friendship. The proof is here to-night. For 22 years the members of this club in celebrating my birthday added to the pleasure of the first meeting an original compliment. In 22 years several generations of club members come and go, but there is always a central phalanx of veterans to keep up principles and traditions of the organization.

"I have been greeted to-night by fathers who have brought their sons, and by sons who have brought the grandsons of those who welcomed me within these walls 22 years ago. The political revolutions which have taken place in the country and in the State, the financial crises which have for a time paralyzed our industries, and the agitations which seemed revolutionary, but disappeared, have neither interrupted nor impaired our numbers or the pleasures of our anniversaries.

"Lucian, the famous gossip of antiquity, the predecessor and originator of the immortal Pepys, in one of his stories says that he called upon a famous centenarian named Gorgias, who lived at Corinth 1,700 years ago, anxious to put the questions to which every centenarian has been subjected ever since, and probably before, for there is nothing new under the sun.

"ATE THE HERRING ALONE.

"Lucian called upon Gorgias to find out the secrets of his extreme age. He said to him, 'You have just had your one hundred and eighth birthday and are enjoying splendid health, vigor, and vitality. Now, to what do you ascribe it?' Gorgias answered, 'To the fact that I never have accepted an invitation to dine out.' One of our centenarians a few days ago, answering the same question at 103, said in his case it was due to the fact that he had eaten a red herring every day. I think the American had the better time. He certainly did not eat that herring alone, and it created a thirst which led to companionship in quenching it.

"What a ghastly century was that of Gorgias who had never dined out. The brilliant men of his period, the sculptors who are the despair of our artists, the architects whom we can never equal, the philosophers and poets who have been models of all succeeding generations, the orators, statesmen, and soldiers whom subsequent history has never eclipsed, all were visitors during his long life to beautiful and artistic Corinth, and he might, at the dinners which were invariably given them, have enjoyed the pleasures of their society and left an autobiography of personal reminiscences of incalculable value to posterity.

"I have met most of the distinguished men and women of my time in this and other countries, and with scarcely an exception the best I ever knew of them occurred at dinner. An evening with Gladstone was a liberal education. He possessed the most comprehensive mind of his generation and was gifted with the most graphic power of expressing his opinions.

"A formal interview with him was of little value, but in the confidences and intimacies of a long dinner at a friend's house Gladstone could be more eloquent, more impressive, and more delightful than in his best efforts in the House of Commons. It was possible on such occasions to study the workings of that marvelous mind and get an insight into the sources of his magnetic power.

"BROWNING CHARMING AT DINNER.

"To read Browning's poems was one thing, but to hear Browning talk at dinner was much more human, informing, and charming. He said to me that when at the request of the Government, the Duke of Sutherland gave a dinner to the Shah of Persia at the Stafford House, he was one of the guests. In order to impress this semisavage monarch, every one was requested to wear all their regalia. The Prince of Wales and members of the royal family, the dukes, marquises, and earls came in all the medieval splendor of their rank and order, and with all their jewels, real and paste.

"Mr. Browning said that, having no rank, he came in the crimson gown of an honor man of Cambridge University. Diamonds did not impress the Shah, because the buttons on his coat were real stones as big as horse-chestnuts. The ermine and tiaras produced no impression upon him, because he and his suite were arrayed in more barbaric splendor. But his wild eye roving around the table came upon this crimson Cambridge robe at the foot, where, as a commoner, the poet sat.

"The Shah instantly said, 'Who is that great man?' 'Why, that is Mr. Browning.' 'What is he?' 'He is a poet.' 'Command him to come here and sit beside me.' So a royalty or a prime minister was displaced and the embarrassed poet was put beside the autocrat. The Shah said, 'I understand you are a poet, a great poet,' which Browning modestly admitted. 'Well, then,' he said, 'I want you to stay here with me, because more than the fact that I am the supreme ruler of Persia, I am a great poet myself.

"Mr. Browning assured me that the story was true; that the Shah said to the then Prince of Wales, afterwards King Edward VII, 'This is a magnificent palace.' The prince said, 'Yes; this is the finest palace in Great Britain.' 'Well,' said the Shah, 'let me give you a little piece of advice. When one of my nobility gets rich enough to live in a house like this, I cut off his head and take what he has. It is very simple and saves a great deal of trouble.'

"DOLLAR FEASTS DELIGHTFUL.

"But the night will not permit an enumeration. I have learned more state secrets from cabinet ministers abroad in the confidences of the dinner table than I could have had in years of residence, and under similar circumstances the armor of reserve has dropped from Presidents of the United States and their troubles, their anxieties, their wishes, their ambitions, their friends, and their enemies have been an open book.

"'Ah, but,' says the philosopher who is eternally denouncing the opportunities of wealth, 'dinners are all very well for you, but how about the rest of us?' Why, my dear sir, the dullest, most stupid, and most boorish dinner I ever attended cost $100 a plate, while my most delightful evenings have been with a bohemian coterie, where a dollar was the limit. The cost of the dinner, the rarity of its wines, and the brand of its cigars are of no account unless about the table are men and women of mind, of individuality, of versatility, of something to give which is worth receiving, and a willingness to listen to the message which you think is worth delivering.

"Senator Hoar, who in his long, brilliant, and most distinguished career had met everybody worth knowing, told me that no gathering, however small or however large, equaled in wit and wisdom, in flashes of genius, in things always to be remembered and never to be forgotten, the weekly luncheons at Parker's, in Boston, where Longfellow, Hawthorne, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Theodore Parker, and others, and Judge Hoar, the brightest of them all, met for a week-day luncheon.

"Judge Robertson, of Westchester, and I were invited by Secretary of State Seward to dine with him in Washington on our way to the Republican national convention which renominated President Lincoln. That dinner changed the Vice President from Daniel S. Dickinson, of New York, to Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, and made a different chapter in American history.

"The newspapers, which tell us everything, say that the present tariff and income-tax bills were perfected at a dinner at the White House. This brings us in immediate and acute contact with the most interesting of current events.

"NO EXCITEMENT OVER TARIFF.

"In my 57 years in public and semipublic life I have participated in many political revolutions, and in none of them have these changes, especially of the tariff, been received with so little excitement and scarcely a suggestion of passion. There are no editorials or flaming speeches predicting direful disasters or indignation meetings resolving that we are on the brink of financial and industrial ruin.

"These tariff propositions, going as they do to the very foundation of our financial and industrial system, and the manner in which they are received are high indications of that much-abused word 'progress.' We have become a deliberative and contemplative people. Without inherited prejudices or partisan bias we can calmly weigh measures and policies and arrive at individual conclusions as to results when they crystallize into law. We all recognize that at some time these theories must be tried. We have all recognized that at some time the theorists must have devolved upon them the responsibilities of government.

"There has been no period since the Civil War when experiments could be tried with less danger than now. The country was never so prosperous, employment was never so general, wages were never so high, the farmer was never so rich or receiving such returns for the product of his field and his live stock, the output of the manufactories was never so great, the expansion of our credit and the amount of our exchanges were never so large, and our imports and exports never reached such a volume.

"The fly in the amber, or, to put it more seriously, our irritation and discontent under these otherwise happy conditions, is the high cost of living. The laws which our new rulers are putting in force will affect equally all the peope; therefore it is the duty of all of us to wish them Godspeed and good luck. It is the hope of all of us that the realization of their dreams, which some of us have feared, will be in the line of their most sanguine hopes. Their problem is a difficult one. In simple form, it is how to reduce the cost of living without impairing opportunties of earning a living. In that is the whole crux of the situation.

"AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION.

"It has been our habit to touch lightly and, if possible, informingly upon the things that have happened since our last gathering. The Constitution of the United States has not been amended in over 100 years. The fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, which were passed after the Civil War, were really not amendments, but simply declarations of principles which were in the Declaration of Independence and in the spirit of the original instrument.

"But after over 100 years of satisfaction with the Constitution, within this year two amendments have been added, one an income tax, the other for the election of United States Senators by the people. I am not going to discuss these measures. They are here to stay. But when the history of their passage comes to be written it will be disclosed that there are some curious phases of human nature.

"When the amendment to the Constitution of the United States for an income tax came before our New York Legislature, it was defeated by a message from Gov. Hughes. That message did not oppose an income tax, but clearly stated that the needs of our Commonwealth were growing so rapidly and the sources of State taxation were so limited that the income tax should be left to the States, and the General Government, with its infinite possibilities, could raise revenue from other sources.

"When the income-tax amendment was under discussion in the Senate, I had a heart-to-heart talk with a group of Senators from the Western States who were urging its adoption. I said to them, 'Our revenues at present are furnishing a surplus; we never will need to resort to this method of taxation except in a great emergency. Then why do you want it now?' Their answer was, 'Because with an income tax we can collect one-half of the expenses of the Government from your State of New York and the other half from New England, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois.'

"The exemption of $4,000 a year in the present bill shows that these gentlemen control this legislation, because very few in their States have an income of that size. It is an interesting question in legislation of this kind, since in no country in the world where they have an income tax is the exemption equal to $1,000, whether in order to have the whole people alert, inquisitive, and critical upon the expenses of government and in checking extravagance, the largest possible number should not have their attention called to those expenditures by contributing something toward the support of the Government.

"BECAUSE BRYAN WANTS IT.

"When the income-tax amendment was before our New York Legislature I said to a man who as much as any other controlled that body, 'Did you think Gov. Hughes was right?' He said, 'Yes.' I then told him what these western Senators had said to me. He said, 'That I believe, too.' I said, 'Then why are you urging the adoption of this amendment by our State?' His answer was, 'Because Bryan wants it.'

"When the amendment for the election of the United States Senators by the people was so framed that the United States Government had the power to see that all the people voted and that none was disfranchised, I said to the Senators from the States

where the negro is disfranchised, 'Do you see danger of a force bill if this amendment is adopted? Don't you think that as crises arise, and they will arise, where a majority of the States feel that certain measures in which they are interested could be passed if all the people, including the negroes, in your States voted, they will pass laws under which the Government will see that they do vote, at least for United States Senators?' They said, 'Yes; we see all those dangers.' I said, 'Then why are you voting for it?' Their answer was, 'Because Bryan wants it.'

"This brings us to a horizontal view of one of the paradoxes of our American life. We are rushing with unprecedented rapidity for us, for we are a conservative people, toward the breaking down of the safeguards which are in the Constitution against hasty and inconsiderate action by the people. We are proceeding upon the theory that leadership no longer does or ought to exist, that all matters should originate with and be decided upon by the people as a mass on the passion or emotion of the moment and without the intervention of representative bodies or interpretations by the courts, and yet there never was a time when leadership counted for so much as it does to-day.

"There never was a time when leaders asserted themselves with such confidence and autocratic authority. More than 4,000,000 Republicans followed Col. Roosevelt in the last campaign, not because they wanted to break up the Republican Party, not because they adopted all the doctrines of his platform or of his speeches, but because they believed in Roosevelt and wanted for President of the United States a strong, militant, aggressive, and audacious leader.

"CALLS FOR LEADERSHIP.

"The national convention of the Democratic Party at Baltimore was swayed by Mr. Bryan. It was recognized that the great mass of his party recognized him as a supreme leader whom they were willing to follow wherever he chose to go. For the first time in 123 years the President of the United States leaves the Executive Mansion and appears at the Capitol to impress upon the legislative branch of the Government his views upon pending legislation. These are not symptoms, but facts. With all the shouting and the trumpeting for a pure democracy, the exactions of our busy, hurried, rapid, nervous life call for a leader in every department more than at any other period in our history.

"The same is true in the industrial disorders which are now so acute. In their more revolutionary phases they are governed by a leader with very few assistants, whose power is unlimited, whose authority is unquestioned.

"Another curious phase of this trend to pure democracy is that its leaders are opposed to majorities. Ten per cent of the voters initiate a number of radical measures. They are submitted to a referendum at the next election, and a plurality of the votes cast make them laws or insert them in the Constitution. In the history of these referendums the vote has averaged about 20 per cent of the total vote at any election. The measures have been adopted by the petitioners who constitute one-half, and many times more than one-half of those voting carrying the day because the majority of the electorate have not cast their ballots.

"When it is proposed that no law by referendum shall become a law and no amendment shall be attached to the Constitution unless it receives a majority of all the votes cast at the election when it is submitted, without exception the reformer cries 'No'; reforms must be carried not by the unintelligent mass, but by the few who understand the needs of the people.

"BELIEVES IN TRADE-UNIONS.

"I believe in trade-unions and trade organizations. In the railway world I have been their best friend, but there is a new movement now progressing all over the world and forging to the front with us with lurid exhibitions of its power. As a student all my life of every idea which has captured any considerable number of people, whether upon religious, or social, or industrial, or economic questions, I bought the book which gives the most authoritative and vigorous exhibition of syndicalism by one of its ablest and most eloquent writers.

"It is very interesting, though not yet very alarming, except in its fierce and bloody riots to compel other unions to join. He says:

"We have in the United States to-day nearly 500,000 organized fighting soldiers. In the whole world we have 7,000,000. We are comrades with a common purpose. The cry of our army is 'No quarter.' We want all you possess. We will be content with nothing less than all you possess. Here are our hands. They are strong hands. The able-bodied workers would not have to labor more than two or three hours every day to feed everybody, clothe everybody, house everybody, and give fair measure of little luxuries to everybody.

"Then he goes on to say:

"When all these things are accomplished, then all the world will be impelled to action—scientists formulating law, inventors employing law, artists and sculptors painting canvases and shaping clay, poets and statesmen serving humanity by singing and by statecraft. Our intention is to destroy present-day society as a fact, and also to take possession of the world with all its wealth and machinery and government.

"Here are a few of the bunkers over which this army must successfully propel its bomb: There are about 8,000,000 people, men and women, in this country who own their own homes and will fight to retain them. There are over 4,000,000 who own their own farms, other millions who get their living from farms, and none are so tenacious of their rights as the farmers. There are about 11,000,000 who are engaged in various industries in a way that interests them to a point where they will not tamely surrender their rights in raising stock, or as florists, or horticulturists, or nurserymen. There are the millions of small shopkeepers everywhere whose living and the future for their families are in the goods in their stores.

"A NATIONAL CONSCIENCE.

"Our eyes are so blinded by the increase in the capitalization of great corporations like the steel or tobacco or sugar that we lose sight of the fact that there never were so many small manufacturers with limited capital, employing few men, among whom the proprietors are the hardest workers, scattered all over the United States. The foundations of our society are deep in the selfish interests, in the ambitions, in the hopes, and in the affections for their offspring of 99 per cent of our people. Besides all that is the national conscience, with an irradicable sense of right and wrong, based upon respect for the property and lives and liberties of others, for which every church, every common school, every agency of education and instruction, every fraternal lodge, is a recruiting station.

"Now, the crux of that idea is that when this millennium has been brought around nobody will have to work over 2 hours in 24. During the rest of the day everybody will be happy because industrially occupying their time in creating or making or producing things which are useful and helpful to their fellows. A distinguished philosopher has said that the mainsprings of action are ambition, necessity, and greed. It may be growing out of what happened in the Garden of Eden that effort requires a spur. Every one of us knows that in our own experience. There is no one at this table here to-night who would be what he is unless there had been a motive to accomplish something for himself. There is no truth more self-evident than that this selfishness has in it also the elements of patriotism.

"The man who forges ahead and in his advance creates continually larger opportunities for others to get on is selfishly a climber and unselfishly a philanthropist. The curse of the youth of our country is idleness. Our hooligans, our gang men, our gunmen, our young criminals are all the products of idleness. The ambition of the boy at school is aroused first by competition with his fellows. As he advances to the high school or the college it is for the honors which can be achieved.

"IDLE MEN NOT HAPPY.

"I look back over 60 years of continuous effort, and when I try to differentiate the causes of my health and happiness I come back always to work. I never yet knew an idle man who was a happy one. I mean an idle man who was such from choice. Every man I ever knew who was doing the best he could in the line of his talent and equipment, and who became fond of his work, and who outside of his regular occupation had some fad which interested him, and who could on occasion play as hard as he worked, was healthy and happy himself and radiated happiness and inspiration to every one about him.

"We are all workingmen, but I have known thousands of what are known as laboring men—that is, those who earn a living by the work of their hands—who in their little gardens found repose and recreation, who in their church, or in their lodges, or in their social work discovered never-ending sources of education in broadmindedness, in higher ideals of citizenship, and material, spiritual, and intellectual advancement.

"It is an old charge that republics are ungrateful. Perhaps that is a mistake, and they are only forgetful. I recall on this question three of my late colleagues in the Senate, who were among its most distinguished and useful Members and are now in private life.

"When the case for the expulsion of Senator Lorimer, of Illinois, was tried before the Committee on Privileges and Elections a large majority of the committee, though they knew that the newspapers generally demanded Mr. Lorimer's expulsion, and such was the sentiment of a majority of the people, yet acting as judges they could not find in the testimony sufficient warrant for a verdict against him.

"SENATOR BEVERIDGE'S CASE.

"Senator Beveridge, one of the most brilliant Senators of his term in the Senate, made a minority report and led the fight against Lorimer. He had often before proved himself to be an accomplished and brilliant debater, but he never was so able, resourceful, and eloquent as in this battle. It was on the eve of his fight for a reelection to the Senate, and he and his friends felt that his reward was certain. He made one of the most thorough and able canvasses of Indiana that any candidate ever did, and yet he was beaten.

One of the most useful and able Senators in my time was Norris Brown, of Nebraska. Mr. Brown believed that nine-tenths of the people of his State were in favor of a constitutional amendment for an income tax. He introduced the amendment and gave his time, energy, and remarkable diplomacy to secure its passage. I am quite certain from my own familiarity with the course of that legislation that except for Mr. Brown's *advocacy* and support the amendment would not have passed the Senate. When he came before his people for the approval of his course, he was beaten.

"My captivating friend, Jonathan Bourne, of Oregon, was the author of most of the so-called reforms which have substituted the initiative, the referendum, and the recall in Oregon for representative government and made the governor and the legislature rubber stamps. In season and out of season, in the Senate and on the platform and in the press, he portrayed the merits of this return to a pure democracy and this recovery by the people from an obsolete system of their full rights.

"It is said that the placing of one of his greatest speeches on this question in the hands of every voter in the newly admitted State of Arizona led to the adoption of the most radical constitution ever known. We all thought that whatever might happen to the rest of us, the call for reelection of Jonathan Bourne was to come with a unanimity never known before by a grateful people. Yet he was beaten.

"It is an interesting study in politics whether people are ungrateful, which I do not believe, or forgetful, which may happen, or whether their tribune is not sometimes mistaken in thinking that he knows just what they want.

"DOES NOT LAMENT THE PAST.

"It has been the fashion in all ages for elderly people to lament the good old times and long for their recall. I do not share in any way in this desire. Solomon repudiated it, but then Solomon had more things than all his predecessors put together, including the family, and notwithstanding his hundreds of wives and thousands of concubines, seems to have been very happy in his domestic relations. George Washington, on the other hand, thought that the times as they were in the few years preceding his death far worse than in earlier days, and that they gave little hope for the future.

"As I look back over 57 years of intense activity in many departments of life, of a full share of both successes and failures, of hard knocks and compensating triumphs, of sorrows and joys, I come to the conclusion that while one year may be very bad, very miserable, and very hopeless, yet take time by decades every 10 years as a whole is infinitely better than all the preceding ones.

"Still, there are some things which seem to be permanently lost, and are to be greatly regretted, for the enjoyment of life. One of them is conversation. The most charming volumes in history are made up of the conversation of agreeable talkers, but it is a general complaint that now conversation is a lost art. Some say it is because bridge whist has so shortened the dinner as to make it a feed instead of a function, and the craze for gambling in bridge whist has destroyed the freedom from care and elasticity of mind which are necessary for the interchange of thought, of humor, of anecdote, of argument, and of raillery. We ought to be grateful, therefore, to anyone who can help in the restoration of that most charming, I almost say indispensable, medium for the enjoyment of friends and acquaintances—conversation.

"WILSON'S 'NEW FREEDOM.'

"President Wilson is happily contributing to this end. He is advocating in a series of brilliantly written magazine articles what he calls 'The New Freedom.' There is intense curiosity to know what the 'New Freedom' means. This century and a quarter of unexampled and unparalleled growth and prosperity under our Constitution and laws has given us the freedom so gloriously expressed in the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence was a philosophic statement of liberty, but the Constitution of the United States crystallized it into law. Jefferson's idea of liberty was that governments are based upon the individual and that he must have the largest freedom with the fewest possible restrictions and the least possible legislation.

"President Wilson now has an opportunity of which he must avail himself of putting into law his 'new freedom.' We are told by the press, always so Argus-eyed and so truthful, that at a conference at the White House a few days since the President agreed with the chairmen of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives which have charge of appropriation bills that the one now passing should have on it a rider exempting labor unions and farmers' associations from the restrictions and penalties of the Sherman antitrust law. They get a liberty which no one else enjoys and become a privileged class. Now, this is practical. It is a new freedom.

"The first restraint ever put since the adoption of our Constitution in 1787 upon the activities of the individual when acting in great combinations was by the Sherman antitrust law. Under prosecutions commenced by Cleveland and continued by McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft these combinations have been relentlessly pursued because violating the Sherman antitrust law. Some of them have been put out of business, and many of them have been dissolved. Decisions have been rendered in these cases which bring every great combination within the restrictions of this law. Now a new freedom is to be given by legislation to labor unions to do as they please and farmers to form associations and combinations for the marketing of their products.

"PRACTICAL DEMONSTRATION.

"There is no suggestion that those who are engaged in iron or steel or tobacco or oil, in hats, shoes, or clothing, or printing, or anything else shall be relieved from the beneficent restrictions of the Sherman Act, in which I think most of us heartily believe. But labor unions and farmers can club together and by the processes which are so successful in protection Germany, and called cartels in free-trade England, and called combinations in protection America, and called trusts, can have—the one in doing what it likes and the other in raising the price of bread and meat—all the advantages of the freedom which everybody had before the Sherman antitrust law.

"Now, this practical demonstration of the new freedom has led to more conversation everywhere than anything which has occurred for many years. It is an enlightening, illuminating, and instructing conversation. It raises that one topic of intense interest at all times where everybody is affected, 'Who will next receive the new freedom?'

"Vice President Marshall is a charming gentleman and a delightful speaker. I have heard him on many subjects upon which he talks so well, and none better than upon brotherhood in Masonry, he and I being both brethren of the thirty-third degree. Two weeks ago to-night he attended the Jeffersonian banquet in New York. He there delivered an address which was as novel as it was original. He claimed that the inheritance of property from one's parents is not a natural or a constitutional right but purely a privilege granted by statute, and so to prevent accumulations of property all that the legislatures have to do is to repeal the laws of inheritance, and then whatever a person acquires will go not to his natural heirs but to the State.

"Of course if such a law was passed there would be no accumulations afterwards, because the main incentive for saving money is to take care of those who are dependent upon us; in other words, our wives and children. There would be people so masterful and with such genius in that line that they could not help making money. If they were not to have the pride and joy and comfort of its enjoyment in the benefits it would give after their death, they would squander it.

"The first line in which a man begins to squander money is self-indulgence. Drunkenness would become the attendant of prosperity, and the prohibition States, which are now doing fairly well in restricting the consumption of liquor, would discover that their laws were universally nullified. The new view of life would be 'Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die.'

"This speech was delivered on Saturday night two weeks ago and published in the Sunday morning papers. It made conversation all over the United States. When I came out of church and met the people of all the other churches I was stopped dozens of times, not to talk about the sermons which had been heard, but to discuss the speech of Vice President Marshall.

"CONVERSATION REVIVED.

"I lunched with some friends and dined with others that day, and both functions were prolonged far beyond the usual time by an animated discussion of Brother Marshall's deliverance. If Eugene Debs had said this it would have passed unnoticed because expected. It is the unexpected which inspires conversation. So from the new Vice President of the

United States it became a matter of interesting talk in every gathering, private or public.

"Well, these things have helped in bringing into activity again the almost lost art of conversation. Still, these subjects are not so fine as those which prevailed in the good old times. We used to long for a new novel by Dickens or Thackeray and talk over the old ones until the new ones came, and then the new ones until others were published, until David Copperfield, Micawber, Capt. Cuttle, Jack Bunsby, Dora, Becky Sharp, and Col. Newcome were intimate members of our families. They inspired and radiated the home.

"We eagerly discussed Hawthorne's latest novels and what Whittier, Lowell, Emerson, and Dr. Parker, Dr. Storrs, or Henry Ward Beecher had contributed to the wisdom and enjoyment of the world. John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer had their audiences and their admirers, and the Shakespeare and Browning societies found opportunities in every hamlet in the country.

"I am at a loss to know why there are no writers of equivalent reputation and equivalent consideration contributing now to the cordiality and camaraderie of us all. Why, we carry the shop everywhere and talk of either what we want or what we have or what the other fellow possesses and how he got it. It is very depressing.

"But, my friends, I do not despair. On my doctrine of decades I isolate this 10 years. I avoid the calamity howlers. I expel from my reading desk and my mind the preachers of disorder or destruction or despair. I place my trust, my hope, my optimism in that fine, discriminating, cordial, loving association of the people with each other and of their trust in and courage for the rights and the liberties of all."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 4, after the word "sawed," strike out "10 per cent ad valorem" and insert "15 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the strange political philosophy of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] would provide through this bill for the increase of factories to manufacture cigar boxes in Cuba. We have a large concern in my city which is engaged in the business of taking sawed cedar which comes up from Cuba and the former Spanish-American possessions and turning it over to American workmen, who at American wages shape it into cigar boxes, and I wish we had them in Florida, or in Georgia, or in South or North Carolina, nearer the supply of the raw product. They would all be worthy of protection, but that is not the proposition in this bill. According to the gentleman's philosophy, instead of encouraging a man to invest his capital here or to employ Americans in the manufacture of cigar boxes of raw material coming from Cuba to Pennsylvania, we are to encourage the men in Cuba to retain their cedar wood and build factories and employ cheaper labor there to make cigar boxes for us.

It seems to be the philosophy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] not to attempt to do any business in the United States, not to encourage anyone to rear a factory and employ labor, but to let this be done in foreign countries. This bill proposes that the man who does rear a factory in the United States shall pay a duty on the raw material of 10 per cent, and then it removes from him the protection he gets on the product that is finished here. We have asked in this instance that the duty which enables the American workman to manufacture cigar boxes in competition with Cuba be restored. We have asked that the Democratic majority shall see the error of its ways and adopt this amendment.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. He probably did not catch the tenor of this paragraph. By striking out the word "other" it means the cedar wood would come in at 10 per cent.

Mr. MOORE. I think the amendment contemplated changing from 10 to 15 per cent in order to protect sawed cedar.

Mr. PALMER. There was not a question of changing the rate to protect anything. It was in order to get rid of that very question as to what cedar should come under the 10 per cent rate, and there would come in free under the paragraph as now changed cigar boxes, and cedar wood would come in free when manufactured; and unmanufactured, in the shape of logs, it comes in free.

Mr. MOORE. That is the very point I am making, namely, that the gentleman has increased the opportunity to manufacture in Cuba and reduced the opportunity to manufacture here.

Mr. PALMER. It is just exactly the contrary.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to offer an amendment to this lumber schedule, because I realize that it is useless to do so. Nor is it my purpose to take up but two or three minutes of the time of the committee in discussing it, because I realize that is also useless for this side to discuss it further.

We have not the acute situation with reference to oriental competition in my State that the gentlemen from the Northwest who have spoken have, but we sympathize with them. We are interested in the lumber industry in Kentucky. We have thousands of men employed in that industry and hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in it. I wish the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and those who are helping him in this assault upon the lumber industry could take a look into the humble homes of the men who are earning their daily bread for themselves and their families. They would realize that this question about cheaper lumber for the home builders is a two-sided one. In every race I have made for membership in this body in that district I have contended that if Democracy obtained the power to do so it would injure the lumber industry and the coal industry. I have contended also that the party is utterly opposed to the principle of protection in any shape. Many Democrats in that district who are interested in the development of the great resources that we have there have denied that proposition. I am glad that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] and other leaders of the Democracy have made it perfectly clear now that I was correct when I said that they are opposed entirely to the policy of protection. It will relieve me of the necessity of rearguing that question when I run again.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does the gentleman say that he will not make an occasional casual reference to it in the course of his campaign?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; I guess I will; and I will also have my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] come down there and help me do it. He does it so handsomely. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, mind what I tell you, when this bill goes into operation the lumber industry and the coal industry will suffer. Leaders of Democracy in Kentucky contend that taking the duty off of coal will not reduce the price to the consumer, and putting lumber on the free list will not reduce the price to the consumer. If that is so, then why take the duty off of these articles and give up that much revenue, which you say you were after in framing this bill? In the name of the people——

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LANGLEY. No. The gentleman never yields to me, and I take great pleasure in declining to yield to him. [Laughter.]

In the name of the great industrial district which I represent, which is just now starting on an era of prosperity that will be almost unparalleled if they are let alone, I desire to protest against this lumber schedule as well as many other schedules in the Underwood bill that will deal a staggering blow to my district and State. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of the State of Washington, I desire to say something on this shingle schedule.

Now, to begin with, I want to make perfectly plain the fact that as far as I am concerned, speaking for myself alone and for nobody else, I believe in the substantial immediate reduction of the tariff schedules. I believe in revising the tariff schedules downward, and I believe it is the duty of this Congress to reduce these schedules generally, and the statute that is passed by this Congress ought to show that kind of legislation. I do not believe it is the movement of the Democratic Party or the Progressive Party; I do not believe it to be the movement of any party. I believe it to be a movement that has the backing of the great body of the American people, and I believe if this Congress did not substantially reduce these tariff schedules there would be almost a revolution in this country. I believe the people have demanded it, and I believe it is the duty of every Congressman sitting on the floor of this House to cooperate in endeavoring to reduce generally the tariff schedules that have been forced on the people for all these years.

I believe they have been essentially wrong in almost every instance. But I desire to say to you that this question of the shingle industry of the State of Washington presents a special problem. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, yes! [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. That is all right. I am willing to stand for a reduction in all the schedules and a reduction in the rate on shingles, but I do not believe that this Congress ought to wipe out all of those duties. You have not wiped them out on all of the various articles. You have, in a number of cases, maintained

a duty, and here we have a duty of 50 cents a thousand that you are wiping out entirely, and putting shingles on the free list. I say to you that the shingle industry is situated differently from the lumber industry.

Mr. FARR. Of course. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRYAN. I do speak for the shingle industry, and the argument that is made on behalf of the shingle industry in this House ought to appeal to every honest and sincere man as he studies the situation in the State of Washington. I will not repeat the figures already presented by my colleagues from the State of Washington. If you put shingles absolutely on the free list, if you cut off entirely the duty on shingles, I am sure that the competition that has been suggested here from oriental labor will interfere, not with any great industrial enterprise so much as with the many small mills of my State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I have no time to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BRYAN. These mills are located on the shores of Puget Sound and on the little streams that empty into the Sound, and the men who work in these mills are right close to their homes, and they are working there in the mills, and I say they ought to be maintained in that work.

These mills are located on the shores of Puget Sound and on the little streams that empty into the Sound, and the men who work in these mills are right close to their homes, and they are working there in the mills, and I say they ought to be maintained in that work.

I say that the particular situation with respect to British Columbia labor does affect us more than any other industry, perhaps, that has been referred to here. I believe the committee ought to take this up. So far as I am concerned, I would like to vote for this bill. I want to see the tariff reduced. I am sincere about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of my colleague to the fact that there was not a single Democrat from the great Northwest in the caucus-congress held here for several weeks by the majority—not an individual to point out to the men making this bill this terrible and desperate situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to no one. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not care by what party name a man be called in this controversy. This is not a controversy of parties. This is a controversy in which the people of this country have spoken. It does not make any difference about the party lines, and it does not make any difference about the catchwords you have been using all these years. You have got to meet this issue and recognize the fact that the people have demanded a revision downward. The Republican platform demanded a revision of the tariff, and it was claimed it meant a revision downward. The Democratic platform provided for a revision downward and the Progressive Party platform demanded a revision downward. I intend to stand for that, and I stand for what I claim all the parties stand for and what the American people stand for; and there is going to be no compromise on that.

But when you come to figure out the various schedules, as explained by the able leader of the majority in this House, you must consider business conditions to a certain extent. You ought to consider this particular industry at this time. There is no reason, there is no ground, for turning this industry over to British Columbia labor. It is not right, and it does not correspond with those principles that are fundamental in the human breast. It does not give the people a square deal or that which is right and just. And I think if you reduce the schedule not more than about 50 per cent, you will comply with your platform and with the demands of the people. I am willing to cut the present duty in two in the middle. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the paragraph and amendment be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendment thereto be closed.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman can offer an amendment later. I am moving to close debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FORDNEY. I wish to speak on that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Two of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, are very much interested in this matter. They have not had an opportunity to speak, and this means the death of this industry if you put it through.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am perfectly willing that the gentlemen may speak on their own amendments.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, how many amendments on this side will be offered to this paragraph?

Mr. MOORE. I have one.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have one.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] wants five minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of information, will it be in order to offer an amendment at this point to fix a less duty on the next paragraph or on the same paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman could offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all amendments that may be desired may be presented to this schedule.

Mr. MANN. This paragraph?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They all want to speak on lumber. It is all one thing.

Mr. MANN. This is on shingles.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I know. If we can have unanimous consent, I want to close up this schedule. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this schedule be closed in 20 minutes. Is that the amount of time the gentleman wants?

Mr. MANN. They want 20 minutes on the shingle proposition.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree to that. I insist on my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the debate on this paragraph and amendments be now closed.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to appeal to the gentleman not to do that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to give the gentleman a chance to offer his amendment.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not want to offer any amendment to any paragraph in the schedule.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Party has gone on record as believing in a tariff for revenue. The shingle business at the present time is to some extent competitive, and we have been getting a revenue from 6 per cent of the shingles that have been used in the United States—these having been imported into this country from Canada.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in his opening speech to this House said that the Democratic Party was not going to cut the tariff schedules with an ax, but intended letting them down gently with a jackscrew. I would like to know just whereabouts he applied the jackscrew to the shingle industry. It looks to me as though he went at it ruthlessly with an ax or butcher's cleaver, without taking into consideration the nature of the business, the men who were employed in it, and whether or not it was operated by a trust or by small concerns. I think his committee gave this question absolutely no thought. Why should they wipe out an industry that supports from 150,000 to 200,000 people in the United States? There is nobody who can show that in any way shingle manufacturing ever has been in the hands of a trust or monopoly.

Neither has there been any widespread demand for cheaper shingles. Taking the country over, I think shingles have been sold at a very reasonable rate. In the census of 1910 it was shown that the shingles in the State of Washington only brought an average of $1.81 a thousand, and I think that is a very reasonable price for shingles at the factory.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to go into any extended remarks on this question. Your minds are made up, but I want to say to you that some of these rates are coming back, and some of these things you are doing now will come back to plague you in the future. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in his report to the House when submitting this bill from the Ways and Means Committee, quoted from the Democratic platform and summarized the basic principles from which the committee worked in formulating this bill, as follows:

(1) The establishment of duties designed primarily to produce revenue and without thought of protection.

(2) The attainment of this end by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

Mr. Chairman, has the Democratic Ways and Means Committee in any sense of the word carried out the principles laid

down in these two propositions? I say "no." In article 1 they say:

The establishment of duties primarily to raise revenue for the Government.

Under this bill you wipe out all revenue to the Government from shingles. They were imported into this country in 1912, 508,445,000 shingles of a value of $1,194,113, which paid duty to the amount of $254,222. Under this bill you do not leave any tariff for revenue at all, but relieve Canada of this burden of a quarter of a million of dollars which that country has had to pay this Government for the use of our market. I presume that in thus relieving Canada you were applying the principle that "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

Your Ways and Means Committee does not carry out the idea or plan laid down in article 2 of their basic principles, for therein they say they expect to accomplish this purpose, "The raising of revenue to support the Government by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry." In the face of that declaration you turn around and deliberately place on the free list the shingle industry, which in my State alone employs more than 15,000 American laborers, placing them in direct competition with the Hindus and other oriental labor employed in shingle manufacturing in Canada.

Affidavits are now on file with your committee showing that fully 80 per cent of the Canadian labor is oriental. I suppose we are to judge by this action of the Ways and Means Committee that they do not regard the shingle business a legitimate business, and those who labor in our shingle factories not engaged in legitimate industry. "O consistency, thou art a jewel," but thou dwellest not with the Ways and Means Committee.

You say, in laying down your principles, article 1, "Revenue without thought of protection." You protect the goat industry of Texas by placing 10 per cent ad valorem on the animal and 20 per cent on the fleece. The great Democratic State of Texas raises more goats than all of the rest of the United States combined. Raising goats is a "legitimate industry," hence you did not wish to "injure" it. As Texas is to Angora goats and mohair the State of Washington is to the shingle industry. Washington makes more shingles than all of the rest of the United States, but evidently, as I have remarked before, shingle making is not a "legitimate industry," as you make them duty free. "Oh, upright judge." The same inconsistency permeates this entire joker. As you have treated shingles you have treated about all of the products of the North and West.

One of the farm products extensively raised in my State is oats, and at the present rate of duty on oats my State often has felt the effects of Canadian competition. You have reduced the rate of duty under this bill one-third on the grain and on its finished product—rolled oats, meal, and so forth—you have removed it entirely, so that they come in free, injuring not only the farmer's feed market, but destroying absolutely his milling market and obliterating the oatmeal miller and his employees' chances for remunerative business and labor. O, wise and far-seeing statesman, Canada should sincerely appreciate your generosity!

Mr. Chairman, in a speech I made on the floor of this House in the Sixty-second Congress, when we were discussing the reciprocity measure, I said the name was a misnomer, and that in my judgment it should be entitled "An act of discrimination against certain of our people in favor of Canada." I thought my judgment was good regarding the title of that bill, and I think the same title is even more pertinent to this one. We did receive a little something in return for our concessions to Canada under that ill-advised measure. On a basis of 1910 business we gave Canada about 70 per cent of the best trade, but did receive some 30 per cent (using 100 as a base) in return.

This Democratic Congress is giving Canada vastly more under this bill than it received under that and receives absolutely nothing in return.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in the House of Representatives, February 14, 1911, speaking on Canadian reciprocity, said:

Now, as to agricultural machinery and meat, I recognize this bill is not well balanced, when you put cattle on the free list and leave a prohibitive tax on meat, as you do in this bill.

Under the Canadian reciprocity bill cattle came in free, and beef paid 1¼ cents a pound duty, which would be about 10 per cent ad valorem for the average price of the beef carcass. "Not properly balanced?" The gentleman recognized it. I wonder if he thinks this bill is properly balanced.

It puts the meat, hide, hoofs, hair, and horns on the free list. The only thing that does not come in free is the life, and on that they charge 10 per cent ad valorem. Oh, yes; the gentleman has it properly balanced in Canada's favor and in the Canadian butcher's favor. What do Democratic Ways and Means Committees care for the American laborer in that line, anyway? All they care for is the "consumer." About all we have heard from that side of the House during this debate is the "consumer." They "expect to benefit the consumer."

Mr. Chairman, practically all of our people are both producers and consumers, all acting in one capacity or the other to one another, and if the Ways and Means Committee could realize that, they would be a little more careful in framing tariff measures, realizing that discrimination is bound ultimately to injure all, as all except the idle rich and the genus hobo are producer and consumer alike. We prosper as a whole, or vice versa, but it is not worth while to discourse on economics—that is the last thing, and probably the least thing, within the knowledge of the caucus that agreed to this measure. I do wish, though, that your committee would have shown as much real, genuine solicitude for the American consumer, which embraces all of our people, as you have for the foreign consumers.

Mr. Chairman, I hope when this measure reaches the other end of the Capitol it will receive most careful consideration, and, by amendment, be returned to us more evenly balanced, showing more desire for equality of opportunity than does this misfit, rough-hewn, discriminating, unpatriotic misnomer at the present time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate my new colleague from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] that in his first speech, fresh from the people, newly baptized in righteousness, with the words "Onward, Christian Soldiers," still upon his lips, he classifies himself as one of those speckled and spotted protectionists who wants protection for himself and free trade for everybody else. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

When this schedule was under consideration four years ago I stood here upon the floor of this House and pleaded with the Republicans that they should not reduce the tariff upon lumber; that they should not reduce the tariff upon coal; and that they increase the tariff upon shingles. They did reduce the tariff upon lumber; they did reduce it upon coal; they did increase it upon shingles, and some of my Republican colleagues were almost moved to tears at that time as they thought of the great hardship that would be worked upon the poor man who wanted to buy shingles; but they were comforted by the thought that lumber and coal would be cheaper.

Now, what has been the result in the State of Washington? You reduced the tariff upon lumber, and immediately the price of lumber went up and it has been up ever since. The Government lost the revenue, and no man in the State of Washington or anywhere in the United States has bought a foot of lumber for a cent less.

You reduced the tariff upon coal, and coal immediately went up, and in my country the railroads that owned both the mines and the railroads put the difference of the tariff in their pockets, and no consumer in the State of Washington has ever bought a bushel of coal for a cent less. The Government lost the revenue; that is all. You increased the tariff upon shingles, and what was the result? Immediately the price of shingles went down. Our mills began to run 12 months instead of 6 months in the year. That gave employment to American labor. That increased their wages over $3,000,000 each year, and since the Payne law went into effect the American workmen in the shingle mills of the State of Washington have received over $12,000,000 in wages that otherwise would have gone to the Chinamen and the Hindus in British Columbia, and no man in the United States has paid a penny more for a bale of shingles.

Now, they have a combination over in British Columbia. They restrict absolutely the output of the shingles there. They will permit only so many shingle mills to run in each community. It is an absolute trust, and if you strike down the shingle industry in the State of Washington it will only result in an increase in the price of shingles. The only result of this bill will be that our mills will again stand idle——

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

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I do not wish to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I must refuse to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Then do not comment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman ought not to object if I comment. He is my friend, and I do not want to say anything unkind about him——

Mr. PALMER. You ought not to comment on anybody that you will not yield to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to give me any instructions. He has strutted around here in his egotistical manner and berated everybody in this House, and it does not become him to be calling anybody to order, because if there is any man in this House that has never been accused of being a gentleman he is one of them.

Now, the result of putting shingles upon the free list will be that a large amount of our product will rot in the forests or be burned that would otherwise be manufactured into shingles. It will transfer the work and wages now given to Americans to the laborers in British Columbia, and it will not cheapen shingles to any consumer. There is no reason that can be given why any industry should be protected, or why there should be a duty on any industry that does not apply to the shingle industry in this State. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, having heard considerable from the lumbermen, whose remote blood relations we are told are extensively interested in this tariff on lumber, perhaps it is time that a word was said on behalf of the lumber purchasers of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While I expect, in view of the excoriation which I have just received from the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] I ought to be good and sit silent, I can not allow the opportunity to pass to say a word on behalf of the people of this country, who have been demanding free lumber in tones of a trumpet voice for many years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Washington has a personal grievance against me, but I am surprised that he should display it in the manner in which he has. His grievance grows out of the fact that I led a fight two years ago to cut out the mileage graft, of which he is one of the chief beneficiaries in the House, for he collects out of the Treasury for travel expense by way of mileage something like $4,000 in a single term of Congress. He has ever since been making remarks about me somewhat on the order that he has just made.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken as to the amount.

Mr. PALMER. In three sessions of a single Congress, I think the gentleman draws $1,400 each session, which would be about $4,000. What are these gentlemen complaining about? The gentleman from Washington asserts that if we put lumber on the free list the price of lumber will not go down. He points to something in the past to prove that. If that is true, how are you going to be hurt? Your cries in this House and the lumber dealers' loud protests are a sufficient indication that if we put lumber on the free list the price of lumber to the American home builder will go down, and that is the reason we are putting it on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] has asserted, and, by the way, I would like to commend to him and to his colleague from Washington, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, the example of those distinguished men whose names they bear, William J. Bryan and Senator LA FOLLETTE, who led the fight from coast to coast for free lumber for the American people. [Applause.] It would be better for them to follow the example of those great patriots than to look to the interests of their own districts alone.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I can not yield now. I repeat, it is as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] has said, if you do not do this thing you will have almost a revolution in America. In 1908 the Democratic Party went out to Denver, and in the very center of the great lumber district of the country they declared to the world that, in behalf of the man who wants to build his home on American soil and rear his children around his own hearthstone, they would remove the tax from lumber. Since that time in the House of Representatives the Democratic Party moved to recommit the Payne bill in order to put lumber on the free list. A revolution within your own party began when you opposed putting lumber on the free list. The demand is widespread and universal. Every party is committed to it, and gentlemen who sit on this side of the Chamber, excepting only those who confessed their interest in the matter, believe that we ought to do this thing, and we propose to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to correct that statement.

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

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I speak on this matter for the purchasers of lumber—the men who consume the lumber. The city of New York, which in part I represent on this floor, during the past 12 years has built over 163,000 buildings, costing over $2,200,000,000. We use more lumber in the city of New York than any three States in the Union put together. Now, when the Payne bill was under discussion four years ago I talked with the lumber merchants in New York as to the effect of free lumber on the price to the consumer. I must confess to having some little interest in the matter, for of the 163,000 houses constructed in New York City in the last 12 years I have built nearly 1,000. I use lumber in my business, and I made it a point to make some inquiries about it. I asked these lumber merchants, "If we reduce the duty on lumber, how much cheaper would the builders of New York City and those who wish to build homes be able to buy lumber?" They said not one penny. "The minute you put lumber on the free list, that moment the Canadian will raise his price." And what happened? We reduced the duty on rough lumber from $2 to $1.25 per thousand, and the next day the Canadian raised the price for his lumber, increasing it to the extent of the amount of duty reduced. I went home a week or two ago and again interviewed our lumber dealers. I told them Congress intended to put rough lumber on the free list and asked how much cheaper can we buy it this winter, and they replied "Not one cent." They informed me that they were making their contracts now with the Canadians to be delivered after the Underwood bill becomes a law, and that these contracts were based on an arrangement whereby the Canadian lumber dealer increased his price to the extent of one-half the duty and the New York merchant got the other half. So, Mr. Chairman, what is the consumer going to get out of it—those of us who buy lumber and cut it up and put it into buildings? I asked that question and was informed, "You are not going to get any advantage, and if you want to place an order for lumber such as you did last spring you can have it for just the same price and consider yourself lucky to get it."

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] then thinks the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] is slightly mistaken when he speaks so eloquently about what he is going to do for the home builders?

Mr. CALDER. I know whereof I speak when I say that the reduction of the duty on lumber is not going to make a bit of difference to the consumer.

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

Mr. CALDER. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I can not yield. It is going to make this difference: We are going to take out of the Treasury of the United States the revenue that the lumber producer in Canada puts into the Treasury for duty, and we are going to compel the people of this country in some other way to make that up.

Mr. FARR. Just as we lost the duty on coffee.

Mr. CALDER. Just as we lost the duty on coffee.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman now yield for one brief question?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. If the taking of the duty off lumber and putting lumber on the free list is not going to reduce the price, how will it reduce necessarily the wages to the workingman?

Mr. CALDER. I am not discussing it from that standpoint. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I am discussing the question solely and purely from the standpoint of the consumer.

Mr. HARDY. That was the question I wanted to ask the gentleman from Washington. It was a simple question.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the speech just made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER], if he be correct in his statements, suggests the necessity for some additional legislation to reach the Lumber Trust, which seems to be operating in New York. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will be quick and prompt.

Mr. CALDER. I will say to my friend that he will have to legislate in some way to reach the Lumber Trust in Canada.

Mr. HARDY. And in the United States.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Leaving that aside, Mr. Chairman, I believe that if there is an industry in this country, or a commodity in the entire list of all of the commodities produced in this country, that needs no protection, it is lumber. So far as my observation in my own State and in the adjacent State of Louisiana goes, it is absolutely true that there is no class of manufacturers in the country who are so uniformly prosperous as the producers of lumber. Some of the greatest fortunes in the Southwest—and if newspaper reports be true, one of the greatest fortunes in the entire country—have been made out of the natural increase in the value of that commodity, due to the constantly diminishing supply. Those are factors which will

be uninfluenced by the tariff. I do not know that I entirely agree with the suggestion made by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], that the abolition of tariff duty will reduce the price of lumber to the consumer, at least for any prolonged length of time, but it will have this effect: It will arrest for the time being and cause to come more slowly the inevitable advance in the price of lumber, due to the diminishing supply. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I was told the other day by a constituent of mine, who has made a considerable fortune out of lumber as a merchant and in manufacturing, as a producer of lumber, that within his knowledge 67 producers—I am not sure whether he said corporations or individuals, or both—in the Southwest would go out of business in less than five years because of an exhaustion of their supply. Now, lumber is not an annually renewable crop. We ought to do all we can to encourage its importation from other countries. We ought to conserve our own supply, because it is one of the products that is essential to the comfort and convenience of the human family. For that reason, if for no other, I would be in favor, as I have always been, although not committed at all to the doctrine of free trade, I would be in favor of removing all tariff from any products of lumber in any form, manufactured or unmanufactured. This manufacturer of lumber—this owner of timberlands—told me when I had my conversation with him that he was on his way to complete a purchase of additional lands involving an expenditure of $2,000,000, and that as a producer of lumber and as a lumber merchant he had no objection whatever to the removal of the duty. He said it would not interfere a particle with the general prosperity of the lumber trade of the country, and the reason I suggested, the diminishing supply, was that he said in his judgment it would cause a constantly increasing cost to the producer.

Why, Mr. Chairman, within the last few years I have known timberlands to sell in southeastern Texas at $15 an acre, which at that time was thought to be an exorbitant price, which since have changed hands at $75 an acre. My informant, who has prospered so well in the lumber trade, tells me that in his judgment investments in timberlands at current prices, swollen though they may be in comparison with the prices of less than five years ago, will yield as big a return in the way of dividends on the investment as any enterprise in which any man can engage. Why, sir, I believe that the lumber dealers are engaged in a conspiracy against the interests of consumers, in so far as a conspiracy may be made out from their evident purpose of maintaining a uniform standard of prices. It is notorious that there is only a show of competition. A prospective buyer gets the same prices from all the dealers to whom he applies. At least that is my information, and——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak upon this, unless there is a limitation——

The CHAIRMAN. There is a limitation. All debate upon this schedule is now closed. The Clerk will report the first amendment in the order in which amendments come in the bill, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 4, after the word "sawed," strike out "10 per cent ad valorem" and insert "15 per cent ad valorem."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 7, after the word "ad valorem," insert "shingles, 50 cents per thousand."

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington) there were—ayes 55, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

172. Paving posts, railroad ties, and telephone, trolley, electric-light, and telegraph poles of cedar or other woods, 10 per cent ad valorem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment of Mr. POWERS.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, after line 10, insert two new paragraphs, as follows:
"Par. 172¼. Rough lumber, $1.25 per 1,000 feet b. m.
"Par. 172¼. Railroad ties, 10 per cent ad valorem."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

177. Porch and window blinds, curtains, shades, or screens, any of the foregoing in chief value of bamboo, wood, straw, or compositions of wood, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; if stained, dyed, painted, printed, polished, grained, or creosoted, and baskets of like material, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 15, after the word "baskets," insert the words "in chief value."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that debate is closed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does that include the entire wood schedule?

The CHAIRMAN. The entire schedule.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE E—SUGAR, MOLASSES, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

179. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, seventy-one one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscopic test, twenty-six one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing not above 40 degrees, 15 per centum ad valorem; testing above 40 degrees and not above 56 degrees, 2¼ cents per gallon; testing above 56 degrees, 4⅛ cents per gallon; sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test: *Provided*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. FORDNEY. The amendment covers both of the paragraphs, but I would like to have it read now, if agreeable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out paragraphs 179 and 180, pages 47 and 48, and substitute the following:

"179. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, ninety-five one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and for each additional degree shown by the polariscope test, twenty-six one-thousandths of 1 per cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing above 40 degrees and not above 56 degrees, 3 cents per gallon; testing above 56 degrees, 6 cents per gallon; sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscope test: *Provided*, That every bag, barrel, or parcel in which sugar testing by the polariscope less than 99 degrees is packed shall be plainly branded by the manufacturer or refiner thereof with the name of such manufacturer or refiner, and the polariscope test of the sugar therein contained, accurately within one-half of 1 degree, and a failure to brand any such bag, barrel, or parcel as herein required shall be deemed and taken to be a misbranding of food within the meaning of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes.' And the requirements of this proviso shall not apply to any sugar shipped or delivered to a refiner to be refined before entering into consumption.

"180. Maple sugar and maple sirup, 4 cents per pound; glucose or grape sugar, 1½ cents per pound; sugar cane in its natural state or unmanufactured, 20 per centum ad valorem; sugar cane defecated, shredded, artificially dried, or which has been subjected to any manufacturing or other process, 50 per centum ad valorem."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I may withdraw the point of order, but the gentleman's amendment really covers the whole issue in this paragraph.

Mr. FORDNEY. It covers the whole schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It covers the whole schedule, because the other points in the schedule—saccharin and candy—are not really at issue. Would 30 minutes' debate on this paragraph be satisfactory?

Mr. PAYNE. I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. There will be several amendments offered to this schedule besides the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Probably most of the discussion will be disposed of on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, although I think there should possibly be some debate after that. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] intends to offer an amendment, and I may offer one myself.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] will offer an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there is about 50 minutes' debate desired on that side of the House, as indicated by the gentlemen standing up.

Mr. MANN. A good deal more than that.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman [Mr. UNDERWOOD] if it is not possible for me to get some time, whatever agreement will be made on this schedule. As the gentleman knows, I was not able to secure any time in general debate. I would like to get at least 20 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I must say to my friend that I have refused to let anybody violate the five-minute rule, and I can not do that.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, this is as important a schedule as there is in the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say this: If the gentlemen on that side of the House are willing to agree to two hours' debate, and allow the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and some one on this side to control the time, and divide it, you can make as long speeches as you desire. You can divide it to suit yourselves. But if we go on under the five-minute rule——

Mr. BROUSSARD. Would the gentleman allow me in his hour——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not surrender the time on our side of the House in opposition to the bill.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I take it that I am acting strictly within the rules of the party to which the gentleman and I belong. The fact that I am opposed to the schedule and acting strictly within the lines of the party ought to give me some consideration on this side. The gentlemen on the other side yielded some six hours to the gentlemen who belong to the Progressive Party and who are also opposed to the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman is opposed to the proposition, and ought to take his time from the opposition.

Mr. MANN. We granted time to certain gentlemen who announced in their speeches that they were supporting the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not recall that.

Mr. MANN. That is the fact, and we have always done that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to agree to two hours' debate, and the time to be equally divided, and I will give the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] 10 minutes of my time if that is agreed to.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] well knows that in this debate at present the minority side of the House need more time than the majority and should be granted more time. This is rather an important schedule to some districts of the country. I hope the gentleman will be willing to grant this side of the House at least an hour and a half.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinios [Mr. MANN] that on most of the schedules we did grant the minority more time. But this is a vital schedule, and our side of the House is entitled to be represented on it.

Mr. MANN. I do not care how much time you take, but I do not see how we can get along without a good deal of friction with less than that time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will make a proposition to the gentleman. I was going to give 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], who is on your side. If you will take care of the gentleman from Louisiana, I will agree to 2 hours' debate, 1 hour and a quarter to go to your side and the balance to this side.

Mr. MANN. I will be glad to do that if the gentleman from Alabama will give the gentleman from Louisiana 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will not stand on that proposition. I am willing that you shall have 5 minutes more of our time, so that you would take 1 hour and 20 minutes, and we will take 40 minutes.

Mr. MANN. And you are to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am about to yield you an hour and 20 minutes, and you are to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana. That is your own proposition.

Mr. MANN. No; that was 2 hours' time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I said we would have 2 hours, and we would give you an hour and a quarter, and you were to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana. You said you would not do that and suggested that I should yield only 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana. Now, I am going to give you the other 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I did not understand that. If you will give us an hour and a half, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. I hope the gentleman from Alabama will not be technical.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I took the gentleman from Illinois at his word.

Mr. MANN. Oh, do not say that. You did not do that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Illinois said he would be agreeable if I would give the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I will agree, if the gentleman from Alabama will give me 1 hour and 20 minutes, to give the gentleman from Louisiana 5 minutes if the gentleman from Alabama will also give him 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I had already agreed——

Mr. MANN. That is the only proposition I made at the best.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agreed to give the gentleman from Illinois one hour and a quarter, and the gentleman from Illinois proposed to give him five minutes. That is the best I can do.

Mr. MANN. I do not want to assume the task of dividing up the time with so many gentlemen desiring time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to leave it with the Chair to divide up the time.

Mr. MANN. That will be still worse. If one man controlled the time, some others would get less than five minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Oh, I don't know about that. I would be willing to risk the Chair. I think myself that he has been pretty fair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, if that proposition is not agreeable, we shall have to read.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it quite possible that a gentleman will use an hour's time or 50 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is quite a vital question. I think it should be agreeable if we gave all but 40 minutes to the other side.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is not the proposition.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this schedule be limited to 2 hours; 1 hour and 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], whoever is selected, and the remaining 40 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], at the end of which time all debate on the schedule shall cease.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And a vote shall be taken on the amendments that are pending.

The CHAIRMAN. And a vote shall be taken on the amendments pending.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That may be offered at any time.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that if that arrangement is made I would yield only 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, and would reduce the time among other gentlemen, probably to 3 or 4 or 5 minutes, for them to determine.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the 10 minutes I desire are coming to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I tried to take care of him; and if I can not, then I can not.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I think I should have some time. I have not had any time heretofore. I could talk 5 minutes in sections and be able to get in 20 minutes in four 5-minute talks.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would couple with his request the proposition that we should have 5 minutes of that time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman from Illinois can arrange that.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Illinois says that if you go to scaling down we might lose our 5 minutes at that rate.

Mr. MANN. I think some gentlemen would be entitled to 5 minutes. If that understanding goes through I will yield only 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD].

Mr. BROUSSARD. Can not the gentleman from Alabama yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wanted to arrange it, but I can not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the remainder of the schedule before I speak upon this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest that it is in order to read paragraph 180.

Mr. HAYES. Before that is done, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] has proposed an amendment which is, in effect, an amendment to two paragraphs. The Chair does not understand whether the gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that, as has been done before, two paragraphs be considered together.

Mr. FORDNEY. That was my intention.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to give unanimous consent that there may be a vote upon his amendment as a single amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] asks unanimous consent that the amendment which he has offered, and which has been read at the Clerk's desk, shall be considered as a whole, it being an amendment to two paragraphs—179 and 180. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Of course, that will not affect the offering of further amendments to the first of those two paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered; and the Clerk will read paragraph 180, with the understanding that opportunity will be given later to offer amendments to paragraph 179.

The Clerk read as follows:

180. Maple sugar and maple sirup, 3 cents per pound; glucose or grape sugar, 1½ cents per pound; sugar cane in its natural state, or unmanufactured, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] desire to offer his amendment now and have it pending?

Mr. HAYES. I am willing to do so. I will offer it now and have it pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 48, strike out the proviso in lines 11, 12, and 13.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] five minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I offer my amendment for more than one reason, but one particular reason for offering that amendment in its present form is this: When the free-sugar bill passed this House last year and went to the Senate this amendment was known as the Bristow-Lodge amendment to that bill, and when voted upon in the Senate it received every vote cast there with the exception of three, one Senator from Idaho and two Senators from Louisiana, who voted against the bill because they did not believe in any reduction of the duty on sugar.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] frankly and openly stated the other evening in this committee that he believed if the rate of duty proposed in this bill is put into effect at the end of three years the sugar industry of the Southern States—Louisiana and Texas—must die, must go out of existence. Gentlemen, I want to say to you that before the Ways and Means Committee and before the investigating committee on sugar last year—the so-called Hardwick committee—there was not one man, woman, or child who appeared in the interest of any lower rates of duty, or free sugar, with the single exception of importers or the manufacturers of refined sugar who import raw sugar.

The gentleman has said that he is going to put lumber upon the free list for the masses of the people. Not a single soul has been present asking for what he proposes either in lumber or in sugar, but all admit that if sugar goes upon the free list your domestic cane industry in this country must die and the beet-sugar industry of this country will either be crushed or greatly injured. All admit that, and yet to-day you know and I know that the reason for low prices of sugar in this country is because of the keen competition between the domestic manufacturers of sugar, and when our domestic sugar goes off the market—which is about this time of the year or a few days later—the price of sugar generally goes skyward. Then it is furnished to the consumers by the great sugar-refining companies.

I am going to give you this statement for what it is worth: A Member of the House only yesterday told me that he saw in a newspaper—I did not see the article—that in a short time a president of the American Sugar Refining Co. will be elected. It has been stated on the floor of this House that the only independent manufacturer of refined sugar is the Federal Sugar Co., of which Mr. August Spreckels is president. That gentleman appeared before the Hardwick Committee and the Ways and Means Committee asking for free sugar. The newspaper report is to the effect that this gentleman, Mr. August Spreckels, is about to be elected president of the American Sugar Refining Co. That means a merging of the Federal Sugar Co. with the American Sugar Refining Co., if that statement is correct, thus leaving the consumers of sugar in this country—after this bill goes into effect and the domestic sugar industry is crushed—absolutely in the grasp of the American Sugar Refining Co. and the Arbuckle Bros.' Sugar Refining Co., which two companies refine 92 per cent of all the refined sugar made in this country, exclusive of the domestic industry. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I appeal to you, gentlemen, not for this industry alone but for the consumers of this country. Do not put the consumers of sugar in this country absolutely in the hands of what you admit is a monopoly—the great sugar refining companies of this country, three in number to-day, two if the Federal merges into the American, with August Spreckels at the head of the sugar refining company in New York. As I stated, he is in New York and his brother, Rudolph Spreckels, is on the Pacific coast, and between the two the industry will perish. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there are no beet-sugar factories in the State which I have the honor to represent. We have hoped, however, and have had good ground to hope, that eventually, with the growth and development of this great industry, we would have many factories. But I have a duty to perform here to-day somewhat unusual in its character. The great State of Montana, lying north of Wyoming, has beet-sugar factories. It has localities of wide extent which a prominent Democrat in the State told me the other day would suffer injury from which they would not and could not recover in a decade if this bill passed. That State has no one on this floor who will speak for that great industry. To the south lies the imperial Commonwealth of Colorado. Within her borders are 17 beet-sugar factories. Last year there was paid to her farmers for sugar beets between twelve and fifteen millions of dollars. She has no one here who will speak for her people depending on this mighty and growing industry.

One of the gentlemen hailing from that State will, I imagine, a little later tell you that Colorado is willing to dismantle her 17 sugar factories; that she is willing to have her beet fields sown with ragweed or any old crop, provided he can retain his regularity as a Democrat.

He will tell you that he told the people of Colorado that he would vote for free sugar. He is unsophisticated enough to imagine that his position in the matter of the duty on sugar had any effect whatever on the fact of his being here as a minority Representative of that great Commonwealth. He might have been singing any kind of a song, in the frame of mind that the people of Colorado were in last year, with the Republicans divided squarely in two, and have been elected. Dismantle her factories, destroy one of the most important and valuable crops of her fertile acres, reduce the income of the population of her beautiful sugar-growing sections, and the gentleman will hear from his constituents in no uncertain way.

The gentleman from Alabama has said that in the main this bill has been constructed with the use of a jackscrew and not an ax. Here is a case of dynamiting. Here is a case of confiscation. The sugar factories north and south represent an investment of over a hundred million dollars. These will be actually confiscated. Sixty to sixty-five millions of dollars annually are paid to the farmers of the country for beets and cane, and no man whose opinion is worth paying any attention to, here or elsewhere, can deny the fact that when sugar goes on the free list the sugar industry, beet and cane, is destroyed under the American flag.

There are men on that side honest enough—and I hope in this debate they will say what they have said in private and sometimes almost said in public—that this mighty industry is an expensive luxury and they are willing to destroy it because in their opinion it is in the interest of the American people.

If I was on that side of the aisle and intended to vote for this bill that is the position I would take, for it is the only logical, tenable position in connection with the proposition contained in this bill to destroy the American sugar industry.

What is going to happen is that, after our beet fields no longer produce sugar beets, after our factory wheels cease to turn, the lawbreaking Sugar Trust at home, and foreign combines, will have the American people by the throat and raise the price of sugar higher than it has been for years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I do not at this time desire to enter into any extended discussion of this schedule. A few days ago I gave at some length my reasons for believing that the tariff on sugar ought not to be reduced, much less should sugar be placed on the free list. I have offered an amendment which is now pending and which will permit this House to vote directly on the question whether or not it is in favor of putting sugar on the free list.

I desire at this time, Mr. Chairman, to ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment in order that the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the minority leader, may offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCKELLAR). The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to be allowed to withdraw his amendment which he has offered on the sugar schedule. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is in order to offer an amendment at this time. There is an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will state, if the gentleman will permit me, that my understanding of the agreement is that these amendments might be considered as pending and then voted on afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair was not present when the agreement was made.

Mr. SHERLEY. That was my understanding, that the amendments could be offered during the debate.

Mr. MANN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to perfect the paragraph:

Strike out of lines 11, 12, and 13, page 48, the following language: "That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has offered an amendment, which will be considered pending.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH].

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure, in the discussion of the tariff question, to be able to quote the opinion of some one of the opposite political faith. It is my good fortune at this time to be able to give to you the views of a leading Democratic national committeeman on the subject of sugar. I quote from what Col. Robert Ewing, Democratic national committeeman of the State of Louisiana and owner of the New Orleans States, is reported as having said in the Washington Post February 26, 1913:

There are two industries in Louisiana on which we need protection—sugar and rice. I am a tariff-for-revenue Democrat and have never been any other kind of a Democrat. Sugar and rice must be protected, however, in order that these industries may survive and that we may get revenue from them. Sugar is the only necessary of life, the only staple commodity, that has fallen in price, notwithstanding the duty.

I invite attention now to the next few words that Col. Ewing said:

Free sugar would not mean any material benefit to the consumer. The price might fall for a short time, but it would be only a matter of months when the refiners would put the price back where it was.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell my Democratic friends when sugar will fall in price, and that will be after the 1st day of May, 1916, if this bill becomes a law. If the refiners have any gratitude in their souls to the Democratic Party they will put the price down from that time until after the November election of 1916. To continue what Col. Ewing said:

In other words, free sugar would mean merely that the Government would be playing into the hands of a trust.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, if he is correctly quoted, the senior Senator from the State of Louisiana, in this morning's Washington Post, confirms every word that I have quoted as coming from Col. Ewing.

Last Saturday night, in this Chamber, the able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] expressed his views on the subject of sugar, and in the course of his remarks said that in 20 years either under this pending bill or under the present law the industry would be wiped out in Louisiana.

In Michigan, as in many other States, we have millions of dollars invested in factories. The farmers have hundreds of thousands of dollars in machinery, and the laboring men, as well as women, are paid splendid wages for the work they do in the sugar fields in connection with the sugar-beet industry of our State. I have no hesitation in saying that the prophecy which the gentleman from Georgia made with reference to Louisiana will be true with reference to the sugar-beet industries of Michigan, Colorado, Utah, and other States. But it will only be in keeping with every other bit of tariff-for-revenue and free-trade legislation that has ever been written upon the statute books since the birth of this Republic. It is not possible for one of you gentlemen to point to any free-trade or tariff-for-revenue legislation in this country under which we have not had results like we had in 1837, in 1857, between 1893 and 1897, and I am frank to say to-day that I would like to have somebody give to the country some consolation and comfort that we can hope that this bill will be an exception to every other tariff for revenue or free trade piece of legislation that has been written on the statute books. [Applause on the Republican side.]

"THORNTON FREE-SUGAR FOE—LOUISIANA SENATOR FIRST DEMOCRAT TO ATTACK PROPOSED SCHEDULE—ASSERTS CUT WOULD PLACE CONTROL OF INDUSTRY IN HANDS OF MONOPOLY OF REFINERS.

"The first outspoken attack on the Democratic tariff bill by a Democrat came yesterday, when Senator THORNTON, of Louisiana, in a public statement scored the sugar schedule. The Louisiana Senator said the sugar schedule was bound to defeat the one object which has been claimed by President Wilson and Leader UNDERWOOD as the primary purpose of the proposed legislation. Senator THORNTON said:

"'I am in thorough accord with the view expressed by President Wilson that a tariff bill should be so framed as to encourage competition and prevent monopoly. But the pending tariff bill, in so far as it concerns sugar, will have just the opposite effect. The provision for free sugar, without doubt, will put the entire control of the sugar industry of the United States in the hands of the big refiners. At the present time they are meeting with very effective competition from the domestic sugar industry. Its effect has been, and now is, to cheapen the cost of sugar to the consumer.

"'The admissions of the refiners themselves under examination before various congressional committees show that for several years they have been annoyed and embarrassed by the rapid growth of this competition, which cuts into the profits from the operation of their refineries for several months each year. They have declared that without tariff they have nothing to fear from the competition of foreign refiners. They are seeking the removal of the only competition from which they have anything to fear.

"'In view of this situation, it is easy to see that free sugar will result only in the destruction of competition and the opening of the way to the establishment of a burdensome and oppressive monopoly, able to impose its will upon the public and to exact higher prices from the consumer.'"

I will also append the following letter:

WAIALEE, HAWAII, *April 10, 1913.*

Hon. SAMUEL W. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Several years ago you very kindly used your influence to try to secure for me the appointment of collector of customs at the port of Honolulu, so that I now take the liberty of asking you to give me another lift. This is not for myself, but for all the people of Hawaii. If you can possibly do so, I should like to ask you to vote against the reduction of the tariff upon sugar, as such reduction will surely spell the ruin of this Territory. The revenue received from the tax upon the sugar industry in Hawaii amounts to 55 per cent of all the revenues. If this industry is crippled, where shall we turn for revenue? A great many will say that we must turn to other crops, but this is impossible on account of the climate, soil, and the countless insect pests which are able to live through the entire year, as we have no cold weather to exterminate them.

Hoping that you may be able to help us, I remain,

Yours, respectfully,

H. M. TUCKER.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, the peculiar climatic conditions of California make that Commonwealth a State of wonderful and diversified interests. If there is any industry in that great State that will not be injuriously affected if this bill goes into effect, I have failed to find it.

One of the chief industries of California is the beet-sugar industry. We have in that State 13 beet-sugar factories and are to-day the chief beet-sugar producing State in the Union. I want to present a few figures in order to impress upon this House the importance of this great industry to the State I in part represent. We paid last year for beets to the farmers $6,701,582. We paid for labor in the factories and fields over $3,900,000. We paid for fuel oil $500,000. We paid for bags $391,000 and for other supplies $542,000, making the total expenditures due to this industry in the State of California over $14,100,000. The number of acres harvested is 112,000. The tons of sugar beets grown are 1,037,000. The tons of sugar produced are 168,000 and the total investment in factory, land, and equipment in the State of California is over $19,904,823. This is but one of the great industries of California that is going to be disastrously affected by the passage of this law. In the beet-sugar industry alone we employ in California 25,000 men, and it can readily be appreciated that with the expenditure of this vast sum of money and the employment of this number of men that to strike down this industry and close these 13 factories you inflict a severe blow upon California. No doubt the rising generation in California

do not recall the effects of the Wilson law upon the industries of the State, but if this bill is enacted as at present written they will have a bitter experience that will not so soon be forgotten. Not only have we an interest in the beet-sugar industry in our own State but we are interested in the cane-sugar industry of the Hawaiian Islands. We sympathize with those people. The Hawaiian Islands are good customers of California and the United States. The total value of domestic merchandise shipped to Hawaii from the mainland for the 12 months ending December, 1912, was $28,029,240. The total for the same period, 1911, was $21,917,747. The total for the same period, 1910, was $21,637,751. Hawaii's products sold to the United States mainland increased approximately 5½ per cent from 1911 to 1912. Hawaii's purchases from the United States mainland increased approximately 30 per cent from 1911 to 1912. Strike down this industry in Hawaii and this entire country will suffer. Destroy the beet-sugar industry and you play into the hands of the Sugar Trust and do not benefit the American consumer. I shall support the amendment which has been offered to restore the rates upon sugar and to strike out the proviso for free sugar in three years. While I realize that this amendment will not be adopted because of the fact that the majority are bound and gagged by caucus rule, I am glad to go on record. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I also come from one of the great beet-sugar producing States of this Union. There is more beet sugar produced in my district, I believe, than in any other district in that State. There is more beet sugar produced in my city than in any city in the United States, and I believe, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this committee, that the effect of this tariff will be to absolutely throttle and destroy this great industry. The Democratic Party, as represented by the membership in this House, proposes not a reduction of the tariff for the purpose of placing the producer of this country on a basis of competition with those abroad, but they propose to enact into law a measure that will absolutely annihilate an industry that represents an investment of more than $100,000,000 in this country, claiming that any industry that can not compete in the open market with a like industry abroad without the benefit of the protective tariff is an illegitimate industry and should be destroyed. Much has been said both for and against this theory in this House in the past week, and I say to you of the majority that when the American farmers and the American laborers realize the fact that you propose to place them upon an absolute basis of equality with the Asiatic and European farmers and laborers, they will have an answer to that argument that will be most displeasing to you. It is a well-known fact, Mr. Chairman, that at such seasons when the beet sugar is not on the market that the great Refiners' Trust of this country absolutely monopolizes the market and fixes the price of sugar. It is also a well-known fact that at such times the price of this commodity is much higher, and I say to you, gentlemen, that if this bill becomes a law, and it will, and if the production of sugar in this country ceases, and it will, that the people of this country will be at the absolute mercy of this great Refiners' Trust. Within the past two years in my home city I have paid 9 cents a pound for granulated sugar. That was at a time when the beet sugar was not on the market.

The excuse offered for the rise in the price of sugar at that time of more than 2 cents was that there was a rumor of a shortage in the beet crop of Germany. Now, gentlemen, there are produced in this country 625,000 tons of sugar annually by the beet-sugar producers. There are something like 350,000 tons of cane sugar produced in this country, and I say to you, gentlemen, that if a mere rumor of a shortage of a crop in Germany would produce a rise in that price of some 2 cents per pound, what rise, in God's name, would an actual shortage of nearly 1,000,000 tons of sugar create?

Gentlemen, there is one schedule in this bill that I would like to vote for. I would like to vote for the income-tax measure, but, coupled as it is with a measure that strikes at the very foundation of all our industrial institutions, I can not support it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question? I do not believe his time has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield my time back to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Was there any time left?

The CHAIRMAN. One minute.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to know why the falling off per acre in the production of beets in your State was so great last year?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I do, sir.

Mr. FOWLER. I see you produced only 6.75 tons per acre last year. I see that California produced 9.1.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I can answer the gentleman. It was due to the climatic conditions in the State. For the past two years the beet-sugar producers in the State of Michigan have lost money on account of having so much rain. In many instances it has been impossible for the farmers to get into their fields to harvest their crops, owing to the wet condition of the ground. I would ask the gentleman to go back further and look at the statistics.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it not true that the forces that make sugar are lacking to an extent, as they are in other States, and prevent you from raising beet sugar?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Absolutely not. The gentleman can find that I am right if he will go back and look at the statistics.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] 10 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has taken occasion to refer to me and my views on the sugar tariff. I appreciate it is just a trifle difficult for the gentleman from Wyoming to believe, in view of the fact that his State has tolerated the representation it has had for the last 10 or 12 years, that the people of the West give intelligent consideration to political problems. The gentleman complains that Colorado has no one on this floor to protest against the removal of the tariff on sugar. The reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is because the people of Colorado at the last election voted to instruct their Representatives to remove the tariff on sugar, and they voted in that way after a most thorough and exhaustive discussion of the question, and they voted that way because they were convinced that the removal of the tariff on sugar would not destroy the beet-sugar industry in that State or in any other State where God Almighty intended that men should raise sugar beets. And I submit that the people of Colorado, who have 17 sugar factories in operation, are better judges of the effect of the removal of the tariff on that great industry than is the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who has no sugar factory within the boundaries of his State.

I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he has no sugar factory there, not because the people of Wyoming can not raise sugar beets, because in the irrigated sections of Wyoming they can raise sugar beets of as good a quality as they can in the irrigated sections of Colorado or Utah or Idaho, but you have no sugar factories in Wyoming because the Sugar Trust will not permit you to erect sugar factories in Wyoming. Evidently the Sugar Trust has felt that it could depend upon the vote of the gentleman from Wyoming without offering anything to the people in that State.

The reason that the people of Colorado are willing that this sugar tariff should be removed is because they want to save the beet-sugar industry from the malign influence of the Sugar Trust. Let us trace the story of the Sugar Trust's interest in beet-sugar factories.

Ten years ago, during the discussion of the Cuban reciprocity bill, the representatives of the beet-sugar interests came before Congress and declared that if you gave them 10 years more of protection the industry would be able to stand on its own legs. We have given them 10 years more of protection and, as a matter of fact, the industry is able to stand on its own legs. About 10 years ago the men who were then, and are now, in control of the beet-sugar industry in the Western States went down to New York and met with Mr. Havemeyer, of the Sugar Trust, and entered into a deal with him by which they sold to him the control of the beet-sugar industry in this country.

Mr. Morey, the president of the Great Western Sugar Co., and Mr. Boettcher, of the same concern, and a number of other sugar magnates, including Eccles, of Utah, have so testified in the case of the United States against the American Sugar Refining Co. They have told how they went down there; they have told of the price they got for a controlling interest in the stock; and then they have confessed that they entered into an arrangement with Mr. Havemeyer by which they became his western representatives. And the correspondence submitted in that hearing proves that Mr. Morey and Mr. Boettcher and the others were hired at salaries ranging from $10,000 to $15,000 a year to go back to the West and see to it that new sugar factories were not established there.

The correspondence is complete and conclusive. These men were the hired spies of the Sugar Trust. Their own letters prove that they went from point to point where they heard that sugar factories were about to be established, and that they used all their influence to prevent the development of the sugar industry.

When they found that the sentiment of a community was so strong that the people themselves were about to erect beet factories they went in and endeavored to secure the control of the majority of the stock, and in most instances they did secure the control of the majority of the stock.

As late as 12 or 18 months ago an attempt was made in the town of Durango, in the southwestern corner of my State, to establish a sugar factory. The farmers came forward and pledged the necessary acreage. The business men pledged generous subscriptions. A banker in that town undertook to finance the factory, and then the whole deal was called off. According to the sworn testimony which appears in the case of the United States against the American Sugar Refining Co., it appears that the banker was called up by the representative of the Sugar Trust and told to abandon the project. The trust's hired man simply put the screws on the Durango financial interests and prevented the establishment of this factory, which meant so much to southwestern Colorado.

That is only one of many instances. And, my friends, as a result of these experiences the people of Colorado and, I believe, the people throughout all that intermountain country, have come to the conclusion that the only way to put the beet-sugar industry on its feet is to demonstrate that it is a legitimate industry, that it can exist without the protection of a tariff, and that it will return to investors a fair rate of interest upon the investment. And that fact can be demonstrated.

We can raise in Colorado and in Utah and in Idaho and in most of those Western States as many pounds of sugar beets to the acre as can be raised anywhere, and they will average as high a percentage of saccharine matter as beets grown in any country on the face of the globe.

Our farmers get more for these high-grade beets than do the farmers of Germany. If our factories get their beets for as low a price as do the German factories why should not they be able to produce sugar at as low a figure? I know of no reason, and gentlemen have submitted no reason.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. What, in your opinion, will be the effect of this change in the law placing sugar on the free list as to the price in the market to the consumer?

Mr. KEATING. The price to the consumer will drop the full amount of the tariff at once. Out of all this discussion concerning sugar one fact stands out, so that no man can question its accuracy, and that fact is that the tariff is added to the price of sugar and that the American consumer pays $115,000,000 more a year for his sugar than he would if the tariff were not added.

The other day the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] questioned my statement that there were no independent beet-sugar factories in this country, that there was an understanding or trade arrangement or selling arrangement—whatever you want to call it—by which the price of sugar was fixed in every town in this country.

He said that was not true, and I want to submit to him what I consider to be splendid authority, the statement of a beet-sugar man, R. A. Wagner, the president of the Wisconsin Sugar Co. Mr. Wagner also says that my statement is not true, and yet I want to read you his letter and submit it as absolute evidence that my statement is true. He says:

> The price of sugar is higher in Colorado because over three-quarters of the sugar used in this country is imported and refined at the seaboard and must pay rail freight to Colorado.

Think of that statement, when there is not a pound of sugar imported into Colorado, but all that is used there is produced within the State. Why, we export five or six times as much as we use in the State. Yet he says that every pound must pay rail freight to Colorado. Continuing, he says:

> In other words, the price is based on the cost of foreign sugar f. o. b. our seaboard, plus freight to point of consumption. The Colorado sugar producers naturally meet these conditions, and in order to get the business make their quotation a few points lower.

And that is true in every town in the United States. The trust, in determining how much it will charge the American people for refined sugar, ascertains first of all the cost of raw sugar at New York. Then it adds the tariff. Then it adds the cost of refining. Then it adds to that a profit, and then it adds to that the cost of the freight from New York to the point where the sugar is consumed, without regard to where the sugar may be produced. And, as I stated on the floor of this House the other day, the result is that down in Arizona, in the shadow of a sugar factory, where they are producing many times the amount of sugar consumed in the State, the people of Arizona pay $1.34 per hundred pounds freight for the sugar that never saw a box car, in addition to the tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, under section 179 of this bill sugar, both raw and refined, is proposed to be put upon the free list at the end of three years. I have not risen to discuss the effect of the removal of the duty upon the sugar industry of the country for two reasons: First, it would not do much good, and, second, because my colleagues from Michigan and elsewhere have done and will further do so. But what I have risen to inquire about, in good faith and for information, is the effect of the provisions of the antidumping clause in this bill upon this section now under consideration.

As I understand it, practically all the sugar-producing countries of Europe levy an internal-revenue tax upon sugar for home consumption. When the manufacturer of sugar in Germany or any other European country where this internal-revenue tax is imposed invoices his sugar to the wholesaler for local consumption, of course such invoice includes the cost of his raw material, his labor cost, any government charges, organization charges, and profits. Necessarily such price will include any internal-revenue tax levied in those countries on local consumption. Now, the purpose of this antidumping clause, as I understand it, is to prevent foreign countries from selling in our markets cheaper than they sell to their own people. What I want to know is, under the provisions of this antidumping clause, how the sugar refiners of Europe are going to sell in our markets cheaper than they sell at home, and how are we to get cheaper sugar when the price of sugar there for home consumption is equal to or greater than the price of sugar to our consumers here at the present time? If they do sell sugar cheaper here than at home, the antidumping provision puts a 15 per cent duty upon the sugar so imported into the United States. And here is the secret of the whole business as it looks to me: This provision, coupled with the antidumping clause, enables the American refiner to get free raw sugar from Cuba and protects him from the sugar refiner of Europe by a 15 per cent duty.

Mr. HARDWICK rose.

Mr. MANN. Let the gentleman from Georgia answer in his own time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Georgia answer in his own time? That is the only question I have to ask. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood that the time which was not consumed would not be charged to either of us.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] in his demonstration of the reason that there were not more beet-sugar factories established in the State of Colorado or in Wyoming, it seemed to me that he had convinced me that the sugar-refining interests did not want the sugar factories and that at the present time they are doing what they can to keep them down. That is what I understand was the gentleman's argument. I understand he is about to vote for this bill, and thereby is going to try to strike a terrific blow at the sugar-refining interests. My friends, in striking that blow you are simply putting out of business all of the beet-sugar factories, and the sugar-refining people, instead of thinking that you have struck a terrific blow at them, will simply think that you have given them a slap on the wrist, or it may be a love pat.

The distinguished and affable gentleman from Alabama said that the duties were being reduced with a jack, and as we notice you are letting the sugar interests down with two bumps instead of one, and we are to wait three years to see how hard the last bump will be. As I recollect, in one county of my district—and I believe I have a right to speak here on behalf of the interests of my people—in one county, Huron, there were 10 years ago 6,000 tons a year of sugar beets produced. Now there are better than 96,000 tons a year, and at the same time the valuation of the farm lands has doubled, indicating that the farmer does get some benefit from protection. As I remember that and think of the disaster that is impending over these farmers in that county, it occurs to me that the jack that was instrumental in the reduction of the tariff in this bill was not the jackscrew that the gentleman has referred to, but that guardian angel of the Democratic Party, the blundering jackass. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to presume to discuss further this bill, but I believe it will be proper here in the midst of all these discussions, at least some of them from men

who are assuming their statistics, or at least picking them up out of dusty volumes, that it would only be fair to call to the witness stand for a minute one of the men who has got his living out of the business, trying to make something for himself and his family, and also to afford a market for the manufactures of the cities. Hence, I am going to read this letter from a farmer who is engaged in the production of sugar beets:

CROSWELL, MICH., *April 26, 1913.*

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
Representative Seventh District, Michigan.

DEAR SIR: I earnestly beg of you to do all in your power to prevent the removal of duty from sugar. I think I express the sentiments of all the farmers of this beet-growing district.

On Friday, the 18th instant, the report was started that the Croswell plant of the Michigan Sugar Co. had turned down all contracts and was not going to operate the coming campaign. Well, you ought to have heard the "holler" that the farmers and the residents of Croswell put up until they found the report was not true.

Whenever two or more farmers met the question was, "What can we put in to take the place of sugar beets?" And I say nothing will take the place of sugar beets on Michigan farms to-day, on account of the intensive cultivation and deep-rooting system of the sugar beets, as they bring up fertility from the soil that we would get in no other way. It is the indirect benefit we get from the sugar beet that pays us more than direct benefit. We will take my own farm here for example.

When I bought this farm 10 years ago I harvested from 17 to 30 bushels of oats and about 1 ton of hay per acre. Now, after growing sugar beets for 7 years, I get from 50 to 60 bushels of oats and 2½ tons of hay, and from a worn-out farm I have built up a farm as good as any in Sanilac County.

I raise from 12 to 18 acres of beets on my 80-acre farm every year, and it is getting richer all the time—thanks to sugar beets.

As a cash-money crop the beets are ahead of any other crop we can grow. Of course, it costs more to grow an acre of beets than any other crop, but we get paid for it in the benefit it does our land. As for growing them for less per acre than we are getting now, I know there is not a farmer in this neighborhood that would contract for an acre. It costs us $20 per acre to get the hand labor done. This labor is done by the foreigners, and we are making good citizens and good farmers out of these foreigners; in fact, four of the families I have had in the past seven years have bought farms within 2 miles of my farm.

You gentlemen in the city are worrying about your foreign population. Let them go out into the country and help produce what you in the city want to eat.

The letter continues:

Our land has increased in value, in fertility, and we have made good citizens out of these foreigners, and it is all through sugar beets. When the farmer prospers everybody else prospers.

Thanking you in advance for anything you can do to help the farmer, I remain,

Yours, very truly, E. C. WESTBROOK,
Croswell, Sanilac County, Mich.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, by the courtesy of Members on this side of the House I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that, acting strictly within the rules of my own party, formulated and adopted in a Democratic caucus, I should have obtained from the Democratic leader time to present the case of the Democratic constituency that I represent here. I have sought in vain to get recognition which I think I am entitled to receive in a Democratic House. Failing in that, I want to express my appreciation of the courtesy extended to me by the leader of the Republican Party in permitting the constituency which I represent—which was 90 per cent in the last election in the votes of that district—in affording me an opportunity to present their case.

I have no desire to be an obstructionist or to criticize the leader of the Democratic Party, but it seems to me that one or the other thing ought to be done. If I come strictly within the rules of my party, opposing the measure as I do oppose it, I ought to get time from the leader of my own party. [Applause on the Republican side.] And if I can not get the time from him I ought to be excluded from the Democratic caucus, that the people at home may know that the Democratic leadership of this House, without personal reflection on the gentleman who now is here in control of the Democratic forces, may know whether they have friends here in their own party or whether they must appeal to the leaders of the other party in order to secure time to present their cause. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am not going to deal with the subject at length. My personal relations with the gentleman who occupies the leadership of my party on the floor are very agreeable, and in my estimation he stands as high as does any other Member in this House [applause]; but I do desire to express in behalf of my constituents the thought that at least within the ranks of their party they should be able to get as frank a recognition as they get from the party for which they do not vote.

My time is so limited that I will not deal with that very much, but I make this acknowledgment to the gentleman leading the forces of the minority upon this floor, in order that he may understand not only my appreciation of the courtesy which he has extended to me, but the appreciation of the people whom I represent on this floor.

I want to get to the meat of this subject. I have long contended in this House that the destruction of the domestic sugar industry in this country will lead us back into conditions which existed long ago, when there was no domestic industry, and permit the refiners operating along the coast of the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf, and the Pacific to dominate the American sugar market. I believe in the little time allotted to me I can demonstrate that the efforts of the gentlemen who are now using their means, their money, and efforts to secure, not free sugar, as some claim, but to secure very low duties, in order that they may, with the destruction of domestic sugar, dominate the American market and raise the price of sugar to the American consumer.

A man working for wages in this city brought me this morning this card which I hold in my hand. He got it from a package of sugar of 20 pounds, refined from cane sugar, coming from the Tropics, which he bought in the market on yesterday for 4½ cents a pound. That sugar was refined by the Spreckels Refining Co., which my friend from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] will at once recognize is the employer of Mr. Lowry, the man who has taken charge of the propaganda for free sugar, and it reads as follows:

Tariff on sugar is an advantage to the Sugar Trust and its allies only. With free raw sugar this sugar would cost you about 2 cents per pound less. Urge your Congressman to insist on the removal of the tariff on sugar.

This card was in a package of 20 pounds of sugar bought by this man, and he brought the card to me. He paid 4½ cents a pound for the sugar only yesterday. Now, let us look the facts squarely in the face. I once before took the position in the House that this refiner, including what he calls the Sugar Trust, which is generally accepted to mean the American Sugar Refinery, the Arbuckles and himself, were in alliance not to put sugar on the free list, but to so reduce the duty as to put the beet-sugar people in the West out of business, and also the sugar-cane people in Louisiana and Texas out of business, in order that together they might dominate the market. Their efforts have been directed, first, to control the beet production in the West by controlling the factories in the West. They have never worried about us. These refiners have robbed us of Louisiana, so far back that no man's memory runneth to the contrary.

They saw the beet industry developing in the West absorbing a large proportion of the sugar being supplied to the American people, and my friend from Colorado [Mr. KEATING], I believe, will agree with me, and they started first by trying to absorb a majority of the stock in the beet industry in the West. They failed in that. The industry developed too fast. In 10 years there was 1,500 per cent of production increase, and they had to abandon that plan of controlling the domestic sugar output. Then they adopted another plan—that of discouraging men from putting money into the development of the sugar industry in the West, in order that they might stop the increased production of sugar in continental United States. They failed in that. Then they appealed to Congress, not to put sugar on the free list, but to reduce the duty on sugar to the extent of destroying the industry, in order that they might again absorb the control of the American market and then lift the price of sugar to the consumer as best suited them. This card comes from Mr. Lowry. It is issued by his employer. It is printed in the same way that numerous articles you have received in your mail, each and every one of you, are printed. I have here a document published by him on the 12th day of April, this year, only a few days ago. In that document at the head of it, as has appeared on every recent document issued by him, including the two that came this morning, he does not advocate free sugar as appears upon this card, but a duty of 0.624 cent; but he advocates and he speaks for Spreckels, because the evidence is before at least three committees of the Congress—the Hardwick, the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and the Finance Committee of the Senate last year—that every bit of the expense incurred in the propaganda which he is conducting is paid out of the pocket of Spreckels, who claims, according to him, to be fighting the Sugar Trust. Mr. Atkins, the vice president of the American Sugar Refining Co., speaking before the Committee on Ways and Means the other day, said he did not want free sugar, but wanted to reduce the rates of duty. The Arbuckles took the same position before the Ways and Means Committee in my presence here recently.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Arbuckles were for free sugar.

Mr. BROUSSARD. They are not, any more than Spreckels is; and right at the head of every document that you receive now that calls for free sugar, as on this card, you will see printed:

The rate we propose, 0.624 cent per pound; raw sugar, 96 test, 0.60 cent per pound.

Sixty one-hundredths cent per pound means that every domestic refiner in this country, every domestic producer in this country, must go out of business. What follows? Domination of the American sugar market by the refiners.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 36 minutes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. May I get 10 minutes more?

Mr. MANN. I will yield the gentleman 10 minutes more in view of his very interesting statement and the courtesy of some Members here. [Applause.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. I thank the gentleman very much; 0.624 puts the domestic producer out of business, the beet and the sugar men in the West and South, and it gives the market entirely of at least 3,600,000 tons of sugar a year into the hands of the refiners. This card of the refiner pleads for free sugar and tells the consumer that he can get 2 cents per pound reduction on his sugar. These circular letters of this same refiner pleads for a small duty, just as the American and other refiners desire. Give just enough duty so we may put the domestic producer out of business and then what?

Let us see, by this document—I take the gentleman's very statement—paid for, printed, and posted, the efforts and time of the gentleman who issues it, paid for by Spreckels, the refiner. What does it show? It was alleged here when Cuban reciprocity was up, when the proposition was a reduction of 50 per cent, that the reduction was to help the Cuban planter. When the proposition of 20 per cent, which finally became law, was under consideration, the argument was that we owed that much to the Cuban planter. The bill had not been law more than 18 months when the Cuban planters were complaining to Congress that the refiners, including Spreckels, the employer of Lowry, was absorbing the entire 20 per cent which Congress supposed they had given the Cuban planter. Now, what appears here in this document? Lowry says this on the 12th of April:

Cuban sugars are to-day selling at 2 cents, cost and freight, and pay a tariff of 1.348 cents. San Domingo sugars (nonprivileged) are offered at 2.06 cents per pound, cost and freight New York, and pay a duty of 1.685 per pound.

We gave 20 per cent, according to this gentleman's statement—and I have verified the statements and I know they are correct—we gave 20 per cent to the Cuban planter. That sugar, bought in bond, upon which the refiner pays 1.348, sells for less than the sugar that is brought from San Domingo that pays 1.685. It is therefore evident to any man who will stop to look into the matter, that the Cuban planter does not get one cent of the 20 per cent reduction. Now, then, does the consumer of this country get the reduction? Will any man get up and say so? This card which my friend handed me gives the difference between the New York price of sugar that come from Cuba and the New York price of the sugar that come from San Domingo. Both sugars once refined sell for the same price to the consumer, and if the Cuban planter sells his sugar cheaper in bond to the refiner, including Mr. Spreckels, for less money—despite the 20 per cent preferential he has—than the San Domingo planter, who pays the full duty, it is evident that the Cuban planter gets none of the benefit of the 20 per cent reduction. On the other hand, if the consumer of this country can not distinguish between the Cuban and the San Domingo sugar after Mr. Spreckels has refined it, but must pay the same price for each, it is evident to any man who will think about it at all that the entire difference between the difference in duty on San Domingo and Cuban sugar is absorbed by the refiner. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The American producer does not get a cent of the 20 per cent reduction. He can not possibly get a cent of it in spite of this card, saying that free sugar would give my friend the same sugar which he purchased only yesterday at 4½ cents a pound for 2½ cents a pound. Besides, note the bunco game attempted upon the consumer. Free sugar, it urges on the card, while to you gentlemen of the House the same sympathetic gentleman tells you daily he does not really wish free sugar, but six hundred and four one-thousandths of a cent, so as to enable him at one and the same time to kill his competitors and permit him to continue to reap the benefits of the 20 per cent Cuban preferential.

As a matter of fact, the refiner buys his sugar cheaper from the man who produces it in Cuba than from the man producing sugar elsewhere, despite the advantage of 20 per cent on the rate of duty fixed in the law; but when he comes to sell it to you and to me he sells both for the same price, and thus absorbs the entire 20 per cent. This is not a novel proposition. Back in 1872 or 1873 this Republic made a treaty with the then Kingdom of Hawaii by which the sugar from those islands should come in free. This was done, so it was claimed, to reduce the price of sugar to American consumers on the Pacific coast. Three years after that treaty was enacted, in 1876, and for the entire term of the treaty this disproportion was maintained, that sugar sold on the Pacific coast at 10 cents a pound, with free raw sugar upon the Pacific coast, as against 7½ cents a pound on the Atlantic coast, with a duty of over 2 cents per pound.

This condition continued for over a quarter of a century until annexation. Nor did this condition cease until beet sugar began to be produced on the Pacific coast, when the refiner was forced to sell his sugars for less. It is the policy of the refiners of the country to destroy the domestic production when they will again dominate this market. Mark what I say. After sugar shall have become free you will find that the refiners in this country will be exerting their influence with whatever party may be in power, for these being in a trust, belong to no party, will be exerting their influence to permit them to have this Government send a party to represent this Republic at the Brussels conference, and when they shall have done that they will exclude from the United States European beet sugar in competition with themselves. Through this instrumentality in 1911, with a dearth of sugar on the American market, the Brussels conference, forbidding Russia to ship to us any portion of her 2,000,000 tons of surplus sugars, enables the refiners to lift the price of sugar to the American consumer to 7½ cents, and Spreckels was the worst offender of them all. They have absorbed the Cuban crop, they have absorbed the Hawaiian crop, they have absorbed the Porto Rican crop, and after they have done that, and they have no further competitors in continental United States and after, with your assistance, they shall have destroyed the beet sugar in the West and the cane sugar of the South, the price of sugar will rise, boosted by the refiners, as it was when they secured Hawaiian reciprocity. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is their purpose, judging from the evidence that appears in the three separate efforts of theirs.

Let me show you how much money they made out of Cuban reciprocity when they told us then, through a similar propaganda, conducted by the American then, much in the way that Spreckels conducts this one now. They have absorbed under that treaty, as I have just shown, and do now absorb, the entire 20 per cent reduction upon the tariff rate. There has been imported into this country since the Cuban reciprocity treaty from Cuba, in round figures, 28,000,000,000 pounds of sugar, and they have declared in dividends, that ought to have gone either to the Cuban planter or to the American consumer, over $96,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I would like to get just two or three minutes more.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. Thank you.

Now, what does that mean with regard to our trade with the islands which we own and with which we are in treaty relations? Let us take Hawaii. There was exported to Hawaii from the United States in 1911, $21,000,000 of goods. There was imported into the United States from Hawaii $40,250,000 worth of goods, of which sugar formed $36,500,000. Last year there was an increase of 30 per cent in this trade. What will become of that trade? If I am correctly informed by the resolution of boards of trade of Honolulu, Iloilo, and our islands of the Pacific; if I am correctly informed by the gentlemen who are here and have come here to protest against this freeing of sugar after three years, it means that that industry must go. There is no question about the destruction of the Louisiana industry. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], who investigated the Sugar Trust, says frankly that it must go at the end of three years. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has been frank and fair enough in the debates in this House to say that in his judgment it must be abandoned; that $100,000,000 worth of investments in Louisiana must disappear as the result of this policy.

What will become of this trade of Hawaii? I will tell you what will become of it. There are 80,000 Japanese in Hawaii to-day. The moment you reduce this duty to the extent of making it impossible for any but the most favored plantations to continue, the moment you reduce it to the extent that these people must reduce the cost of production in order to be able to compete against the world on this market, that minute the American white man in Hawaii will move away from there

and come back to his native country and engage in some other pursuit. What is left? The Jap is not going back to Japan. He is getting an outpost in the Pacific, 7,000 miles closer to the United States than before.

He will be a dominating influence; he will become the sole laborer. And do not make a mistake about it. The Japs understand the industry. They developed the sugar industry in Formosa after the Jap-Chinese War. They have sent men down to my State to learn from the agricultural college that furnishes the sugar chemists the world over to-day—sent men down there, as I know personally to learn that industry. And instead of continuing importers of sugar, they are preparing, according to our consular reports, to become exporters of sugar.

They will be the people who will handle those plantations in Hawaii, so well favored as to survive this disastrous legislation and to compete with the world with Japanese labor; and instead of that $40,000,000 of trade coming to the United States you will find that trade going to Japan, because the control of the islands will be in the hands of the Japanese, who will stand the cut in wages when the white man shall have been driven from those islands. [Applause on the Republican side.]

What about Porto Rico? Every cablegram, every resolution of every commercial body in the island of Porto Rico, as well as the statements of men whom I have seen here from Porto Rico, assures me that in consequence of the annexation of the island, bringing about American labor and methods of living in Porto Rico, they must go under with free sugar. And yet the trade with Porto Rico is thirty-three and three-quarters million dollars. The importations from the island to the United States are thirty-four and three-quarters million dollars, of which over twenty-five million dollars is sugar.

What else will occur there? We have been able to put our rice—our surplus rice, our low-grade rice, raised in Arkansas and Texas and Louisiana—into Porto Rico in competition with the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROUSSARD. It surely is not 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yielded five minutes to the gentleman the last time.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Can I get a few minutes more—just two minutes?

Mr. MANN. I will yield to the gentleman three minutes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Now, the grade of rice that is sold in Porto Rico is not consumed in the United States at all, and the loss of that part of the crop means the putting of that industry out of business in all three of the States I have mentioned. Why do I say that? Under the treaty with Cuba we have a 40 per cent preferential rate on the Cuban market, and the duty on rice in Cuba is more than 3 cents a pound. With 40 per cent advantage on that market we have never yet been able to ship from this country as much as a thousand sacks of rice to Cuba per year.

We are selling now in Porto Rico one-fifth of the entire production of rice in the United States, and of that grade that is not consumed in this country. This proposes to cut the duty 50 per cent. If we can not ship into Cuba, as we believed we could, when Cuban reciprocity was adopted, with a preferential of 40 per cent on 3 cents per pound duty, how can we ship a pound of rice into Porto Rico, with a cut of 50 per cent and a duty of only 1 cent per pound?

We shall lose that market, and not only will those people quit trading with us in rice but they will get their main supply of food from Europe, where they take the brown rice of the Orient, and in fitting it for market in Germany and Spain send their low-grade rice to the West Indies. Not only will we lose that market, so far as the rice produced in this country is concerned, but we will also lose the other part of that market, which represents this $34,750,000.

How about Cuba? We got last year from Cuba $60,000,000 worth of trade, and we shipped into Cuba $110,000,000 worth, of which $81,500,000 was sugar. And this last year there was an increase of 12 per cent, making over $90,000,000 worth of sugar.

The moment sugar is free, which is the basis of our treaty with Cuba, there will be no more incentive to continue the treaty, and of itself it must become inoperative and void. And that trade will go where the Cuban can get the best prices; we will lose most of it. All this trade with Hawaii and Porto Rico and Cuba must be lost absolutely as the result of free sugar at the end of three years.

Now, I did not want to discuss this matter very much further, except as to Cuba. Here is a report which has just been made, on March 24, by one of our consuls to the State Department regarding the sugar crop in Cuba. There is a great increase in the sugar production in Cuba this year, even as there was last year over the previous year. There will be over two million and a quarter tons of sugar produced, and yet the planters are in bad shape, says the consul, because the American refiner has already absorbed the 20 per cent preferential. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want first to answer in my own time the question propounded by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] which he would not let me answer in his time, although his language and matter invited an immediate answer.

The antidumping clause will have no effect whatever on the sugar situation, for the simple reason that if the gentleman will read the dumping clause carefully he will find that it applies only to a commodity upon which a duty is established, and it applies to no commodity that is on the free list, and so far as free sugar is concerned, it could have no effect.

It is possible that the dumping clause might have an effect during the three years of reduction, but my own belief is that when the Treasury Department construes the dumping clause in regard to refined sugar during these three years, it will be bound to hold that local taxes, in the nature of consumption or internal revenue taxes, will not be considered a part of the retail price in foreign countries.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Would it not be better to amend the bill in harmony with my suggestion?

Mr. HARDWICK. No; I rather think not. I do not think it is necessary. Of course the main question is what the effect of the antidumping clause will be upon free sugar. It will have no effect whatever upon that, as I have explained, and gentlemen can form their own conclusions as to effect during the three-year period when we will have a duty that is reduced 25 per cent.

I want to cover, if I can, in my own way, some of the facts in reference to the sugar situation, and I am not trying to make a speech about it. But before I start to do that I want to say that if gentlemen will withhold their questions until I finish developing an idea, I will then yield to them as long as I have a second of time left. I will yield then to any gentleman on either side, so far as the time will permit.

As far as Louisiana cane sugar is concerned, before this debate began to-day many gentlemen on that side and on this side came to me and asked me if during the closing hours of the general debate the other night I did not admit that putting sugar on the free list would eventually put Louisiana out of the sugar-cane business. I did so admit, and I went even further than that, and I now repeat it. Even the present duty, in my judgment from an exhaustive examination of this question, could not keep Louisiana in the sugar business a dozen years.

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

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; if it is a brief question.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Does the gentleman believe that in the three years before sugar becomes free under this bill the sugar industry can prosper, even for one more year or two more years?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not think it can prosper during the three years, and I do not think the gentleman's industry is prospering now, and I will tell him why in a minute. Even if the American consumer would consent to keep the present duty, nobody knows better than my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] that the Louisiana cane-sugar industry can not live anyhow. We are not murdering that industry. We are not sending it to an untimely and unmerited death. The God of nature is sending it there.

This is the best illustration I have ever seen, according to the way I view this situation, of a hothouse industry. The gentlemen in Louisiana have splendid rich lands upon which this sugar cane is grown. When I ask them why they do not plant those lands in cotton, they tell me that if they should plant cotton there the stalks would grow so high that they would have to use stepladders to pick the cotton out of the bolls. They can raise vegetables, grains, cotton, or anything, and they ought to raise something adapted to that climate and that soil, instead of raising this tropical product which they can not raise on even terms with other countries more adapted by nature to its cultivation.

Let us see if the figures do not prove that. The facts which I am going to give you during the course of these remarks are mainly taken from the report of a committee which is unanimous—agreed to by gentlemen on both sides of this Chamber—so there can be no question about its fairness, nor do I think there can be any reasonable question about its accuracy.

In Java raw cane sugar is being produced to-day at 1½ cents a pound, and in the Philippines at 1¾ cents a pound; and one of the greatest experts in all the world, Mr. Prinsen Gerliggs, of Holland, says that in the Philippines, when they get modern machinery there and when they get transportation to the sugar fields, the Philippines alone can produce all the sugar this world can consume at a lower price than any other country on earth. Already Philippine sugar delivered costs 1¾ cents per pound, but they have to pay tremendous transportation charges to get their sugar to the market. In Porto Rico, Cuba, and Hawaii the cost of production is about 2 cents a pound. Now, against that cost of production of raw sugar our friends from Louisiana are here with an industry which they admit can not produce raw sugar for less than 3¾ cents a pound, or almost double the cost. It seems to me that it is our bounden duty to save our Louisiana friends, both politically and industrially, from themselves—from the serious and fundamental mistake they are making—and to do so in the hope that they may soon turn to other industries better adapted to their splendid soil and therefore more profitable. They ask us to continue the policy that has been maintained in this country to the detriment of the American consumer these many years of taxing all the people in order that a few may maintain this hothoused industry. It is undemocratic, it is unfair, and it is unrighteous; and I stand to-day with that great commoner who came out of Virginia and founded a great party, to whom the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRINGER] so eloquently referred the other night as saying, in effect, that it was absolutely unjust and unrighteous to fasten a duty on any product which could not be permanently produced in this country, in the end, as cheap as anywhere else. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Oh, but gentlemen speak of destroying the industry. In a meeting held in New Orleans on the 12th of November, 1912, after our first free-sugar bill had passed the House, there were resolutions adopted and speeches made. Some of those speeches are not very complimentary either to my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] or to myself, but we will let that pass. They did pass a resolution stating the condition of the industry, so far as the capital invested therein was concerned. What did they say? They said that the industry had invested in it $119,000,000, and they itemized it—$70,000,000 in land, $10,000,000 in mules, $35,000,000 in factories, $2,000,000 in farm implements, $2,000,000 in plantation railroads. Now, we are not going to confiscate the land, and it is land on which they can raise better cotton than we can anywhere else. We are not going to do anything with the mules, and as to confiscating the machinery, they can sell that like they would any secondhand stuff.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. To whom shall we sell the machinery that is not worth a thing to any man?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know; you could sell it to Cuba or the Philippines.

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; we could not; their system is different.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman said they came over here and got machinery and learned our methods. But I can not waste time on that minor detail. You can probably get something for it. So they ask us to preserve an industry that represents a total investment of thirty-odd million dollars, and to do it they want to tax the American people $140,000,000 a year. It is not Democratic and it is not right. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Not just now.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Just one question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Has the gentleman read Mr. Lowry's statement this morning?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. And he says the consumer does not get it; the refiner gets it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will tell the gentleman before we pass that point that the gentleman's description of what happened when the Cuban reciprocity bill passed is entirely wrong and is absolutely incorrect. Here is what happened: The Cuban reciprocity act passed and the refiners obtained 6 cents per 100 pounds benefit from the Cuban preferential, Cuba 10 cents per 100 pounds, and the American consumer 18 cents a hundred pounds. That is the estimate of the best expert in the country.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Who?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Wallace P. Willett. The gentleman will admit that Mr. Willett is one of the best sugar experts in the country?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is what he swore to, and I will refer the gentleman to pages 3551 and 3741 of the hearings of the special committee, and he will find that that is exactly what he swore to. I tell you what I thought would happen when we passed the bill. I thought the Cubans would get right under the tariff wall just as the Hawaiians did, and take the full benefit of the duty against the rest of the world, at the expense of the American consumer. They could not do it. Why? Because the refiners had loaned them money and were pressing them to pay the debt. So that the refiners were able to take from them 24 cents per 100 pounds of the reduction of 20 per cent, leaving to the Cuban planters the remaining 10 cents per 100 pounds.

The refiners would have kept all of this 24 cents if they had been in combination, as the gentleman indicated, but competition was so keen between them that for every 10 cents they kept they gave the American people 18 cents. I did not expect when I voted for the bill to get anything in the way of reduction for the American consumer, but in point of fact did get the 18 cents reduction, as I have stated.

As far as the Hawaiian business is concerned, of course, when we put Hawaii within the tariff walls and kept up that tariff wall against the balance of the world the Hawaiians just said, "You can not buy your sugar from Germany or Java or anywhere else without the duty added, and you will have to pay us the amount of the duty," and that answers the gentleman's whole argument upon that point. The gentleman from Louisiana or some other gentleman spoke about American labor. If he will examine the sworn evidence—I believe my friend from Louisiana made some statement about labor?

Mr. BROUSSARD. No.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am glad the gentleman did not, because if he will examine the evidence in this case he will find that, according to what his own people swore before the special committee, they pay for field labor from 75 to 85 cents a day for men and a dollar a day in the harvest time, and for women 75 cents a day.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Not at this time.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Oh, the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am absolutely accurate in that statement. It is taken from pages 1816 and 1817 of the hearings of the special committee.

Mr. BROUSSARD. But the Louisiana people furnish these people with homes and fuel.

Mr. HARDWICK. In Cuba, where they furnish all these things, too——

Mr. BROUSSARD. Oh, they do not. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have been there and his committee has not. They sleep in the open—in the cane fields.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not wonder that the gentleman does not want me to emphasize this matter. In Cuba they are paying from $1 to $1.25 a day for the same class of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. But the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; but I have not the time now to permit the gentleman to take it all up. Please do not bother me now. In Cuba the factory cost is about the same as it is in America. The labor cost of manufacturing a pound of cane or beet sugar is not very much. It costs about 14 cents a hundred pounds; and I do not think they need any protection, as far as the factories go, either beet or cane, because of factory labor.

Mr. BROUSSARD. That is where the trust comes in.

Mr. HARDWICK. Besides that, in Louisiana the sucrose content of the cane is from 6 to 7 per cent. In Hawaii it is from 14 to 15 per cent. In Cuba it is from 10 to 12 per cent and sometimes 14. In Louisiana they plant almost every year, and they have to cut the cane in October in order to keep the frost from getting it. In Cuba and Java and these other countries the frost never bothers, and they do not have to plant more than once in 10 years. It is perfectly apparent why Louisiana can not continue this industry. It is not the unkindness of the Democratic Party. It is simply the decree of the God of nature. It ought never to have been attempted in that climate. It never has been successful. The only time in its history that it has ever paid was during those palmy days to them, to which the

gentleman referred, when the people were paying 7 and 8 and 10 cents a pound for sugar.

I want to give a moment now to the beet-sugar factories. That is not the situation as far as the beet-sugar factories are concerned. There are not a dozen fairly well organized factories in this country that can not live and make more than 10 per cent on the investment under this law, and I defy any man to disprove it in this Chamber or elsewhere.

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

Mr. HARDWICK. Let me call attention to some of the facts and then I will yield. There are 76 beet-sugar factories in the country—17 in the State of Colorado, 16 in Michigan, 13 in California, 6 in Utah, 5 in the State of Idaho, 5 in the State of Ohio, 4 in Wisconsin, 2 in Nebraska, and 1 in each of the following States: Montana, Minnesota, Kansas, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and Arizona. The total capital of these 76 beet-sugar factories is $141,410,000, according to the last statement they rendered. Their total capacity for slicing beets per day in tons is 63,550. That is the total capacity of them all, and that, according to the admissions of these same men when they were in effect pleading for continued high duties, does not mean a real investment of more than sixty-three and a half million dollars in these entire 76 factories. In the report in which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] agreed with me, we valued them all at sixty million, not quite as much as I have estimated it here to-day.

Say $63,000,000 is the total of factory valuations in this country. So, taking $39,000,000 in cane and $63,000,000 in beet factories you have a total real capital of about $100,000,000 invested in this industry, which every year levies tribute on the great masses in this country under the tariff of from $125,000,000 to $141,000,000, in order that a few may be "protected" at the expense of all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman now permit a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Let me go on; not at present. I will yield later, if possible.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman will yield before his time has expired?

Mr. HARDWICK. If I possibly can. Now, I want to take three of the great beet-sugar companies as examples and show how they are capitalized and organized and why they are pleading for this continued high protection. I will take first the Great Western Sugar Co., one to which reference has been made here to-day. It was started in 1906, chartered under the laws of New Jersey—and that was before the regeneration of New Jersey [laughter and applause on the Democratic side]—with a capital of $30,000,000, one-half common and one-half preferred stock, the preferred representing to a certain extent real value and the common in every instance promoters' profits—water, pure and simple. In five years that company has accumulated on its real investment of about $12,000,000, $9,000,000 surplus, besides paying 12 per cent interest on the real capital invested—7 per cent on the preferred stock and 5 per cent on the common. They have done pretty well. Do you know why? Because they can make sugar there in the best factories of that concern within a few points of the cost in Germany. Let us take another one, the American Beet, a California concern. Our friend Mr. Oxnard, of whom we have all heard in connection with sugar, is at the head of it, or was until recently. The American Beet Sugar Co. has a capital of $5,000,000 preferred and $15,000,000 common; real value according to the slicing capacity of this factory about $5,000,000 and the $15,000,000 common—water—and yet in 1911 it paid 6 per cent profit on the actual investment of preferred stock and passed a surplus of $1,643,659, a dividend of 10.95 per cent on water pure and simple; and in 1912 paid 6 per cent on its preferred and laid up a surplus that would have paid a dividend of 13.5 per cent on its common. So that this common stock, representing no investment save a capitalization of the tariff, paid 10.95 per cent in 1911 and 13.5 per cent in 1912. Let us next take the Michigan Co. The Michigan Sugar Co. was capitalized originally at $9,000,000, one-half common and one-half preferred—one half possible value, the other half certainly water—and the gentleman agreed to that in the report, too. [Laughter.] It was organized in 1906 with a little over 5,000 tons slicing capacity for all these factories, and it has paid during all the time 6 per cent on its preferred stock, representing value, and 7 per cent on the common stock, or water, a total of 13 per cent dividends per year on its actual invested capital; and in 1910, besides paying this dividend, it declared a stock dividend of $2,000,000 and passed $1,000,000 to its surplus.

And if we can believe the American Sugar Industry, a paper published in Detroit, Mich., the common stock, that in the beginning represented nothing on God's earth but water and a capitalization of the tariff, was quoted in March, 1912, at $121 a share, which was $1 more than the value of the preferred stock. [Applause on the Democratic side.] These are the lusty infants that will perish unless we give them protection. Oh, but they say: "We can not stand the foreign competition without a tariff." Let us see. The German cost of production for beet sugar is 2.41 cents a pound; the best factories of the great West, 2.56. Spreckels, according to his own statement—I mean John D. Spreckels this time, and not Mr. C. A. Spreckels, whom they abuse simply because he carries on a propaganda in the interest of the American consumer as well as himself for free sugar. What does John D. Spreckels say on this subject? He says he produces it for 2.70 cents a pound. What else? The best factory of the Oxnard plant produces it for about 2.80 cents; so I say when you remember the German cost is 2.41 cents and when you consider the ocean freight charges and insurance, 14 points, from Germany to New York, and remember that it is not disputed that every one of those factories has about 80 or 90 points in freight-rate protection before any sugar can reach the territory they can supply, you will readily see that these beet factories have "protection" of about 1 cent per pound entirely independent of all tariff duty, which more than equalizes any difference in cost of production between foreign and domestic beet sugar and about equalizes the difference in cost of production between domestic beet and foreign cane.

It is doubtless true that without a duty these beet factories will not be able to continue to pay excessive dividends on vast issues of watered stocks, but they will be able to pay a good dividend on the actual investment, and that without reducing the price they pay to the farmer for his beets, for to-day our beet factories pay the farmer rather less than more than the German factories pay for beets, though the German tariff duty is only about one-fourth as high as the present American duty. But gentlemen insist that the American consumer will get no benefit from the reduction or removal of the duty.

I deny it. I deny it on the authority of history, on the authority of the sworn evidence from the highest protectionists in this land. What happened? In 1890, when you put sugar on the free list in the McKinley bill, and you did not think it was so awful then, according to the sworn testimony of Mr. Willett, sugar went down to the full extent of the reduction in duty—it went down that extent within a few days, and it remained that much lower in price during the time the McKinley bill was in force. Mr. Willett proved by tables that every time the United States has reduced the duty on sugar the price went down just that much. Not only that, but Mr. C. A. Spreckels; Mr. Jameson, of Arbuckle Bros.; Mr. H. A. Oxnard; Mr. Atkins; and every other sugar man examined by your committee gave evidence to the same effect. But it is insisted that after all the duty is removed the refiners will combine and raise the price of sugar——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. I have only a moment. The contention is absurd. The refiners now have no substantial domestic competition, except from each other. The Louisiana cane people have never been competitors of the trust. They furnish it with its raw material and have always been at its mercy and under its thumb. The beet people might be competitors, but the American Sugar Refining Co. owns nearly half of all their stock, and I do not think under those circumstances there is liable to be any serious competition between people who have that sort of business relations with each other. Not only that, but you talk about reducing the total of the world's production of sugar by the destruction of the domestic supply. What is our total domestic production? A few hundred thousand tons out of a total world production of about seventeen and one-half or eighteen million tons. They say competition will be forever destroyed if the amount of sugar that competes for our markets is all the sugar of the world, rather than the small amount, relatively, that we produce ourselves. A most remarkable argument, but one I can not subscribe to; besides, there is no limit to the world's production of sugar in favorable climates. It is the product of sunshine and air, and can be produced in limitless quantity.

So long as the Brussels convention continues to authorize the imposition of a duty of about a half cent per pound on imported sugar in European countries the cane sugar of every tropical country on earth will find in our country their largest

and best market, unfettered by discriminatory duties and open to the sugars of all the world on even terms, and will out of self-interest seek our markets first and will furnish us with an abundant supply of sugar at a much lower price than it can be obtained anywhere else on earth. This means a great saving of many millions of dollars per year to the American consumer. It means sugar about 2 cents per pound cheaper than it could be bought if the duty remained. It means the greatest good for the greatest number, which is or ought to be the one object of American statesmanship. I therefore earnestly urge upon the committee the support of this schedule. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. In the time limited, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] has not a particle of evidence presented to the Hardwick investigation committee to the effect that there is a beet-sugar factory in the United States that ever produced a pound of sugar below 2.7 cents—none except the factory he referred to in California; whereas in the State of Michigan the average cost of production of beet sugar is 3.54 cents per pound. You speak about the price of sugar being lower in this country under the McKinley law. It is true; but the Government paid 2 cents bounty at that time, and it is true that the consumers of this country received cheap sugar.

You speak about the Michigan Sugar Co. stock being watered. You should tell the gentlemen of this House that when that company was organized in 1906 it purchased eight sugar factories in that State and put in additional money to pay outstanding debts, and new stock was issued for all the new money that had been put into those factories. It was not watered stock. Every dollar of it was money—100 cents on the dollar. Why do you not state the facts? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on the two sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has 8 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KALANIANAOLE].

Mr. KALANIANAOLE. Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to go into the facts and figures on sugar, but will say a few words as to the effect of free sugar on Hawaii and especially upon its citizenship. Before we were annexed to this country we were a prosperous nation, and in the belief that that prosperity would continue, Hawaii voluntarily ceded its sovereignty to this country.

Yet, to-day Congress is proposing in three years' time to enact free sugar, thereby annihilating Hawaii's chief industry, the source of its prosperity.

Hawaii, unfortunately, is a one-industry country. The sugar industry was begun 40 or 50 years ago by the missionaries sent there from this country, and since its establishment there has been a continuous growth. Should the sugar industry be wiped out it will be impossible to substitute any other industry in its place.

The effect of this legislation on the citizenship of Hawaii will be to turn Hawaii over into the hands of the Asiatics. No people have done more—and I say this earnestly—since annexation than the people of Hawaii to Americanize that country. Hawaii has expended millions of dollars to bring Europeans into the Territory to replace the Asiatics that are there. And yet when you have enacted this law, placing sugar on the free list, gentlemen, you place Hawaii, the paradise of the Pacific, under Asiatic control. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We Hawaiians have a majority of votes there; and yet, gentlemen, we have brought into that country thousands upon thousands of white people. Why? To stay in that land and make it an American community. To-day you are attempting to stop the further bringing of those white people from Europe through the attempted enactment of new immigration laws. Now, you are jeopardizing our hopes of Americanizing those islands through this radical policy of reduction.

Gentlemen, it is hard for the people of Hawaii, but they are Americans to-day, and they must bear the consequences. We are not grumbling, but we do ask for justice at the hands of the Federal Government. Under the treaty between this country and Hawaii you guaranteed to us justice and a continuance of that same prosperity that we had before we joined our fortunes with this country. We of Hawaii ask for justice. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, the manufacturers of cane sugar are said to be operating under an international agreement, with headquarters at Berlin and a substation at New York. They can take care of themselves under free trade, whether it comes now or three years hence. But the Lord have mercy on the sugar planter of Louisiana that is being betrayed in the house of his friends!

This bill gives the beet-sugar industry of the United States, the only competitor of the Sugar Trust, three years' notice to wind up its affairs and get out of business. It has been stated on this floor that the beet-sugar industry is in the hands of the trust. So far as California is concerned, the trust has nothing whatever to do with any of the 13 factories in that State. They are absolutely independent. They have to fight the Sugar Trust, and they have reduced the price of sugar.

It has cost us on the average during the past three years $2.88½ a hundred to manufacture beet sugar in California, and yet to-day that sugar is transported to New York and sold for $4.06 a hundred. If it was not for the competition of the beet-sugar factories and the beet sugar in this country, the price of sugar would be nearly twice as high as it is at the present time, and the American consumer of sugar would be absolutely in the power and at the mercy of the Cane-Sugar Trust, which is international and has only the beet-sugar people to fear. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, in the minute I have I simply want to utter some words of consolation for the benefit of my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. I want to read to him what Mr. Spreckels says about this proposed tariff on sugar. He says:

I am much pleased with the proposed reduction in the sugar tariff. Personally I would have liked to see free sugar declared at once, as there is no need of protection for the sugar-refining industry.

I call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that this bill is in the interest of the great sugar refiners of this country. Why is it that every time Mr. Spreckels, Mr. Atkins, Mr. Heike, or Mr. Gilmore, the representatives of the great sugar trusts in this country, have spoken they have spoken in favor of free sugar? Why is it, I say? Because they want the beet-sugar industry of this country destroyed so that they can levy their tribute upon every pound of sugar that comes into this country. And then Mr. Spreckels is good enough to say that the only reason why three years is allowed for the tariff on sugar to be done away with is to give the Louisiana planters time to settle up their affairs.

It is pleasant to the farmers who raise sugar beets and sugar cane to have notice that they are to be executed in three years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

On this important subject of the duty on sugar the Fremont Chamber of Commerce recently adopted the following resolutions:

FREMONT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Fremont, Ohio.

Resolutions.

Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Fremont, Ohio, That we protest against any legislation by Congress removing the duty on sugar; and believing that the beet-sugar industry, recently started and now being developed, is one of very great importance to the people of this country, and that the removal of the present duty on foreign sugar at this time is calculated to and will destroy this important industry and will result in no appreciable benefit to the consumer in the way of cheaper sugar, we therefore most earnestly and respectfully request that the Senators and Members in Congress from Ohio oppose any measure interfering with the present rate of duty on imported sugar, and that they most earnestly oppose any measure or legislation placing sugar on the free list.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to each of the Senators and Members in Congress from Ohio.

The foregoing resolutions were adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Fremont at its meeting held on March 12, 1913.

THE FREMONT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By W. G. WAITT, *its President.*

Attest:

CARROLL COX, *Secretary.*

The Ohio Farmer, a representative agricultural paper of the State of Ohio, has the following editorial in its issue of February 15, 1913:

FREE SUGAR.

The people of the United States should wake up to the real importance of the attempt to remove the tariff on sugar. The plea is made that this tariff lays a burden on everyone who eats sugar. That means everybody. If the removal of the duty would mean cheaper sugar, the fight would be a just one. But free sugar would not necessarily mean cheaper sugar, while it would mean wiping out the American sugar interests—both beet and cane—and make us dependent upon the foreign producers and the great American refiners—the Sugar Trust—with nothing

to hold them in check. The following quotation from a letter recently received at this office is significant:

"I was in Washington attending the hearing on sugar before the Ways and Means Committee, and it does look like the legislation was bound to go through that will kill the sugar interests of the United States, including both beet and Louisiana cane; and the parties that are doing it are the three sugar refineries of the United States. If the people think that they are going to get cheaper sugar by putting into the hands of these people the entire sugar bill of the Nation, they will wake up some day and find themselves mistaken. Besides all of this, I can absolutely prove that growing beets increases the yield of everything that is grown on the same soil for four years thereafter. * * * The tremendous yields of continental Europe come from the use of a root crop in the rotation."

The beet-sugar makers of the central West have been able to furnish dangerous competition to the sugar refiners, and that is the reason for the powerful attempt to put sugar on the free list. The farmers of the central West are beginning to realize what they can do if they have a sale for the sugar beet. They should bring all of the pressure that they can exert to induce their representatives to kill the free-sugar bill. It would work great damage to the American sugar interests without permanently benefiting the general public.

The Findlay Morning Republican comments editorially in its issue of January 16, 1913, and says:

[From the Findlay Republican, Jan. 16, 1913.]

BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY.

One of the Ohio and Hancock County industries which is in danger of being hurt by the revision of the tariff by the Democrats, if they carry out their announced program, is the beet-sugar industry. Perhaps no other product of the farm, unless it be wool, is in such imminent danger, and certainly a reduction of the tariff on no other product would bring such immediate and telling results to our community.

The possibilities of this industry are not generally understood by the public, but the records show that Ohio alone consumes $20,000,000 worth of sugar per year, while she produces only about $8,000,000 worth. She now has only 5 factories, but those who are in position to know state that we could support 30 factories, which would mean that Ohio could not only supply her own sugar but could supply the demand from other States which do not produce any, to the extent of $25,000,000 annually.

The five factories now in operation in the State paid last year to the farmers for beets more than $2,500,000, to the railroads for transportation of the product $600,000, and for wages and salaries $450,000. It is estimated that the farmers' profits were from $30 to $70 per acre in addition to the increased fertility of the soil which comes from a proper rotation of sugar beets with other crops. Careful experimentation has demonstrated that by proper rotation of crops the yield of corn has been increased 27.6 per cent, oats 48 per cent, barley 52 per cent, wheat 49 per cent, and potatoes 46 per cent since the sugar beet has been included in the plan of rotation over the yield in former years before the introduction of the sugar beet. If this be true, and it is claimed to have been carefully worked out by experts, then the growing of sugar beets is not only a direct profit producer for the farmer, but indirectly it is the best crop he can grow.

Taking all these facts into consideration, it would be a calamity to remove the tariff from sugar in order to help out the cane-sugar refiners, who largely import their raw materials from Cuba and whose sole object in advocating free sugar is first to check and eventually to stamp out the beet-sugar industry in this country. If they can not get free raw sugar, then they want to get such a material reduction as would crush out the domestic industry, or at least stop the building of additional factories.

This is a vital matter for the farmers of Hancock and surrounding counties, which constitutes one of the most productive fields for the growing of sugar beets.

On April 3, 1913, the editor of the Mount Victory (Ohio) Observer writes as follows:

OHIO CAN GROW NATION'S SUGAR—1 ACRE IN 10 OF IMPROVED LAND WOULD YIELD THIS RESULT—GOVERNMENT IS AUTHORITY—MILLIONS NOW SENT ABROAD TO PAY FOR FOREIGN-GROWN SUGAR SHOULD BE PUT INTO POCKETS OF AMERICAN FARMERS INSTEAD, IT IS DECLARED.

That the average American consumes 82 pounds of sugar each year; that only 10 pounds of this ration are now produced in this country; that vast sums are now sent abroad to pay for imported sugar which should be kept at home and put into the pockets of American farmers; and that Ohio alone could produce all the sugar required by the Nation—and with a tremendous addition to the wealth and prosperity of the State—are some of the striking facts set forth in a recent report of the Department of Agriculture at Washington on the sugar industry of the United States.

That it would be a simple matter for the United States to produce at home the sugar now brought from abroad is shown by the department's report that if 2,000,000 acres of land were devoted to sugar-beet culture the Nation would be entirely free from dependence upon foreign-grown sugar. As the present acreage devoted to this crop is about 500,000, this means that four times the land now utilized for sugar-beet growing should be devoted to this purpose in order to avoid the tribute which the American people are now paying to foreigners for their sugar.

On the other hand the department produces figures to show that there are 274,000,000 acres of improved land in the 19 States in which it has been demonstrated that sugar beets may be grown successfully.

"If one farmer in four in these States," reads the report, "were to plant a 3-acre patch and give it the care that could readily be bestowed upon so small a plot it would be unnecessary for us to buy foreign sugar. Two-thirds of 1 per cent of the improved land in this area is all that would be required to accomplish this result. More than that acreage lies idle, absolutely unused, every year. Any one of the States of Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Ohio could produce all this sugar and then have the beets occur only once in a 10-year rotation; several others could do it alone on a five-year rotation."

In Europe, it is pointed out, the importance of a hoed root crop and of sugar beets as the most desirable of such crops is fully recognized. In fact, in the leases for many German and Austrian farms it is provided that a certain proportion of the land must be planted in sugar beets each year. As showing how the various European governments have done everything in their power to encourage sugar-beet growing, on account of its influence in increasing agricultural production, the report says:

"It will be seen that the culture of the sugar beet plays a very prominent rôle in the agriculture of northern Europe and that it occupies a correspondingly prominent place in the national economy. The industry from its foundation has been fostered by national legislation in every country of Europe. It is thoroughly protected from the competition of the cheaply produced tropical sugars and is by means of excise taxes made to yield large sums for the support of the governments. Europe as a whole derives $200,000,000 per annum from sugar taxes, yet this is a minor factor in its national economy in comparison with the wealth added by the beet-sugar industry, the money saved by the home production of all the sugar consumed, the receipts from heavy exports of sugar, the employment of many thousands of people, and the indirect agricultural benefits which have accrued from beet culture."

Applying the experience of Europe to conditions in the United States, the report continues:

"With due recognition of the fundamental agricultural principles involved and with adequate tariff protection, the conditions in the near future will become favorable for a very rapid expansion of the beet-sugar industry in the United States. If this is to be of the greatest good to the country at large the raising of the beets should not be developed as a specialized business, but should be undertaken in limited acreages by general farmers and in rotation with grains and other crops. The indirect benefits of beet culture can thereby be fully realized."

It is the recognition of the great saving that would result to the American people from growing their own supply of sugar, the widespread benefits of sugar-beet culture in adding to the agricultural wealth of the country, and the vital necessity of increasing the acreage output of American farms in order to halt the rapid rise in the cost of living that has induced officials of the Department of Agriculture, including Secretary Wilson and Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, regardless of politics, to appear before Congress and to urge that no reduction should be made in the present tariff on foreign sugar that would destroy or hamper the progress of the beet-sugar industry in this country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama has 8 minutes remaining in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 11 minutes and the gentleman from Alabama has 8 minutes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] has an amendment pending which I would like to have disposed of before the debate is concluded.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, my understanding was that all amendments were to be disposed of after the debate was concluded, but I understand why the gentleman wishes this disposed of at this time, and I have no objection to a vote on it now.

The CHAIRMAN. What amendment is that?

Mr. MANN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. I ask for a vote on that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That only relates to this one amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Let it be reported.

Mr. MANN. I ask to have it reported again. Gentlemen are asking to have it reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. If there be no objection, that amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment of Mr. FORDNEY was read, as follows:

Strike out paragraphs 179 and 180, pages 47 and 48, and substitute the following:

"179. That from and after March 1, 1914, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, ninety-five one hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and for each additional degree shown by the polariscope test twenty-six one thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing not above 40 degrees, 20 per cent ad valorem; testing above 40 degrees and not above 56 degrees, 3 cents per gallon; testing above 56 degrees, 6 cents per gallon; sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscope test: *Provided*, That every bag, barrel, or parcel in which sugar testing by the polariscope less than 99 degrees is packed shall be plainly branded by the manufacturer or refiner thereof with the name of such manufacturer or refiner, and the polariscope test of the sugar therein contained, accurately, within one-half of 1 degree, and a failure to brand any such bag, barrel, or parcel as herein required shall be deemed and taken to be a misbranding of food within the meaning of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes.' And the requirements of this proviso shall not apply to any sugar shipped or delivered to a refiner to be refined before entering into consumption.

"180. Maple sugar and maple sirup, 4 cents per pound; glucose or grape sugar, 1½ cents per pound; sugar cane in its natural state or unmanufactured, 20 per cent ad valorem; sugar cane, defecated, shredded, artificially dried, or which has been subjected to any manufacturing or other process, 50 per cent ad valorem."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment which has just been read.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, we are pledged by the Baltimore platform to place on the free list all articles produced by the trusts of this country.

The people, outraged by the systematic increase of prices by these unlawful combinations, gave us their confidence in the November election of 1912. They gave us an overwhelming majority in this House, a safe majority in the Senate, and placed in the White House a President pledged to this platform. They have commissioned us with ample authority to place on the statute books a law in harmony with our pledges. We are now writing that law, and I maintain that it is our duty to see that no trust-made article is sheltered by a protective duty in our tariff bill when it leaves this House for the Senate. It will not do to say that the Senate will correct our mistakes. Our bill should be free from error, so that the Senate will have nothing to do but to ratify our action.

Mr. Chairman, linseed oil, red and white lead are the principal ingredients of paint, which is used by the home builders of this country to beautify and preserve their homes. Under the prevailing prices of these articles for the last 10 years many of the poor people throughout the land have been unable to paint their houses. High prices have put them to great straits in supplying themselves and their families with a meager and often inadequate supply of food, raiment, and shelter. They have neither time nor means to beautify and no leisure to enjoy the beautiful. Their struggle is for existence.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that these articles are now and have been for many years produced and controlled by a trust. Prior to the passage of the Dingley bill in 1897 linseed oil and red and white lead were produced in America by many independent companies, competing with each other in our markets and the markets of the world for trade. On December 5, 1898, the American Linseed Co. was incorporated under the laws of New Jersey, with a capital stock of $50,000,000, of which $25,000,000 is preferred and $25,000,000 is common stock. This was the beginning of the Linseed Oil Trust in our country, for it took over at that time 47 independent oil-producing companies scattered throughout the United States, as follows:

1. Crown Linseed Oil Works, St. Louis, Mo.
2. Close Linseed Oil Works, Iowa City, Iowa.
3. Burlington Linseed Oil Works, Burlington, Iowa.
4. Hawkeye Linseed Oil Works, Marshalltown, Iowa.
5. Hall Linseed Oil Works, Chicago, Ill.
6. Mankato Linseed Oil Works, Mankato, Mo.
7. Sioux City Linseed Oil Works, Sioux City, Iowa.
8. Missouri Linseed Oil Station, St. Louis, Mo.
9. Woodman Linseed Oil Works, Omaha, Nebr.
10. Grove Linseed Oil Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
11. Ottumwa Linseed Oil Works, Ottumwa, Iowa.
12. Des Moines Linseed Oil Works, Des Moines, Iowa.
13. Dubuque Linseed Oil Works, Dubuque, Iowa.
14. Kansas City Lead and Oil Works, Kansas City, Mo.
15. St. Paul Linseed Oil Works, St. Paul, Minn.
16. Northwestern Lead and Oil Works, Chicago, Ill.
17. Cedar Rapids Linseed Oil Station, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
18. Evans Linseed Oil Works, Indianapolis, Ind.
19. Topeka Linseed Oil Station, Topeka, Kans.
20. Leavenworth Linseed Oil Works, Leavenworth, Kans.
21. Gilman Linseed Oil Works, Gilman, Ill.
22. Marion Linseed Station, Marion, Ind.
23. Logansport Linseed Oil Works, Logansport, Ind.
24. Leonard Linseed Oil Works, Piqua, Ohio.
25. Detroit Linseed Oil Works, Detroit, Mich.
26. Dayton Linseed Oil Works, Dayton, Ohio.
27. Portland Linseed Oil Works, Portland, Oreg.
28. La Crosse Linseed Oil Works, La Crosse, Wis.
29. Wright & Lawther Oil and Lead Works, Chicago, Ill.
30. Buffalo Linseed Oil Works, Buffalo, N. Y.
31. Emerson Linseed Oil Works, Racine, Wis.
32. W. P. Orr Linseed Oil Works, Piqua, Ohio.
33. Mansfield Linseed Oil Works, Mansfield, Ohio.
34. Cleveland Linseed Oil Works, South Chicago, Ill.
35. Metzer Linseed Oil Co., Toledo, Ohio.
36. Leonard & Daniels, Piqua, Ohio.
37. Douglas & Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
38. Cleveland Linseed & Oil Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
39. Metzer Linseed Oil Co., Toledo, Ohio.
40. Douglas & Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
41. Archer & Co., St. Paul, Mo.
42. Toledo Linseed Oil Co., Toledo, Ohio.
43. Campbell & Thayer, New York City.
44. Dean Linseed Oil Co., New York City.
45. Griswold Linseed Oil Co., Warren, Ohio.
46. Wright & Hills Linseed Oil Co., Chicago, Ill.
47. Western Linseed Oil Co., Minneapolis, Minn.

Since the incorporation of this company it has acquired other interests as I am informed, so that this trust now controls about 90 per cent of the linseed oil produced in America. It is dominated by the Rockefellers, John D. Rockefeller, jr., being a member of the board of directors. In 1909 its net earnings were more than a million dollars. Its president and treasurer, J. A. McGean; vice president, Henry E. Cooper; secretary, W. A. Jones; assistant secretary, R. H. Adams; and assistant treasurer, E. V. Cary, live in New York City, and its principal or general office is located at 100 Williams Street, New York City. It is purely a Wall Street property, controlled by Standard Oil influences—hence a trust.

This tells only half of the story. Paint not only requires linseed oil but lead must be used. To leave lead open to competition would interfere materially with the Linseed Oil Trust in controlling the price of paints. So in January, 1903, Standard Oil influence incorporated in New Jersey the "United Lead Co.," which was a complete union of the Rockefeller-Guggenheim interests and the Whitney-Ryan interests, thereby destroying practically all of the competition in the production, smelting, and refining of lead in this country. Three of the Guggenheims and Thomas F. Ryan were placed on the directorate.

It took over at this time 19 of the leading independent lead companies scattered over the country, as follows:

1. James Robertson Lead Co., Baltimore, Md.
2. Omaha Shot & Lead Co., Omaha, Nebr.
3. Northwestern Shot & Lead Works, St. Paul, Minn.
4. Collier Shot Tower Works, St. Louis, Mo.
5. Bailey & Farrell Shot Works, Pittsburgh, Pa.
6. Markle Lead Works, St. Louis, Mo.
7. Gibson & Price, Cleveland, Ohio.
8. Le Roy Shot & Lead Works, New York.
9. Union Oil & Lead Works, Brooklyn, N. Y.
10. Sportsman's Shot Works, Cincinnati, Ohio.
11. Chicago Shot Tower Co., Chicago, Ill.
12. Hoyt Metal Co., St. Louis, Mo.
13. Tatham & Bros., New York City.
14. Raymond Lead Co., Chicago, Ill.
15. E. W. Blatchford & Co., Chicago, Ill.
16. Thomas W. Sparks, Philadelphia, Pa.
17. Chadwick-Boston Lead Co., Boston, Mass.
18. Lansten Lead Works, Chicago, Ill.
19. McDougal White Lead Co., Buffalo, N. Y.

The capital stock of this concern was fixed at $25,000,000: $10,000,000 is 6 per cent cumulative preferred and $15,000,000 common stock. They have united with other companies until they own and control 28 companies and are allied with 93 corporations and control from 85 per cent to 95 per cent of all the properties engaged in the smelting and refining of lead, with a total approximate capital par value of $201,550,400, with a market value in January, 1904, of $108,460,000.

The Linseed Oil Trust and the Lead Trust are affiliated and controlled by the Rockefellers, Guggenheims, and Ryans, forming one gigantic trust, with no other object than to stifle competition and control the production and price of minerals, oils, and paints. This is the class of men Mr. Bryan denounced at Baltimore, and the Baltimore convention passed a resolution denouncing them as unfit to take part in nominating a candidate for President, and our platform declared that the products of such trusts as the "Linseed Oil and Lead Trusts" should be placed on the free list.

But let us see how they have been dealt with in this bill. Under the present law—Payne-Aldrich law—linseed oil has a duty of 15 cents a gallon. Our bill places it at 12 cents a gallon. This is but a very short step toward the free list for a trust-made product. In fact it is only a society hobble-skirt step. In 1912 the equivalent ad-valorem rate on white lead was 38 per cent. Our bill places the rate at 25 per cent ad valorem. Another feeble effort to carry into effect our pledges in the Baltimore platform.

It will be remembered that linseed oil and white and red lead are placed in the chemical schedule. It will also be remembered that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] had charge of this schedule.

It will also be remembered that he is a great free trader, especially in the press and when out among the people, but when he is a Member of Congress, clothed with authority to revise the tariff, he writes rates on trust-made products, which are approved by the trusts. Here is what the Paint, Oil and Drug Review said in its issue on the 16th of April, 1913, page 27:

> The duty on flaxseed in the Underwood bill is no reduction, because no rebate is allowed on cake, which just about equals the 5-cent reduction in the duty. The reduction in the tariff will have little effect on the flaxseed or oil market, and years when America raises a normal crop of seed we can compete with the world.

There is no doubt that this gigantic oil and lead trust can compete with the world in our markets as long as they are sheltered by these high protective rates.

The Paint, Oil, and Drug Review of April 23, 1913, on page 27, had this to say:

> The reason we favor the Underwood tariff on flaxseed is because it gives the farmers the protection needed and only a nominal advance in duty, and the feature which does not allow a drawback on oil cake appeals to us because the American farmers are just beginning to learn the great value of oil cake as a feed and a fertilizer.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] prepared the chemical bill a year ago, which we passed. At that time I called his attention to the fact that he had made but little reduction in the rate on linseed oil, which was a reduction of only 2 cents per gallon. He then claimed that as his bill could not deal with the duty on flaxseed he was not warranted in making a further reduction in the rate on linseed oil.

A few days ago, while the present bill was before our caucus, I called his attention to the rates now carried in this bill on

flaxseed and linseed oil and suggested that he had an opportunity to lower the rates on each of them. He promised to look into the feasibility of lowering them, but I have heard nothing from him since. It is clear to me that there is a common understanding that the products of the Linseed Oil & Lead Trust are to continue to be sheltered by protective rates. Under the rates proposed in this bill, when white lead sells for 7 cents a pound or $140 per ton, the Lead Trust will receive a protection of $35 per ton. Linseed oil will have a protection of $6 per barrel of 40 gallons to the barrel. This will give this Linseed Oil & Lead Trust a magnificent opportunity to rob the consumers out of millions of dollars annually. I apprehend that the poor man's cottage will still go without a refreshing coat of paint. With these high rates of protection, are not the protectionist journals and dailies justified in predicting that the price of linseed oil and white lead will not be materially lowered, and are they not justified in saying that they like the rates fixed by the gentleman from New York on these articles?

But what will the consumers say and what will they do? Let the gentleman from New York answer this question. He has consumers in his district, I presume, and the chief owners and operators of this trust live in his home city.

It has been claimed by some that linseed oil can not be produced in this country if placed on the free list unless the duty on flaxseed is taken off. Let us see how this figures out under the rate on flaxseed proposed by this bill, which is 20 cents per bushel. One bushel of flaxseed will produce 2½ gallons of linseed oil of 7½ pounds to the gallon, and there will be left a flaxseed cake or oil cake of 30 pounds. This oil cake has a commercial value of $40 per ton. Thirty pounds is worth thirty two-thousands or three two-hundreds of $40, which is 60 cents.

Under normal conditions flaxseed sells at about $1 per bushel. Subtract from this the 60 cents the trust gets for the oil cake and we have 40 cents left per bushel as first cost for the flaxseed, but the trust has 2½ gallons of linseed oil in its hands to balance this item, which would amount to 16 cents per gallon for the oil. Add to this the cost of refining the oil, which is only a few cents, and we get the first cost of the oil—about 18 or 19 cents. It has retailed in my home town for more than $1.25 per gallon.

But let us consider the advantage the linseed oil people will get from the proposed rate on linseed oil, which is 12 cents per gallon. We have already seen that flaxseed has a duty of 20 cents per bushel, and that a bushel of such seed will produce 2½ gallons of linseed oil.

The rate on this oil is 12 cents per gallon, which is equal to 30 cents per bushel. Add to this the 60 cents per bushel it gets for the oil cake and we have 90 cents per bushel and 2½ gallons of linseed oil. Flaxseed costs from $1 to $1.15 under ordinary conditions. It is clear that the original cost of linseed oil per gallon will not exceed more than from 6 to 10 cents, if the proposed rates are enacted into law. This looks very small as compared with the retail prices which we have been compelled to pay in our home towns. Who will claim that a rate of 12 cents per gallon is not a protective rate, even though a rate of 20 cents per bushel on flaxseed should be retained?

But when we consider the production of flaxseed in America, we will be driven to the conclusion that 20 cents per bushel is a protective rate. Flaxseed is produced in this country in Minnesota, the Dakotas, and in a few of the Northwestern States. A normal crop ranges from 20,000,000 bushels to 30,000,000 bushels. While we usually import more or less flaxseed, yet ordinarily we export more than we import. The Argentine Republic produces more flaxseed than any other country in the world, most of which is exported, and America comes next. The following table, furnished by Mr. Ennis, gives the world's flaxseed crop for one year under average conditions:

Country.	Production.	Exports.	Consumption.	Imports.
United States	$26,000,000	$2,000,000	$24,100,000	$100,000
India	16,000,000	15,000,000	1,000,000	
Russia	17,000,000	1,425,000	15,575,000	
Argentina	30,000,000	29,500,000	1,500,000	
Uruguay	5,000,000	4,800,000	200,000	
England			18,800,000	
France	500,000		7,000,000	6,500,000
Germany			18,500,000	18,500,000
Holland	300,000		7,800,000	7,500,000
Denmark	325,000		650,000	325,000
Total	95,125,000	52,725,000	95,125,000	32,925,000

While this table gives the figures in dollars, it is based on the assumption that the seed costs $1 per bushel, and the table can be read in bushels as well as in dollars.

The following table is taken from estimates made by the Department of Agriculture. It reveals that under ordinary conditions we produce more flaxseed than we consume. For the last three years our crops have been short, and we have imported considerably more than we have exported, but when we examine this table closely it will be seen that for the last two decades our imports exceed our exports only in a few instances. This being true, the duty on flaxseed could have been reduced much lower. It yields about the same income per acre as wheat, yet the rate on wheat is reduced by this bill from 25 cents per bushel to 10 cents per bushel. With equal propriety the rate on flaxseed might have been reduced to 10 cents per bushel. I now submit the table for your inspection:

Flaxseed: Quantities produced, 1886 to date, and amounts imported, exported, and retained for consumption, 1886 to date.

Years ending June 30—	Production.	Imports.	Exports.		Retained for consumption.
			Domestic seed.	Foreign seed.	
	Bushels.	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*
1886	13,000,000	1,034,576	.....	30,914	14,003,662
1887	10,000,000	415,179	.....	44	10,415,135
1888	10,500,000	1,583,964	37,265	.....	12,046,699
1889	9,000,000	3,259,460	.....	25	12,259,435
1890	[1] 10,250,000	2,391,175	14,678	.....	12,626,495
1891	8,500,000	1,515,546	144,848	1	9,870,697
1892	19,000,000	285,140	3,613,187	.....	15,671,953
1893	11,104,440	112,015	1,837,370	.....	9,379,085
1894	10,000,000	592,820	2,047,836	.....	8,544,984
1895	7,500,000	4,166,222	1,224	.....	11,664,998
1896	15,000,000	754,507	80,453	90,478	15,583,576
1897	17,402,000	105,222	4,713,747	19,892	12,773,583
1898	12,500,000	136,098	257,228	2,172	12,376,698
1899	16,400,000	81,953	2,830,991	.....	13,650,962
1900	[1] 19,979,492	67,379	2,743,266	.....	17,303,605
1901	17,592,000	1,631,726	2,755,683	21,112	16,446,931
1902	25,319,000	477,157	3,874,033	64,748	21,857,376
1903	29,284,880	129,089	4,128,130	20,211	25,265,628
1904	27,300,510	213,270	758,379	.....	26,755,401
1905	23,400,534	296,184	1,338	3	23,695,377
1906	28,477,753	52,240	5,988,519	.....	22,541,474
1907	25,576,146	90,356	6,636,310	2,044	19,028,148
1908	25,851,000	57,419	4,277,313	11,391	21,619,715
1909	25,805,000	593,668	882,899	.....	25,515,769
1910	[1] 19,512,764	5,002,496	65,193	.....	24,450,067
1911	12,718,000	10,499,227	976	.....	23,216,251
1912	19,370,000	6,841,806	4,323	21,919	26,186,564

[1] Census figures.

NOTE.—Production figures for years 1902–1912, inclusive (excepting census year 1910), are estimates of the Department of Agriculture; those for prior years (excepting census years 1890 and 1900) are commercial estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I insist that linseed oil and white and red lead ought to be placed on the free list and remain there as long as they are controlled by a trust, and that the tariff on flaxseed should be reduced to 10 cents per bushel. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has given us no sound reason for maintaining the protective rates which he has fixed on these articles; in fact, he has given no reason at all.

Mr. Chairman, it is said that the mills of the gods grind slowly but surely. Can not as much be said of the mills of the trusts? Yea, more. High protective rates stimulate them to grind day and night at a rapid rate, and they are surely grinding the people all the time. Thou shalt not furnish the trusts with human grindstones; neither shalt thou furnish power to turn such stones to wear away human flesh and human energy.

Mr. MANN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if the proviso was stricken out of this provision, the bill would not be so bad. If the proposition without the proviso stood alone, I would vote for it. The proviso puts raw sugar on the free list in three years. Few Members of this House realize what this schedule means to the people of Porto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, Louisiana, and the people engaged in the sugar beet industry in other States. In Porto Rico and Hawaii the people are being held by the throat by the Sugar Trust to-day for money with which to harvest their crop. They are constantly under the control of the Sugar Trust.

This schedule is in the interest of the Sugar Trust and not in the interest of the consumers of sugar. There is not a consumer in the United States to-day who buys raw sugar that is made free after three years under the provisions of this bill. The Sugar Trust is the beneficiary. Raw sugar is their raw material, and they are the direct beneficiaries. Before the

refined product reaches the table of the consumer every particle of the reduction that is made will be absorbed by the refiners or the trusts and the dealers in sugar. But the sufferers will be the men in Hawaii, in the Philippines, in Porto Rico, and Louisiana, in the sugar-beet raising States, who are paying the American scale of wages to men employed in growing cane and beets and making these products of the farm into sugar.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] concedes that the proviso will destroy the sugar industry in Louisiana. He might also concede that it will destroy the industry in Porto Rico and Hawaii and in the beet-sugar States. Everyone knows the supply of sugar, and not the tariff, controls the price to the consumer. We produced last year 500,000 tons in Hawaii, 160,000 tons in Louisiana, 340,000 tons in Porto Rico, 606,033 tons of beet sugar in 1911. When you destroy that American production of sugar you put the American consumer absolutely at the mercy of the sugar grower of other countries and of the Sugar Trust, that will then import its raw material free of duty and sell its refined product at its own price, unaffected by the addition to the world's sugar supply of what our own country could produce. You will not raise revenue, and in the end sugar will be as high as now or higher.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 47 strike out lines 24 and 25, and also lines 1 to 5 on page 48, including the word "proportion," in line 5, and insert:

"179. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups and cane juice, melada and concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, 1.4 cents per pound on the sugar content thereof; the sugar content shall be determined by tests which shall be made according to regulations which the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the provision in the bill follows the classification that has usually been in the sugar schedule from time out of memory. Commencing with 75-degree sugar at a certain rate it advances in this case six-thousandths of a cent on every degree up to 96 or 97 degree sugar. This results in an injustice to the producer of raw sugar and results in a better differential, a larger differential, to the refiner of sugar. For instance, take the Underwood schedule. Seventy-five-degree sugar is seventy-one one-hundredths of a cent a pound duty. Under what I propose it would be ninety-five one-hundredths of a cent a pound duty. It would look at the first blush as if mine was the higher, but when we add the fact that practically all of the importations of sugar are over 92 degrees by the test, and that these duties more nearly approach each other when we get up to 92 degree—for instance, in the Underwood bill 92 degree sugar is 1.152 cents and in mine 1.288 cents—on 97 degree his would be 1.282 and in my proposition 1.358, or seven-hundredths of a cent more in my proposition than his. While we start out with raw sugar at a higher rate, when we get into the refined sugar my proposition would be 1.4 cents, and his leaves a greater differential. That difference has run all through tariff bills up to this time and is continued in the Underwood bill. But what I want to get at is to get the exact duty per pound on the sugar content of that pound, whether it is 75-degree sugar or whether it is absolutely pure sugar.

While the rates are not far different, very nearly approaching each other and less than the present rate, they are better and more just and more equitable. I have not said anything in my amendment about striking out this proviso making sugar free at the end of three years. That is provided for in the amendment contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. But if that proviso is left in the bill, I state, not on the authority of the gentleman from Georgia, not on the authority of what people may claim who are raising sugar beets, but I state it on the admission of gentlemen opposed to these industries, to wit, the sugar refiners, that if you wipe out the duty on sugar you wipe out the Louisiana industry and you destroy the sugar industry in the United States.

Before the Hardwick committee refiner after refiner came and testified that that would be the result, and that was what they wanted. Why? They said that this beet-sugar crop came in every year, came in on top of the Hawaiian crop and the crop from Cuba, and destroyed their markets. It took away the market that belonged to them, cut down the price—and it has cut down the price this year and will cut it down every year as long as they continue to live. If you do this thing, gentlemen, you take out of the production of the world's sugar a million tons produced in this country. You cripple the industry in Hawaii and in our insular possessions, and when you have done that the law of supply and demand begins to work, and the result will be that sugar will go up, because there will be less of it to supply the demands of the market of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, while I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], I shall also ask the House to vote upon the amendment which I offered striking out the proviso which puts sugar upon the free list at the end of three years.

I take it, Mr. Chairman, that it is unquestioned that the beet-sugar industry has not started or thrived in any country of the world without favorable legislation or financial aid in its behalf. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] speaks of a hothouse industry. The beet-sugar industry in all parts of the world wherever it has existed has received the beneficent influence of governmental agency, and there be no man so ignorant to-day, whether in hovel or palace, who does not know that the price of sugar to-day would be from 100 to 300 per cent more than it now is if we had to supply our demands without the aid of this beet-sugar industry in the world. [Applause on the Republican side.] You propose now, however, to strike down the industry in the United States on the assumption that the State aid given by other countries to their beet-sugar industries will keep the price of sugar down for your benefit in the United States. No one else has ever cast such ignominious suspicion upon the authorities of other countries. It is true that we are legislating here without regard to the interests of our own industries, but that is not the case with the legislators of other countries. In other lands, and in this land when the Republicans are in control, the legislators are seeking for opportunities to increase industry, to build new establishments, to start up new lines of work, while you, with the ghoulish glee displayed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] in describing the destruction of "only a hundred million dollars' worth of property," as he said—you seek opportunity and search every corner of the country for the chance to strike down some industry, some machinery you can render valueless except for old iron, some manufacturing establishments which you can close. Make the most of your opportunities. The country is already prepared to say that your tariff legislation is a mistake. The first opportunity it has will be the last opportunity you will have. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. MANN. No; I do not think it is worth while.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I was surprised at the statement of the venerable and usually well-informed senior minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means upon that side of the House, if I understood him correctly when he said that the rate on sugar as fixed in this bill amounted to 1.85 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not say that. I said 1.282 cents on 92° sugar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The actual rates fixed in this bill on 92° sugar coming from all countries is 1.15 per cent; on 92° sugar coming from Cuba it is 0.992; on 96° sugar coming from the world it is 1.254; coming from Cuba it is practically 1 per cent on 90° sugar.

Mr. PAYNE. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I must have misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. Else I did not read my figures correctly. I had them here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In other words, the reduction in this bill from the rates in the Payne bill, so far as the polariscope test is concerned, is almost exactly a 25 per cent reduction, or a cut of one-quarter, but the reduction amounts to more than that, because we have stricken out of the schedule the differential that went to the sugar refiner under the Dutch standard, with the result that as the bill stands to-day, and will stand for the next three years, there will be a reduction of forty-six one-hundredths of 1 cent on refined sugar, or, in round terms, there will be a half cent reduction at the customhouse on the duties levied on raw sugar, and at the end of three years' time sugar will absolutely become free, so far as the customhouse is concerned. Now gentlemen on that side are appealing for the protection of American labor in these sugar fields. I hold in my hand a paper that has come to me—the Sacramento Bee, of Saturday, April 5, 1913—which contains a letter in reference to the sugar situation in Sutter County, Cal., and I only read you one paragraph from the letter, because that is the pertinent one. It says this:

This year's crop of beets grown here will be handled by the Alvarado factory of the company. The company has finished planting beets on 3,500 acres of its holdings, and the plants are all coming up in fine shape. Part of the crop has been let to a colony of Japanese for cultivation. The Hindus are also busy on their knees weeding with their little hoes. A number of Mexicans have been brought in and are attending to the irrigating.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is merely a news item that has incidentally and accidentally fallen into my hands with reference to the labor on one of these great sugar plantations—not in Hawaii, not in Porto Rico, but in the State of California.

Mr. CURRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I can not yield. Now, the real proposition involved here is not the protection of labor, because I believe as firmly as I am standing here the great beet-sugar industry of the West can produce its beet sugar on an equality with its European rivals, that it is protected in its home market by railroad freight, so that there is no possibility of competition within a reasonable zone, but what these men want and what they are striving after is to tax the American people in order that they may bring their beet sugar to the Atlantic seaboard and drive out all competition. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is all they are after. It is a question of freight rates. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. I ask to have the language reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the proviso in lines 11, 12, and 13, page 48, as follows: "*Provided*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the language just read.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 68, noes 160.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers (Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. MANN) reported that there were—ayes 88, noes 186.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

181. Saccharin, 65 cents per pound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, did the Clerk finish reading paragraph 180?

The CHAIRMAN. Paragraph 180 was read at the time the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan was offered.

Mr. MANN. I think it was not read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman he is mistaken. The Chair ordered the paragraph read.

Mr. MANN. I did not so understand.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman desires to offer an amendment the Chair is willing to entertain it.

Mr. MANN. I move to amend by striking out the proviso to that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the proviso in paragraph 180, which is as follows: "*Provided*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE G—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

188. Cattle, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 17, page 50, after the word "cattle," strike out "10" and insert "25."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 17, section 188, page 50, so as to read:
"Cattle, 15 per cent ad valorem."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to what appears in the report submitted by the Ways and Means Committee. It states that the average price of cattle under the Wilson law was $6.89; under the Dingley law, $14.19; under the Payne bill, $14.20. Under the Wilson bill was the time when a man out in our country, as the story goes, purchased 100 head of cattle for $100, and the man who made the sale was being congratulated. He said: "That is all right, but you do not know all. That old fellow to whom I sold the cattle was a little nearsighted, and so I ran a hundred extra in on him, and he took them away." [Laughter.]

That, gentlemen of the committee, is a part of the much-mooted restoration that you heard so eloquently discussed in front of this Capitol on the 4th day of last March—a return to $6 cattle. Now, assuming the figures to be accurate which the committee has furnished, I want you to notice this especially, that the value of imports of cattle during 1912 was $4,486,306. The forecasted value for the first year of that divine charter of the "new era" is to be $5,570,000. That is an increase of $1,083,694, but there is an attendant loss of revenue to the Treasury of $457,481. There will be, therefore, paid by the Treasury, in effect, by foregoing the collection which is proper under the present law, the sum I stated, namely, $457,481, which amounts to a subsidy for importing every additional dollar's worth of cattle of 42 cents. This side for years has been in favor of so levying duties that they might encourage competition among stock dealers and raisers in this country; but here is a bald proposition to practically pay out of the Treasury 42 cents for the purpose of bringing in $1 of competition to be furnished by the foreigner.

I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, what the peculiar disposition of the Ways and Means Committee is that they would prefer to forego 42 cents out of the Treasury for the purpose of bringing in $1 worth of additional importations to the country. I wondered if they thought so much more of the Mexican greaser than they did of the Texas ranger. I believe in this country that everything that Americans produce should be moderately protected against every competing article, wherever it may be produced. I am not in favor of prohibitive tariff, but I am in favor of giving the long end of the lever in every market, whether it be from farm, factory, or mine, to the American producer. In the interests of that proposition I ask that cattle be given a duty of 15 per cent. If I were inclined to argue it from the other standpoint, from the standpoint of a competitive tariff, I would say that the more they reduce this the more they pay out or lose for the slight importation. Therefore the reduction should be greater. To make a competitive tariff, as I understand it, the rule is, first, to ask, Is there any importation? Second, What is the source of importation? Has it increased during the last few periods or has it decreased? In other words, is there an increase of the units, increase of the values, increase of the duties? All three are present here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I believe that the Committee on Ways and Means, when it reduced the duty on cattle and on sheep and placed meats on the free list, acted in compliance with the express pledge made to the people of the United States in the platform adopted in the national convention of the Democratic Party in Baltimore and repeated in every congressional district during the last campaign. Personally I felt that in considering cattle schedules they might have gone further and placed cattle on the free list as they did beef and mutton and other meat supplies. And in answer to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], who demands an increase in the proposed duty on cattle, I want to read an article that was printed on Saturday last in the Hudson Observer, a leading newspaper published in my home county. It quotes from a pamphlet issued by Swift & Co., one of the three constituent companies which go to make up the Beef Trust, and is a complete answer to his argument in favor of an increase in the duties on cattle. I read:

THAT DUTY ON FOOD ANIMALS.

President Wilson's attention is respectfully called to the pamphlet issued this week by Swift & Co., of Chicago, a copy of which has been sent to his secretary, Mr. Tumulty, together with the announcements that Representatives KINKEAD and BREMNER, of New Jersey, have de-

cided to bolt the Democratic caucus and vote against the proposed 10 per cent duty on cattle and other food animals.

Why should the 10 per cent duty be imposed? In their pamphlet Swift & Co. show from the records that in 1912 the cattle raisers sent to market 560,265 fewer animals than in 1911. There was also a decrease of 18 pounds per head in the cattle marketed, or a total decrease for the year of 704,498,365 pounds.

This was not a temporary diminution in the supply. Though the population of the United States increased about 16,500,000 in the decade ending last year, the number of cattle in the country had decreased 7,468,000 in the same period. Unless the people eat something else—rice, for instance—and the slaughter of calves is stopped, the price of beef must go to prohibitive figures the packers say.

When it is so frankly confessed that the producers of the United States can not supply us with beef, why should any impediment, even a 10 per cent obstacle, be put in the way of the free importation of cattle on the hoof?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does not the gentleman offer an amendment striking out that 10 per cent duty?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I will state to my friend from Minnesota that I am moving in what I consider the most practical way. I believe and I hope that this duty will come off in the Senate, and when the bill comes back here I am sure that every man on this side of the House will vote for free cattle, as I will, although I am sincerely doubtful as to the attitude that you gentlemen will assume toward the amendment.

I continue from the editorial:

All duties are laid either by Republicans to "protect home industry from competition" or by Democrats for the purpose of raising revenue.

Obviously an industry which can not supply the demand needs no protection, and the customhouses have never yielded from the importation of cattle enough to buy gasoline for the President's car.

But we are told by the consul at New York from that country that thousands of cattle are slaughtered on the plains of Argentina, in the luscious grass of the best grazing land in the world, for their hides and horns, the meat being left to rot because it is shut out of the United States by the tariff. Mexico and Canada also stand ready to provide us with the beef we need if we will let them.

Why, then, a 10 per cent duty on cattle? Is is true that the beef barons and not the cattle raisers asked for and secured this tariff? In any event, why does not President Wilson join the New Jersey Congressmen in the demand that this chief necessary shall be put in the free list? One message from him before the Underwood bill leaves the House might accomplish wonders.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements that are made in this editorial demonstrating the justice of admitting cattle free of duty, in view of the pledges made during the last campaign to reduce the cost of living in this country, I hope that the House will refuse to pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do three gentlemen on the other side want to speak?

Mr. LANGLEY. I want two minutes only.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 20 minutes on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, it appears from the statement made by the chairman of this committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD] at the opening of this discussion that we are legislating through an irrevocable proxy. I do not hope by anything I may say to change a single vote upon that side of the Chamber, because by the chairman's own statement every man on his side of the Chamber is bound and gagged to vote against every amendment offered by this side, no matter how meritorious.

Since you refuse to take advice from Republican sources, I want to bring to you on that side of the Chamber the words of a distinguished Democrat who knows something of the agricultural schedule, and particularly of stock raising in the United States. I refer to Judge Cowan, who, in an article published in an agricultural paper, says he feels it his duty "as a citizen who seeks no office to call attention to the real grave and supreme danger confronting the stock-raising and agricultural interests." That article is as follows:

COWAN SOUNDS WARNING TO CATTLEMEN AND FARMERS.

"We now have the tariff bill before us," said C. H. Cowan, attorney for the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas and the American National Live Stock Association, "and within it sufficient evidence that a serious blow to the live stock and farming interests of the United States has been struck. It needs no explanation or argument to show it.

"Manufacturers organized as they are and labor organized as it is may have looked after their interests sufficient to secure a reasonable preference in our home markets wherever they needed it for their output and to force us to work for them on the lowest level, but it is certain that the live-stock raisers and farmers have not successfully looked after their interests. Like 'snipe hunters' they are left with the bag to hold.

"This bill with free meats, free flour, free wool, free sugar, free potatoes, and other free-list farm products, together with duties so low on many others as to amount to nothing, manifests the intent to place the stock raisers and farmers of this country on a world-lowest level of prices for what they raise and reduce the meager profits by free competition with the cheapest labor and land and cheapest method of living of the countries which we invite to invade our markets, while nothing is demanded in return. The majority of the people of the United States surely are not in favor of that, and there ought not to be a single farmer or stock raiser so dense as to favor it.

"If we had the referendum independent of politics, every State west of the Alleghany Mountains would vote overwhelmingly against the free-trade scheme. The time has come for stock raisers and farmers to rise up and express themselves and get their friends to do likewise. The man who neglects to register his protest to his Senators and Congressmen and in the press, is by his silence acquiescing in this plan for his own undoing which will surely follow. The agricultural interests will be the increasingly greatest sufferers, for, as the opening of our great markets will invite production in other countries to supply us and take the place of what we should and would produce, it will in the end bring our stock raisers and farmers to a level with them. Thus we turn our trade—our home market—over to those who do not support our Government, pay taxes, support our institutions, perform the duties of citizens, or protect it in time of war.

"A fair preference in our home markets should be demanded. Congress is giving it to some, denying it to others—especially to farmers and stock raisers. If it turns out as intended it will impoverish our farmers and reduce their capacity to buy from the work shop or other producers and reach every avenue of trade. If it does not reduce prices, then those from the center of population who are forcing this thing upon us while keeping a preferential duty for themselves, will not get cheaper farm products which they seek.

"Every other important agricultural country in the world has a tariff designed to encourage agricultural pursuits. Why should we, the greatest in agriculture, deliberately discourage it by inviting the surplus producing countries to our markets free? The matter is in the hands of the stock raisers and farmers, and those interested in agriculture, to prevent this calamity by asserting themselves so that their voices are heard. He does not have to be a high protectionist to do this, he simply subscribes to fair play and acts in righteous self-defense against free trade.

"For over 26 years the attorney for the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas and many years for the American National Live Stock Association, acquainted with the business and conditions surrounding it, I feel it my duty on that account and as a citizen who seeks no office to call attention to this real grave and supreme danger confronting the stock raising and agricultural interests, and to urge each individual to act direct for himself.

"We have never had a tariff that enabled the producer to get unreasonable profits on live stock or other agricultural products. We have done nothing to demand punishment; we could not monopolize; we ought not to be selected for sacrifice just because we have not been able to make others afraid of us or produce.

"A general demand by each individual stock raiser and farmer will bring the result."

But my good friend, Judge Cowan, forgot that the literature circulated in the cities in the congressional campaign of 1910 by the Democratic congressional committee pledged the Democratic Party to enact a tariff law that would reduce the cost of food articles to the bankrupt prices of 1896. The Democratic committee in that year distributed to the thousands of voters in the cities of this country a circular entitled "The high cost of living." The following is a copy of that circular:

Voters and householders read the within carefully. How to save your money. Take into booth with you when you vote. Vote for your families. High cost of living facts. Read carefully. Ponder well. Vote right.

1896—PRICES—1910.

The Republican Party has been in complete control of every department of the Government since 1896—President, Senate, and Congress. They have given you a government of trusts—Beef Trust, Sugar Trust, Flour Trust, Clothing Trust, and the "daddy" of them all, the Tariff Trust. See the result below:

St. Louis prices.

OCTOBER, 1896—TWO WEEKS' STORE BILL.		OCTOBER, 1910—TWO WEEKS' STORE BILL NOW.	
2 pounds salt pork	$0.10	2 pounds salt pork	$0.40
5 pounds pork chops	.50	5 pounds pork chops	1.25
5 pounds pork ribs	.30	5 pounds pork ribs	.75
4 pounds smoked shoulder	.30	4 pounds smoked shoulder	.54
2 pounds sausage	.15	2 pounds sausage	.35
5 pounds lard	.35	5 pounds lard	.85
5 pounds corned beef	.25	5 pounds corned beef	.62½
4 pounds butter	.40	4 pounds butter	1.20
2 dozen eggs	.20	2 dozen eggs	.50
1 pound cheese	.13	1 pound cheese	.25
1 barrel flour	3.50	1 barrel flour	5.65
4 pounds chicken	.40	4 pounds chicken	.72
21 pounds sugar	1.00	21 pounds sugar	1.16
2 pounds steak	.20	2 pounds steak	.35
5 pounds roast beef	.50	5 pounds roast beef	1.00
	8.28		15.59½
LOOK AT THESE TWO STORE BILLS.		VOTE TO PROTECT YOUR POCKETBOOK.	

Your table bill has doubled; have your wages doubled? You pay 100 per cent more for your clothing, blankets, and household goods; has your salary kept pace with the increased cost of living? Your rent is higher and your fuel is higher; how much higher is your weekly wage check? Don't you think you had better help put the trusts that have doubled the cost of living out of business? Congressman GOOD'S vote helped to make the bill $15.59½ instead of $8.28.

In this circular you on that side of the House pointed to the prices of 1896 on farm produce as ideal prices, and you promised to enact a tariff law that would bring back those prices. If that is not the implied promise, what was the purpose and

object of the circular? The first article named in this circular, and the price you promised to the consumer, is 2 pounds of salt pork for 10 cents. Think of it, Mr. Farmer, salt port at 5 cents per pound. Hogs are selling to-day in the Chicago market for $8.70 per hundred pounds, and yet you promised to enact a tariff law that would bring to the consumers of this country pork at 5 cents per pound. You gentlemen on that side who represent farming interests find that a caucus rule, for which you voted, absolutely binds you to support this program. But how will your farmer constituents like the result?

Let the Members of this House who are farmers, or let the farmers of the country take this Democratic document and analyze it, taking each article separately, and ascertain how much the farmer will obtain for his produce if the prices above given on farm products should prevail.

Yesterday cattle in the Chicago market sold for $8.90 per hundred pounds, but this Democratic circular promises to the consumer that he should buy his beefsteak at retail at 10 cents per pound. I think I am reasonably safe in asserting that when salt pork and pork chops are selling at retail at 5 and 6 cents per pound live hogs will bring not to exceed $2.75 or $3 per hundred pounds. That when beefsteak sells at retail, allowing for packers', jobbers', and retailers' profits, at 10 cents per pound fat cattle will sell at not to exceed $4.50 or $5 per hundred pounds. Gentlemen on that side may be willing to return to the low bankruptcy prices for farm products and live stock that prevailed in 1896, but the Republican Party believes that the prosperity of the farmer should go hand in hand with the prosperity of the manufacturer and the laborer and every other industry in this country, and that our tariff laws should give that degree of protection that will measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, recurring to this Democratic circular, what fair inference can be drawn regarding the duties levied by the Payne law upon the articles named? The ordinary reader would fairly infer that the Payne law greatly increases the duty upon those things. Now, what are the facts? The facts are that the Payne law did not increase the duty on a single article on the list. Here is a table showing the duty on those articles in the Dingley law and the changes made in the Payne law:

Table comparing duties in Dingley law and Payne law.

Articles named in circular.	Duties in Dingley law.	Duties in Payne law.	Decreases Payne law.
			Per cent.
Salt port[1]	25 per cent ad valorem	25 per cent ad valorem	
Pork chops	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	25
Pork ribs	do	do	25
Smoked shoulder[1]	25 per cent ad valorem	25 per cent ad valorem	
Sausage[1]	do	do	
Lard	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	25
Corned beef[1]	25 per cent ad valorem	25 per cent ad valorem	
Butter[1]	6 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	
Eggs[1]	5 cents per dozen	5 cents per dozen	
Cheese[1]	6 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	
Flour[1]	25 per cent ad valorem	25 per cent ad valorem	
Chickens[1]	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	
Sugar	$1.95 per hundred-weight.	$1.90 per hundred-weight.	2⅛
Steak	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	25
Beef	do	do	25

[1] No change.

No increases under Payne law.
Number of decreases under Payne law, 6.

Here we have a concrete statement of the changes made in the Payne tariff on these articles. Of the 15 articles named, the duty on 9 was not changed. On the remaining 6 articles the duty on 1 was reduced 2½ per cent, and on the other 5 articles the Payne law reduced the duty 25 per cent. We are told by this campaign circular, which is a lie upon its face, that the Payne law increased the price of pork chops 150 per cent, when in fact the Payne law reduced the duty on pork chops 25 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, in the name of the honest and hard-working farmer, I protest against the lies that are now being circulated about his industry. We ought to encourage farming and stock raising. We should induce the men and women who are annually flocking to our shores to leave the overcrowded cities and take up agricultural pursuits. But if you on that side can not say a good word for the farmer, you should at least quit lying about his industry.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I said I was not going to take up any of the time of the committee, because I knew it was useless; but as we proceed step by step in this bill you are rubbing it in so hard on many of the industries of the district which I represent that I am bound to say a few words more.

Cattle raising is one of the great industries of our State. To my mind it is an economic absurdity to put a duty on cattle and then put on the free list that which cattle are converted into. The effect of it, as I view it, is to bunco the farmer and whipsaw the packing industry of the United States and the laboring men employed in that industry. Watch the price of cattle go down after this bill goes into operation.

Mr. Chairman, I shall say nothing further at present, but I want to have read in my time a resolution adopted at a recent nonpartisan mass meeting in the city of Buffalo, attended by about 2,500 citizens, in which they expressed their views upon this matter. I send it to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 26, 1913.

Hon. JOHN W. LANGLEY,
House of Representatives, City.

DEAR SIR: The city of Buffalo is up in arms over the provision——

Mr. LANGLEY. I only asked to have the resolution read.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Read it all.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have no objection to the Clerk reading it all.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. LANGLEY. My request was that the Clerk read the resolution adopted at that meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas we, the citizens of Buffalo, in a mass meeting assembled this 23d day of April, 1913, upon consideration of the proposed changes in tariff schedules now pending in Congress as affecting wheat, oats, wheat flour, cereals, live stock, and dressed meats, by which all raw materials in each case would be left subject to a substantial tax, while the finished products of such materials would be admitted to this country free of duty; and

Whereas we are advised and believe that the certain effect of such legislation would be to destroy live stock, milling, and packing industries in this city and elsewhere now engaging vast amounts of capital and employing thousands of workmen; and

Whereas we believe that the Congress of the United States would not wittingly enact such disastrous legislation if the situation were thoroughly understood: Therefore be it

Resolved, That if flour, cereals, and meats are admitted free, then the raw materials—wheat, oats, and live stock—should also be admitted free; and be it further

Resolved, That we do earnestly protest against legislation that imposes a duty on wheat, oats, and live stock, while permitting free entry to this country of wheat flour, cereals, and dressed meat, and we beseech Congress to give further serious consideration to the far-reaching effects of such legislation, and not to pass a tariff bill containing such unjustifiable and disastrous measures.

Mr. LANGLEY. I commend these resolutions to the prayerful consideration of the distinguished gentleman from Buffalo.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not suppose I ought to say anything about the meat schedule, because I am interested in the meat business. I am a cattle feeder and a cattle breeder on a considerable scale. To my mind the Democratic Ways and Means Committee made a serious mistake in not putting cattle on the free list, and I am going to move to amend the bill to that effect. Our pasturage in this country is well taken up to-day. We all know, if we are experienced in the cattle-raising business, that in most parts of the country it is a great expense to carry the breeding cow through the winter. This is one of the heaviest costs in raising cattle. Northern Mexico is a wonderful place for cheaply producing calves and young cattle. They can there be started much cheaper than in most parts of this country, and provided they can be taken out and brought to a northern climate where they will make good growth the result is a great cheapening of our meat supply.

The difference between a 3-year-old steer in Arizona, New Mexico, or Mexico and his brother sent north as a yearling is at least 300 pounds. Therefore, as a citizen hoping for a more adequate meat supply, I believe in free cattle, and as a cattle raiser and cattle breeder I am in no fear of damage to my business or the wages of my employees from free cattle.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of misinformation in this House concerning the packers. For 25 years I have been up against the Chicago packers. I know what they have taken that did not belong to them, and how much they have taken that did not belong to them, but to-day they have a very small influence on the cost of the best meat. Their charges for handling a standard steer are, I believe, less than $3, possibly a little over $2. That on an animal that is worth $110 is a small percentage. This talk of the farmer being wrecked and ruined by the advent of free meat from Argentina and other places is the veriest nonsense.

The proof of that is in Panama, where Col. Wilson, living in a free-trade market, where he can get Argentine meat, prefers to stock his commissary with the more expensive corn-fed cattle from the Middle West, as it is better stuff and can be handled without much waste. He furnishes the best porter-

house steak at 20 cents a pound, and he gets rid of all unconscionable distributing charges that are common in the butcher shops throughout the country. I do not blame the butcher; he is not getting rich; he is wasting too much and he is paying out money in rent and all sort of delivery charges. The great trouble with us to-day is this waste in distribution.

I am selling upward of 5,000 corn-fed cattle a year and a good many grass cattle. I wish to state frankly that I am not afraid of the influx of cattle or beef from other countries. It is not going to hurt anybody or do anyone much good. The world demand for meat is greater than the supply. I have in my office the statement of a great concern in England which handles frozen meat; this statement shows that our American export has dropped off to almost a negligible quantity. Almost every country in Europe is trying to import frozen meat. It is being kept out of France by ridiculous agrarian legislation. Even Switzerland is importing meat. Meat is a luxury and always will be. It will never be cheap again, and beef is the most costly of meats. It is our obvious duty to conserve the grass and to study cheaper methods of feeding that we may produce as reasonably as possible.

A mere statement of costs of feeding shows the extravagant nature of beef as a human food.

It takes 56 pounds of corn to make 4 pounds of beef with 2 pounds of pork as a by-product. With high-priced land we can not produce corn-fed beef at prices below what means luxury. We ought to save in the cost of the calf; we must mature our meat more cheaply. There is no sense nor logic in a duty on cattle. There is no danger to anyone in free meat or untaxed imports of live cattle.

Mr. Chairman, I move to amend to the effect that cattle be put on the free list.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out "15 per cent ad valorem" and inserting "free of duty."

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I know full well that it is believed that the only thing I know in regard to this tariff is the sugar schedule. As a matter of fact, I have given more study personally, theoretically, and as a concrete proposition, to the meat question than I have given to the sugar question. The tariff on beef and meat has not now, and never has had, anything to do with the price of meat in this country. I have been in Sonora, Mexico, on the Couchiverrichi ranch, where I have a camp, at different times, and last year when the Madero revolution was in force in Mexico—the undivided one-half of that ranch being owned by an American friend of mine—I obtained permission from the Treasury Department to transfer from that ranch, which runs up to the international line—the line along Arizona and New Mexico—several thousand head of cattle, and they were permitted to enter this country upon a bond being furnished to return them within six months. These steers were transferred and they lived among the cattle in Arizona and New Mexico for six months. Then, as I recall it, I obtained a further extension of time under the law from the Secretary of the Treasury, which permitted them to stay for six months longer. They had finally then to be brought back onto the Couchiverrichi ranch.

The result of all this was that when they brought these steers back into Sonora, across the line from Douglas, Ariz., the owners, I am informed, as I know was done with other cattle in Sonora, killed the steers in order to sell the hides in this country, and they let the meat rot on the field. This is a fact. I bought meat—and I have been under contract for the last five years to buy half a steer twice a week at my camp—for 25 Mexican cents a kilo, which is approximately 4½ cents a pound. The other half of the steer is brought to Douglas, Ariz., and the duty there is paid upon it and the meat is then sold for 35 cents gold a kilo. I paid 4½ cents in my camp in Sonora and the American consumer at Douglas, right across the way, paid 35 cents for the other half of that same steer. No man can contradict that statement, because for four years that has been my experience. It is 34 miles from the border. Half of the steer came into my camp at 4½ cents and the American consumer—and I and my men were consumers of this meat—paid in Douglas 35 cents a pound from the retailer—the restaurant man. What did the duty have to do with that?

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

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I can not consent to an extension of this debate. I would like to, but if I do it for one gentleman, I would have to for another.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent and the gentleman may object if he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to object.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MONDELL. I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that debate has been closed upon this amendment by unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the committee for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has objected. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, what is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California to place beef upon the free list.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Is all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto closed?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto, by order of the committee, has been closed. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 13, noes 99.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting as a new paragraph, at the end of line 17, page 50, the following:

"Fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and venison, and other game, except birds, 25 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph which I have offered restores the present duty on fresh meat. I believe that the present law, so far as the duty on cattle and on fresh meats is concerned, is practically a competitive duty, as described by the gentleman from Alabama. In 1907, during the eight months ending with the month of February, there were imported into this country 12,513 head of cattle. During the eight corresponding months of last year there were imported into this country 222,000 head of cattle, upon which the duty of 27½ per cent ad valorem was paid. I realize that the cattle industry and the live-stock industry has undergone some great changes in the past six years. There is to-day a shortage of more than 15,000,000 head of cattle in the United States, and other countries have noted that shortage and desire to take advantage of it. I hold in my hand the Daily——

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Not at present.

Mr. GOULDEN. Just a simple question.

Mr. GOOD. By reference to the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of January 23, 1913, I find this quotation:

Australian meat has been put on sale at San Francisco, Cal. The ship which has just brought the trial order left 300,000 pounds of beef and mutton at Honolulu for the Army in the Hawaiian Islands.

Also, in the issue of the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of August 19, 1912, is found an item relative to prices on meats in Peru:

Lima does not suffer from high cost of meats. The ruling prices in the central market are 12, 20, and 25 centavos (5⅞, 9¾, and 12¼ cents American) a pound, the latter for choice loin cuts, and it is excellent beef at that.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. GOOD. I can not; I have not the time. The gentleman can get time. To show that this bill has been framed in the interest of the Beef Trust, I want to say that gentlemen on that side of the aisle—Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee—have said they did not experience any difficulty with the West in reducing the duties on cattle and meat products, but they experienced their difficulty in the East. Well, I guess that is true. The western farmer realized that you were opposed to his industry, and they are willing to submit

this bill to the test of actual experience. The difficulty you encountered was Wall Street, and that difficulty was met by putting beef on the free list and a duty on cattle. The Daily Consular and Trade Reports of May 18, 1912, states:

"It is reported that work has been commenced on the new freezing works that are to be built at Zarate. The concession for these works belongs to one of the Beef Trust companies. * * * The report of the directors of the River Plate Fresh Meat Co. for 1912 shows a net profit of $279,000, out of which a dividend of 10 per cent is recommended, $50,000 placed to reserve, and $41,000 forward.

Beef Trust plants located in Argentina and Australia can under this bill bring in their meats free of duty, but this bill denies to the independent packers, whose only plants are located in this country, the right to bring their cattle in free. Yes; you met your trouble down East unquestionably; you met it by yielding to these trust magnates who receive these large dividends.

The big four are already firmly established in South America. Swift & Co. control the La Plata Cold Storage Co. (Ltd.), at La Plata, which is just south of Buenos Aires, and also operate a plant at Montevideo, Uruguay. Morris & Co. control the Sociedad Anonima La Blanca, in which for the present Armour & Co. are interested. Armour & Co. also have a plant now in course of construction in South America. Schwarzschild & Sulzberger Co. have men on the ground now building a plant in Buenos Aires.

The voice of the lowly farmer could not reach the Ways and Means Committee and secure the protection which his industry demands. It required greater influence, and that influence put meats on the free list and gave to the Beef Trust a great advantage over the independent packer. It is to be regretted that the spirit of fair play did not prevail to the extent of writing in this bill a fair protection both on cattle and on meats. But our Democratic friends are unfair to the farmer and dishonest with his industry. The fact is that during the past decade prices have been advancing the world over, and in no place have they advanced more rapidly than in free-trade England. The Dingley law became effective in 1897, and the Payne law wrote scarcely a single increase in the duties on agricultural products. Hence the increase in prices on farm produce that has taken place during the past 10 years can not be charged to the tariff. It is traceable to some other cause.

The finding of the commission appointed by Gov. Dix to investigate the cost of living is most instructive. It gives this incident showing the relation between prices received by the farmer for his product and the prices the consumer is obliged to pay for the same article. A farmer on Long Island sent to the New York market 25 bushels of string beans. At the end of 10 days he received a check for 76 cents for his product. The commission also found that at the time of this transaction string beans were sold at retail in New York City at 10 cents per quart, or $3.20 per bushel. I suppose our Democratic friends will claim that the tariff on string beans was the cause of the high price which the consumers of New York were compelled to pay for those beans, but they will have great difficulty in convincing the farmer who received 76 cents for his 25 bushels of string beans that the tariff cut very much figure in the transaction.

Our Democratic friends claim that the tariff is responsible for all the evils in our body politic. If prices are too high, they assign the evil to the tariff. If the prices are not high enough, the tariff is responsible. And so, to correct the existing evils, they propose to tear down, to destroy industry. I submit that if this bill shall become a law the sober sense of the American people will record its verdict in favor of a policy to regulate and not destroy, to protect and not to kill American enterprise and American industry.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have heard of some animals that move backward, and I have discovered in this tariff debate that there are some mentalities that move backward. When you hear it announced on the floor of this House that legislation is in favor of a great monopoly when you put the article that that monopoly makes on the free list, it is mental gymnastics that I am not able to grasp. But, as a matter of fact, the gentleman's party, when they reduced their rates under the present law to ad valorem rates, were in exactly the position that this bill is in except their rates were higher. The duty to-day on cattle, on an average, is 27 per cent. This bill reduces it to 10 per cent, or cuts off 17 per cent of tax. The duty on fresh beef, reduced to an ad valorem, is about 17 per cent. The legislation in this bill is to reduce it to no per cent, cutting off 17 per cent.

Now, I do not say that those mathematics on the part of the Ways and Means Committee were intentional, but, as a matter of fact, the rate produced the result, and the rate on cattle and the rate on beef are both reduced by just 17 per cent of a cut. Now, I can not see where the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber can find, if it is merely a question of adjusting these duties to similar rates, any great amount of criticism, because the balance remains as it is under the present law, except under this law the American people will have free meat and a very great reduction on cattle.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] talks about sausage meat, I suppose.

Mr. GOOD. That is one of the items contained in your bill.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield now.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] overlooked the fact that so far as his criticism in reference to that proposition is concerned, both swine and swine meat are placed on the free list in this bill. He forgot that in his argument.

The whole proposition, though, is this: That this party on this side of the House promised to the American people free bread and free meat, and we are keeping our promise to the American people to-day as we have done in the past. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment be now closed.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma, Mr. MONDELL, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am closing it on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. MONDELL. Is the gentleman proposing to close debate on the paragraph?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On the new paragraph offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. It is already closed on the main paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have entered into an agreement with the House as to debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate on the pending amendment be now closed.

Mr. MANN. This amendment is to place meat on the dutiable list. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McGUIRE] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] are both very much interested. Will not the gentleman make it 10 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman make it 15 minutes, so that I can get 5 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I will.

Mr. GARDNER. Will not the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] yield to a question before he sits down?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let us get through with this first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be closed in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be yielded to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McGUIRE], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may have time sufficient to answer a question. The gentleman stated that the duty of 1½ cents a pound, which is the present duty on beef, was the equivalent of 17 per cent. At what price per pound does he calculate his meat?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not make the calculation. It is the calculation of the Treasury Department for the year 1910, and the Treasury Department says the unit of value for that year was 8.4 per cent.

Mr. GARDNER. That is what I made it. I wanted to show that it was calculated incorrectly on beef that was worth less than 9 cents a pound.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I refer the gentleman to the Treasury Department.

Mr. GARDNER. That was in 1910.

[Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Oklahoma is the most conservative man I know. He has placed the number of lies told about the Payne bill at only 1,000,000.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I mean the number of liars.

Mr. MONDELL. Still more conservative.

This bill places meats on the free list. It has retained a 10 per cent duty on cattle. That means that the gentleman from New Jersey can assure his people that meats are going to be cheaper, while the gentlemen from Texas and Missouri can assure their people that the placing of meats on the free list is going to make no difference, because cattle are still taxed.

The fact is there is no logic whatever in placing meats on the free list and taxing live animals; and if the gentlemen were entirely honest in their endeavor to reduce the price of beef in this country, and were willing to sacrifice the American farmer to do it, they would put both cattle and meat on the free list. You say to the dwellers along the seaboard that you are going to give them cheaper meats, and if you do, you place all the cattle growers of the country in competition with the Argentine and Australia, and at the same time you refuse to allow the cattle growers to secure their stock at a lower price from the only country where we can secure it in any large numbers, to wit, Mexico. But Mexico happens to lie adjacent to the empire State of Texas, hence the duty of 10 per cent on cattle and no duty on meats. Open the gates of Texas to the cattle of Mexico without a duty and the cheapest yearlings grown on earth will come in to feed on the grasses of Texas and the country to the north, where the great ranges lie. While the cattle raisers would suffer from the lower price for meat, owing to free importation of meats, they would at least have the advantage of lower raw material. While the men in Kansas and Nebraska would suffer by the lower price of meat at the seacoast, they might gain something through cheaper cattle coming into the range country from Mexico to be there grown and then shipped to the corn States to be fed.

But you could not carry out a logical proposition. The geography of your party is such that you can not do it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I have only five minutes. You could not carry out a logical proposition like that, which would lower the price of meat in the United States somewhat with the least possible injury to the American stockman; but you have a combination here which no one can defend, which has no logic in it, under which you propose to keep out the cheap young stock grown in Mexico and at the same time put the American farmer in competition with the frozen meat from abroad.

But if you gentlemen want to be consistent, and you honestly want to do what you claim you want to do, you will put cattle on the free list along with meat. If you want to give the American farmer and ranchman the opportunity he is entitled to, to grow and fatten the best meats in the world for the American people, you will place neither meats nor live stock on the free list.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, I started out a while ago with the statement that the duty on cattle does not affect the price of meat in this country so long as the prevailing quarantine laws continue in force, and owing to the shortness of my time I was unable to finish my argument.

I had this proposition presented to this Government by the Government of Spanish Honduras: Can we ship cattle into the United States and break down the price of meat? I took the trouble to go from Puerto Cortez, a ride of 360 miles, to Tegucigalpa, the capital, where I talked with the then President of the Republic, and he secured the signatures to an assent to deliver to me 300,000 four-year-old steers, fat and ready for market, at $20 Honduran money, which, being at the rate of 40 cents on a dollar, meant $8 apiece. At that time steers of that character were selling in Chicago at over $40 apiece. I came back here not with a view of getting the contracts, but I wanted the slaughterhouses in the city of New Orleans, of Mobile, of the coast cities, to get these 300,000 head of steers and bring them from Honduras, the cost of transportation by water being $3.75 apiece, making $11.75 for steers that were selling in St. Louis and Kansas City for nearly $40 apiece. They appealed to me to present the matter to the Secretary of Agriculture. I went to him and he said that there might be some disease among them. The Government of Spanish Honduras put up the money and had two experts sent by the Secretary of Agriculture. They went down there and found nothing the matter with the cattle except that they had ticks. Now, the ticks abound from the 36th degree of north latitude, which includes North and South Carolina and California, and the 36th degree of south latitude, which includes a part of Argentina, where the British get their meat.

There are ticks everywhere between these lines. We ship cattle from Louisiana, North Carolina, Texas, and Tennessee into the markets of Kansas City, Chicago, and East St. Louis; we ship them for immediate slaughter, and no objections are urged to them under the quarantine laws. And yet these 300,000 steers could not be brought into New Orleans, Galveston, Beaumont, or anywhere along the Gulf coast or on the Atlantic seaboard to be slaughtered immediately as they do in Chicago with southern cattle, because the Secretary of Agriculture said they had ticks.

You could kill the cattle and bring them into the country, bring the hides with the ticks on them in, bring the meat into the country, because ticks do not affect the meat, and yet the influence of the Meat Trust was such that these 300,000 steers are still in Honduras dying of old age or being slaughtered for their hides, and the American people are still demanding cheap beef. The gentlemen in charge of this bill have never investigated the subject and are not willing to permit these cattle to be brought into the country and compete with the Meat Trust. These are the facts. The Government of Honduras paid the entire expenses, and the report was in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, a copy of which is in my office, and yet these cattle can not be brought into this country so as to permit competition with the Meat Trust.

You talk about the meats from Argentina and your meat being made cheaper by having this bill passed. I will tell you that you will not cheapen meat at all until cattle from Chihuahua and Sonora and Guatemala and Costa Rica and Honduras, millions of them, can be brought into this country in the tick territory for immediate slaughter. We have a large tick territory in this country, as they have in Mexico and South and Central America, and yet gentlemen say taking the duty off will cheapen meat; but I tell you that it never will until you have regulated that proposition. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired; all time has expired; and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after section 188, a section to be numbered 188½ and to read as follows:

"All meats, including fresh beef, pork, lamb, veal, and all prepared or preserved meat, including ham and bacon, 15 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that a tariff will not in any way affect the price of beef or cattle. If that be true, I see no occasion for this session of Congress or for the modification of this particular schedule. I do not believe that it affects this to the extent that a great many people claim. I want to call the attention of the committee to this one fact: The purpose of this bill is largely shown in Schedule G, where the greatest reductions are made. The reductions amount to twice as much in Schedule G as they do in any other schedule—directed against that 60 per cent of the area of the United States lying in the West. I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact: On page 3 of this report, at the head of the many alleged evils that are to be corrected by this bill, stands this most elevated target: Farm products, increase from 1897, 93.2 per cent. I take it that it is the admitted purpose and claim of this bill to do away with those profits. They did not say anything about that out West. We hear a good deal about it here. I want to tell the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that if he had gone throughout the West and had had Members upon that side declare that they would have free meats and cereals and other farm products there would not have been a Member elected from the great Northwest to sit upon that side. They did not talk about that; and while I am talking about the membership from the Northwest, I want to state this particular fact: We are protectionists in that great Northwest.

I have looked over the returns of the elections in every district of the United States, and I find those who were opposed to protection have carried a majority vote in only 211 congressional districts of the United States, while in 224 districts of the United States the protection votes were in a majority. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There is a great deal of misinformation leading to this sort of action, and some of it comes from exceedingly high authority. I have in my hand a copy of a speech that was delivered on September 12, 1912, in Albany, by a man who has been elevated to high authority in this country. This is what he said:

Take the price of meat, for instance, and the price of meat is at the heart of the business, for it is meat that makes the red blood and makes work easier. The price of meat has gone up 30 and 40 per cent in 10 years in this country, and the price of American meat has not gone up a fraction of a cent per pound in the London markets.

If he means by that that wholesale meat has not gone up in the English markets, I will call the attention of the Congress, and of the gentleman himself, to the actual facts of the price

of American meat imported into the United Kingdom for the last 14 years, and I will give an authoritative statement:

Average annual price per hundredweight of all American beef shipped into the United Kingdom.

1899	$10.06
1900	10.25
1901	10.30
1902	10.98
1903	10.35
1904	10.40
1905	10.45
1906	10.45
1907	10.35
1908	11.08
1910	10.88
1911	11.08
1912	12.00

Increase of price of United States beef imported into the United Kingdom for 1912 over 1902, more than 9 per cent.

Average price for last 5 years over average for first 5 years above quoted, nearly 8 per cent.

The increase in the price of United States beef imported into the United Kingdom in 1912 from 1902, which fixes the period he had in mind, was 9 per cent. The average price of 1910, 1911, and 1912, as compared with 1900, 1901, and 1902, was an increase of 7 per cent.

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

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I read this letter to show some of the inconsistencies of this bill:

EAST BUFFALO LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION,
East Buffalo, N. Y., April 17, 1913.

To Members of the Senate and House of Representatives:

It appears to be the determination of the present Congress and of the President to enact a tariff law admitting meats duty free. This we believe to be a grievous mistake, against which we most earnestly protest; but assuming that meats will be so admitted we respectfully urge that provision be made for the admission of live stock on an equal basis. Otherwise, the producers of meats in this country, which means not alone the so-called "Beef Trust" or "big packer," but the raisers of grass and grain, the farmers, feeders, and stock raisers, as well as the independent butchers and slaughterers, big and little, to the number of several thousands throughout the country, will suffer from such unjust discrimination.

The "big fellow" can take care of himself, either here or abroad, but, while striking at him what is only an imaginary blow in this country, the free admission of meats with a 10 per cent duty on cattle, is but a play into his hands, assisting him in the extension of his operations abroad by opening to him our markets for his foreign productions, with increased profits to himself, to the detriment of actual home producers, the probable throwing out of employment of thousands of workmen, and with no benefit to the consuming public through cheaper meats. The fact is, that the large packers, four in number, constituting the so-called "Beef Trust," already have numerous large plants in Canada and in South America, of which they would immediately avail themselves, and ultimately there would be created and built up a genuine and real world-wide beef trust; and if we really want a beef trust better plans could scarcely be devised for the permanent establishment of such.

With the free admission of meat animals, however, still assuming that meats are to be free, conditions would be more nearly equalized. The farmer, grazier, and feeder could obtain thin stock for raising and fattening, and the home butcher would be on an equal footing in the purchase of supplies. Competition would be on an equitable basis, the law of supply and demand would have a fair opportunity of asserting itself and if benefits are possible they might be realized.

The following, quoted from an interview with Mr. A. J. Shamberg, vice president of the National Live Stock Exchange, appearing in a recent issue of the New York Journal of Commerce, is indorsed and commended to your earnest consideration:

"When the hearings are held in Washington a delegation will be present to present the argument that the raising of the duty on dressed beef while leaving a duty on live cattle will not tend to the reduction of the price of meat. The placing of a duty of 10 per cent on live cattle and allowing dressed beef to come in duty free will further assist the so-called Beef Trust to kill off smaller packers throughout the United States and also to throttle the foreign raisers of live stock, some of the reasons for which are as follows:

"(1) Only very large corporations can maintain killing plants throughout the world and successfully meet keen rivalry.

"(2) Nobody can import live cattle for slaughter in the United States and sell beef thereof in competition with imported dressed beef if the rate of duty is to favor the dead article 10 per cent.

"In consequence, the foreign live-stock raisers will be forced to sell to those interests which have the slaughtering facilities in foreign lands, as they neither can slaughter at home nor ship here alive in competition, owing to such duty discrimination.

"Also our smaller slaughterers throughout this country will not be able either to import the live cattle, owing to duty discrimination against live cattle, nor establish slaughtering plants in foreign countries, owing to the large capital necessary for such.

"As a matter of equity, and to eliminate monopoly, sure to establish itself, the rate of duty should be in favor of the importation of live cattle for the following reasons:

"(1) Because the expense of feeding and shrinkage of carcass is eliminated in transporting beef in competition with transporting live cattle.

"(2) Because the business of importing live cattle would be open to hundreds of persons, the competition among whom in selling would produce cheaper meat (despite extra handling expense) than would the importation of dressed beef handled by comparatively few firms.

"(3) Imported dressed beef will not create the demand for labor, being the finished article, that would be created with importations of live cattle which are to be slaughtered and manufactured into beef, thus creating industry at home.

"Briefly, to tax live cattle and let in dressed beef will place the meat industry in a few hands, encourage foreign industry of slaughter, permit monopolists to dictate prices they will pay for cattle abroad, and the prices meat must sell for here. Legislation of this sort will, I believe, meet strenuous opposition and have to be altered.

"Again, our farmers will be confronted with the importation of meats and not be able to bring in thin stock for feding purposes, and, in time, this would mean the reduction in corn raising, 85 per cent of which great crop is being now used in feeding live stock.

"My hope is that live cattle will be allowed in free, thus creating industry for the farmer, a market for his grains, and stimulus to animal husbandry which supplements the fertility of his soil. Meat should pay a duty of at least 1 cent per pound as a protection to home producers and in the indirect interests of consumers as well."

Respectfully,

EAST BUFFALO LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just taken his seat made the statement, as I understood him, that if the Democratic Party prior to the last election had declared in the West and in the Northwest that they proposed in this bill to give to the people of this country free meat and free bread we would not have elected a single Representative in the entire West or Northwest. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska to the bill on which we made our campaign. On the 8th day of May, 1911, we passed through the House a bill which provided for free beef, free veal, free mutton, free lamb, free pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner, bacon, ham, shoulders, lard, lard compound, and lard substitutes, sausage and sausage meats coming from any foreign country with which the United States has a reciprocal trade agreement and which shall admit from the United States free of duty cotton, wheat, oats, corn, cattle, and hogs, buckwheat flour, cornmeal, wheat flour, semilina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal, rolled oats, and all prepared breakfast foods.

That is the proposition upon which we made our campaign, and this bill passed the Senate and was vetoed by the President of the United States on the 18th day of August, 1911. We gave to the country fair notice that if the Democrats controlled this body and controlled the Senate and controlled the Chief Executive of the Nation we proposed to do these very things. The President vetoed this bill. Is not the fact that we have elected so many Representatives in the Northwest on this sort of a platform due to the fact that we declared in favor of these free foods, and especially due to the fact that the President vetoed this bill, thereby placing the Republican Party in a position of opposition to it all?

Now, they say that the small tariff we have retained on live cattle will prevent the importation into this country of live cattle from the Republic of Mexico, and yet last year when the tariff upon live cattle was nearly three times as much as we have placed it in this bill, when the tariff amounted to 27 per cent ad valorem, and we have placed it now at 10 per cent, we brought into the United States 330,000 head of cattle. Now, when we have lowered the tariff to 10 per cent, when we have made it about one-third of what it was, does it follow and is it logical that fewer cattle will come across the boundary from the Republic of Mexico? Why, instead of 27 per cent——

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has stated the number of cattle that came in at the higher rate. I presume the gentleman wants more to come in. Does not the gentleman think that more cattle would come in if they were free than at the 10 per cent rate?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not think the nominal rate of 10 per cent ad valorem will make any material difference in the amount of importations from Mexico from what the importations would be if cattle were free, but it will result in additional importations. We have not kept this 10 per cent ad valorem on cattle for the purpose of protecting the farmers of this country. The gentlemen who are talking upon the other side can not make the farmers of this country believe in a high duty on cattle. They want cattle in their industry. Why, it is to the interest of the farmers of this country——

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I can not at present. It is to the interest of the farmers of this country to get their free raw material from Mexico just as cheaply as they can get it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just taken his seat is an expert on the subject of this agricultural schedule, and especially with regard to meat. Now, I hold in my hand the Democratic campaign document that I referred to a moment ago, which was circulated either by the Democratic national committee or the Democratic congressional committee, entitled "The High Cost of Living," quoting the prices on meats for

1896 and pointing to those prices as the ideal price, and I want to ask the gentleman this question: If this bill shall become a law, as it now appears, with free meats and a duty of 10 per cent upon cattle, with free hogs and free pork products, how much will that reduce, in the gentleman's estimation, the price of meat to the consumer?

Mr. RAINEY. I will say to the gentleman, we put swine upon the free list now. The gentleman seems to be objecting. Last year we brought in 994 hogs. What difference does that make?

Mr. GOOD. I would like to have the gentleman answer my question. How much will this bill, if it is enacted into law, reduce the price of meat to the ultimate consumer?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know how much we will be able to reduce the cost of living in this country.

Mr. GOOD. I am not asking that.

Mr. RAINEY. But if under Democratic administration we will be able to check the increased price of living that has been growing under Republican administration, then we will have accomplished much.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman answer what is in the campaign circular, or state that it is absolutely false——

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know anything about the campaign circular.

Mr. GOOD. I will be glad to show the gentleman a copy of it, because I went to the expense of having some of these campaign circulars printed and circulated among the farmers in my district. I want to know how much will the enactment of this bill into law reduce the price of meat to the consumers. I want the gentleman to be honest with Members of the House at least.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman can not expect the gentleman from Illinois to be a prophet. In this case we are trying to reduce the cost of living in this country; in this case, the cost of meat. We promised to do it, and we are going to do it.

Mr. GOOD. How much will be the reduction?

Mr. RAINEY. How much does the gentleman think it will take?

Mr. GOOD. How much do I say? I say you will give all the reduction to the Beef Trust, every bit, by putting a duty upon cattle.

Mr. BUTLER. That is wrong.

Mr. GOOD. Now, I ask the gentleman, as he is an expert and I am not——

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman will not get many men to agree with him on that proposition.

Mr. GOOD. Will it reduce the price 5 cents a pound on beefsteak?

Mr. RAINEY. I hope it will reduce it as much as the present tariff raised it, if the present tariff has raised it.

Mr. GOOD. Has the present tariff raised it?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know whether it has or not.

Mr. GOOD. Will the enactment of this law reduce the price? By putting swine and pork on the free list, will that reduce the price of salt pork and of fresh pork?

Mr. RAINEY. It will only affect the importation of 500 hogs. We took that off of the dutiable list because it is one of the Republican absurdities.

Mr. GOOD. But you put on the campaign circular by means of which Democrats obtained places in this House a list of 13 articles, among them salt pork, pork chops, pork ribs, and lard. You put all of those in your campaign circular, and said that the enactment of the Payne law increased the cost of them 50 per cent to the consumer, and now you say the repeal of the Payne law will not amount to a single penny to the ultimate consumer. Did you tell the truth when you issued that campaign circular, or do you tell the truth when you admit that the enactment of this law will not reduce the price to the ultimate consumer? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Unless some other gentlemen wish to speak on this amendment, I move that the debate close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I presume it would be well for us to consider the object of these proposed reductions. It has been stated over and over again that their object is to give to the consumer cheaper prices on food products. There has never been on the floor of this House one single fact stated upon which an argument could be based that would show that these reductions that you propose on these farm products will bring to the consumer cheaper food prices. A few years ago the Secretary of Agriculture made an investigation regarding the prices that were paid by the ultimate consumer of farm products, and he found that the ultimate consumer was paying about 100 per cent higher prices than the farmer was receiving for his products. If you really desire to consider the interests of all the people, as you say you do, would it not be more practical statesmanship for you to suggest some measure by which 100 per cent of the cost to the ultimate consumer is consumed by transportation and middlemen's profits and the combinations that are affected, both in the cities and out, in the disposition of these farm products? It has been stated here by gentlemen over and over again that these reductions in tariff rates will not make one particle of difference in the cost to the ultimate consumer of food products.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I can not yield, I am sorry to say.

If that be true, I will say to the advocates of this bill you are wasting your time; if that be true you are only trying to delude the ultimate consumer with these promises. In fact, that is what you are attempting to do. It was what you did during the last campaign. You went to those men in the East, to the workingmen, and you said, "It is true you are receiving high wages. We do not propose to reduce them, but we do propose to reduce the cost of living one-half." And you went to the farmers of the West and said, "Do not be frightened about taking off the duties on your products. It will not make a particle of difference. You never received any protection. You will get as much for your products after we have gone into power and passed our bill as you ever did, but the benefit will be to you in that you will get a large reduction on everything from the East that you are compelled to purchase."

So you made the East believe that they could sell everything they had to sell high, and you made the West believe they could sell everything they had to sell high, and you made both of them believe they could buy everything they had to use low. The proposition is, as these gentlemen put it, and are now making it, that the same people can sell everything they have to sell high and purchase everything they have to use low.

And that is the foundation on which this argument is now based in this House. I consider that this proposition made here, if it shall be judged on the declarations of these men who favor these reductions in farm products—a declaration made this afternoon—is absolutely unreasonable and inconsistent. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

190. Sheep, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, line 21, after the word "sheep," strike out the words "10 per cent ad valorem" and insert in lieu thereof "$1 per head."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment in the confident hope and fond expectation that it will be adopted. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

But I have offered it particularly for the purpose of calling attention to one of the absurdities in this bill. As has been pointed out already here, the purpose of this bill seems to be particularly to strike a blow at the farmer. Substantially everything that the farmer produces is either placed upon the free list or has the rate of duty upon it greatly reduced.

The item under consideration is no exception to that rule. As in the case of one of the other items that has just been discussed, however, to speak frankly, unless amendments shall be made to other sections of the bill it would not amount to anything at all to change this rate from 10 per cent ad valorem to $1 per head, or to any other figure, as is the case with the proposed duty upon cattle.

This item here, to speak frankly, is nothing more nor less than "bunc," in order that Democratic Members from agricultural districts may have something to talk about to their farmer constituents. For example, take the duty upon cattle, that we have been discussing. What difference does it make to the farmer, Mr. Chairman, if beef cattle and sheep are taken from the free list and placed on the dutiable list, as they are under the terms of this bill, when beef, mutton, veal, lamb, wool, and hides are placed on the free list? What difference will it make with respect to the price of the farmer's sheep while that item remains in? None at all. It gives him no protection whatever, yet compels him to buy protected clothing.

Every possible product that the foreign sheep raiser can bring into the country is put on the free list. Wool is put on the free list and mutton is put on the free list and sheepskins are put on the free list and mutton tallow is put on the free list. But as it is inconvenient and disagreeable and undesirable for Democratic Members who happen to come from agricultural districts to have to go to the farmers and say, "Everything you raise is on the free list," therefore, in order to let Members from Missouri or Texas, we will say, save their faces with their farmer constituents, a fake duty is placed on sheep of 10 per cent ad valorem, and a similar duty is placed on cattle.

Of course, as they have already discovered in the examination of this bill, it is a great thing if there can be somebody on the committee to look after these "special industries" that were discussed yesterday. On the subject of sheep and on the subject of wool we find that a wise discrimination was made by certain able gentlemen in order that the goat industry might be fully protected, while wool and mutton were put on the free list; and then, in order to pull the wool, or the goat hair [laughter], as the case might be, over the eyes of the farmer, an item is put in here, so that the Democratic Members running for reelection in agricultural districts can go to their constituents and say, "We stood up for your rights. We have a duty here on sheep of 10 per cent ad valorem." [Laughter on the Republican side.] So that it does not really make very much difference whether there is any tariff at all on sheep, if you put everything that can be produced by the sheep raiser on the free list.

I have introduced this amendment largely to call attention to that ridiculous and unfair provision in this proposed law. It is simply "bunc" and nothing else. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this paragraph and all amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to close debate and all amendments thereto.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

191. All other live animals not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not offer an amendment to this paragraph further than the formal one to strike out the last word. I have not offered an amendment to any rate in the bill. I do not intend to offer any amendment to any rate in the bill. I have voted for most of the amendments offered on this side. I have not offered any amendments because I realize how utterly futile it is to do so with the gentlemen on the other side pledged to resist all amendments.

In order that some future historian may not misunderstand what has been going on here and assume that there are many or a considerable number of items in these schedules that are not opposed because amendments are not offered to them, let it be written now that there is no hope of any amendment offered on this side being adopted; and, therefore, while there is scarcely a rate in the bill that we on this side approve, many of them are passed over because it is entirely useless to offer amendments.

As I said a moment ago, there is neither rhyme nor reason in the proposition to place meats on the free list and retain a duty on the live stock, and the only purpose there can possibly be, in my opinion, for doing that is, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] has just stated—and I desire to emphasize that statement—that the gentlemen from the cities may be able to say to their constituents, "We have reduced the price of meats; we have made meat free," and to enable the gentlemen from the country districts to say to their constituents, "We have retained a duty on your products."

If, perchance, any of your constituents in the country precincts should suggest that that is not logical, you appeal to their prejudices by saying that it is the product of the Meat Trust that you are placing on the free list, while the product of the farmer remains protected.

With meats on the free list there is not any sense on earth in retaining in this bill any of these items of protection of meat-producing live animals. On the contrary, if you are honest in your efforts to reduce the price of meats, and if you are willing in so doing to reduce the returns of the flockmaster, the herdsman, and the farmer, you must place live animals on the free list as you have placed meats on the free list, in order that the live animals may be imported, to be grown, fed, and fattened here. You will at least be logical if you do that. Though, to be fair to the farmer and stock raiser, neither meat nor live stock should go to the free list.

The gentleman from New Jersey has indicated what will probably happen at the other end of the Capitol—live animals will also go to the free list. That will save the faces of the gentlemen from the bucolic districts on that side of this House, for they can go home and say that they voted here for a bill that retained a duty on the farmers' live stock, but the wicked Senate struck it out; and when they voted for the conference report, of course they had to vote for it in toto up or down, and therefore they could not defend the industries of their farmer constituents, much as they desired so to do. "Bunc," says the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS]. Not only bunc, but buncombe, and heaps of it. But the American people will not be permanently fooled, all or a majority of them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I move to close debate on the paragraph and amendments in five minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not care to debate my amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. All right. Then I move to close debate now.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, debate on the paragraph and all amendments will be closed.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 23, page 50, strike out "10" and insert "25."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. STEENERSON. It is to come in as a new paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 23, page 50, insert a new paragraph, as follows:
"191½. Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds."

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, the alleged reason for placing potatoes on the free list is to cheapen the cost of living. Now, I want to call your attention to the history of this industry, to show you how unreasonable that proposition is. The production of potatoes has been advanced and improved, by reason of the invention of modern machinery, to such an extent that the production of potatoes in the United States has increased very rapidly, so that last year we produced 376,000,000 bushels. It is one of the things that goes into the daily food consumption, and this food supply has constantly increased. At the same time that this great increase of production has been going on the price has been reduced. Now, it was alluded to a while ago that the Democratic campaign circular said that they wanted to go back to the prices of 1896 so far as pork was concerned. Go back to the prices of 1896 for potatoes and you will find that they were 80 cents a bushel, according to the table printed in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, whereas in 1912 the average price in the United States of potatoes was only 52 cents a bushel.

What can you accomplish when 99 bushels out of 100 are sold through the dealers and middlemen, and when they reach the consumer sell for 50 cents a bushel? How much cheaper do you want them? That means that the farmer, after paying the freight, gets about 25 or 30 cents a bushel on an average. What will it effect if you put potatoes on the free list? These men who are engaged in the modern industry of raising potatoes have invested in expensive machinery, in potato diggers, potato planters, manure spreaders, and machines for spraying, and so forth. They have built up extensive warehouses so that they can handle the potatoes very cheaply, and that is the reason that the price has been gradually going down.

Now, if you put them on the free list, the chances are that the foreign countries will flood the market, reduce the price still further, and after you get our people out of the business and devote the land to other purposes the price will go up. You never had in the history of the country as cheap potatoes as you have to-day. If you want potatoes for nothing, that is another thing. I do not believe there is a man anywhere, laborer or capitalist, who wants the farmer to produce potatoes more cheaply than he does now.

You can buy them in my town for 25 cents a bushel, and in 1912, according to your own table, they were only worth 52 cents a bushel. What are you doing? Here is an item where the duty was not excessive by your own test. It was shown

here by this table that the revenue derived from potatoes has been gradually increasing every year from $175,000 in 1896 to $7,175,375.85 in 1912. You are throwing away a revenue of over $7,000,000 annually to let in foreign potatoes in order to cheapen potatoes below 50 cents per bushel, the average price last year. Will you do it? No; you will discourage production at home and in the end raise the price to the consumer here. I do not believe a single laboring man begrudges the farmer the price he now gets for his potatoes. The consumption of potatoes per capita is less than 3 bushels. One day's work at $3 per day will now buy from 6 to 12 bushels. Two days' work will buy a year's supply for a whole family. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on these amendments be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves that all debate close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a telegram read which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 30, 1913.*

Congressman SYDNEY ANDERSON,
Washington, D. C.:

The Minnesota Potato Growers and Shippers' Association, representing every potato grower in the State, is very much opposed to the removal of the tariff on potatoes. Can you do anything for us; and what can we do to assist? We believe placing potatoes on the free list will curtail their raising to the degree that eventually the consumer will suffer more than under the present law. There are numerous other perfectly good reasons for the maintenance of the tariff with which you are familiar.

MINNESOTA POTATO GROWERS & SHIPPERS' ASSOCIATION,
GEO. B. HIGGINS, *Secretary.*

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great attention and interest to the remarks of various Representatives from the agricultural districts. I have read the schedule on agricultural products, and I could not help thinking as I sat here that after all the items appeal to others than those from the agricultural districts, as the schedules contain articles that are the necessaries of life for the great wage-earning population of this Nation. Last summer I happened to be in a community which I believe is within the district of the gentleman from Ohio. I found that the farmers are further advanced than their Representatives in some degree. I went into 37 counties of Pennsylvania last summer, one of the largest agricultural States in the Union, having one of the greatest agricultural counties, old Lancaster, and I found the farmers were making no such arguments as have been made here on the floor of the House by Representatives. They were denouncing the Payne law in unmeasured terms and demanding relief. I want to say to you that the farmers of Pennsylvania and Ohio are in some degree advanced enough to know that they can not hope to get advantage by special privileges which drain the pockets of others. They are not trying to get their hands in the pockets of others half as much as they are trying to keep other hands out of their pockets. I find, as I said in my speech in general debate, that special privilege in whatever form always fights for the advantage of the few at the expense of the many. That statement is responsible, I suppose, for this editorial which was handed to me a moment ago.

After a half column devoted to the superlative merits of my distinguished predecessor, the editorial closes as follows:

Mr. Dalzell's seat is occupied in the Sixty-third Congress, but it is not filled. His district has a Representative, but it is not represented.

This is an editorial from a paper published in Pittsburgh and owned by Mr. GEORGE T. OLIVER. It is a statement that I desire to have placed in the RECORD, for perhaps it explains why the privileged few are always linked together to betray and pray upon the common people of this Nation. I have said on the floor of this House only that which I am willing to stand for and maintain at any place or time. Perhaps, too, there may be something in my opposition some years ago, as a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, to the gentleman, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, to account for this editorial. I said then and I say now that his golden windfall of millions is the only thing by which he can claim advancement to place or station, and to my mind such qualifications are not all sufficient.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing potatoes. [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I want to say one thing further, that I have no desire to fill the sphere of my distinguished predecessor, nor shall I attempt it. I have no desire to be known as the high priest of protection. If I might choose a title I would far rather be known as the high priest of the unprotected.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MONDELL. To discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one minute. There is one minute remaining of the time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to speak later.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEENERSON) there were—ayes 52, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

192. Barley, 15 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, in line 24, after the word "barley," strike out "15 cents" and insert "25 cents."

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, having consumed an hour the first day of general debate, in which time I confined myself wholly to the agricultural schedule, I had not intended to consume any more time on this schedule, because I realize that it is simply a waste of time to talk against a proposition such as we have here to-day, where a party has already legislated on this matter, and it is impossible to change any of these schedules. But this particular paragraph is so absolutely absurd and indefensible from the position taken by the majority themselves that I thought it might perhaps appeal to them to change it. They have started out with the idea of lowering the cost of living to the people of this country, and I sympathize with any party that attempts to do an act of that kind, even though it may be in the wrong, if they are sincere. This is a proposition that does not come under that head. Anyone who knows anything about barley knows that the ultimate consumer of barley is not the man who eats, but the man who drinks. That man is not going to be benefited by the lowering of the duty on barley. Last year the farmers in our State sold barley for 90 cents a bushel. This year they got 35 cents a bushel, and still you will find that the beer that has been made out of the barley during those two years was sold for the same price exactly. The only people who benefited from this at all would be the brewers and possibly the saloon keepers, who might buy at wholesale a little bit cheaper.

Mr. PAYNE. But does not the gentleman know that they all vote? The gentleman does not understand the principle of this bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. HELGESEN. They do. There is a very good reason why I want to appeal to you on this schedule. You have said the reason you want to reduce the duty on grains that go into food products was because we are not raising enough of them in this country. One reason why we are not raising as much wheat as we ought to raise and as we could raise is because of the fact that when you raise wheat a certain length of time the ground will get foul with weeds, and the best way we know of out there to eradicate the weeds is to sow it to barley. Now, it is a very important thing for the farmers of the Northwest to have a crop of barley that is profitable to raise and not one that is a losing proposition, and it seems to me that if you want to benefit this country, if you want to reduce the cost of bread even, the proper thing is to leave a sufficient duty on barley so it will make it a profitable crop for the farmer to raise. By doing so you are going to enable him to clean his land and eradicate the weeds so as to increase the yield of wheat; and if you increase the yield of wheat per acre, you are making a larger volume of wheat and thereby benefiting the consumer. But to cut the barley duty in two is absolutely not going to benefit anyone. Of course, I realize that the Democrats are not in sympathy with the farmer. It is very evident they are not from the speeches made in this House. These speeches indicate exactly where they stand on this proposition. But it seems as if they have inadvertently done something that is not going to benefit anyone except the brewers and saloon men, and being in that condition, they might, even though they have no particular love for the farmer, correct that mistake. Now, if you want to know how the Democrats stand as against the farmers, during the time of the discussion of the Canadian reciprocity proposition several speeches made in this House indicate plainly where the Democratic Party stands as against the farmer. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], in discussing the Canadian reciprocity bill, had this to say on February 13, 1911:

The recent election, bringing about the first overthrow the Republicans have sustained in many years, was freighted with one great demand—the demand of the people of our congested cities to take the taxes off from food and clothing. In response to that mandate we are now taking the first step. From the east side of New York City a million voices are raised in appeal to you that you should make this bill a law. From every city in the East they cry out to you.

Speaking on the woolen bill, on July 30, 1912, he said:

This Democratic Congress was sent here by the consumers of the country, and not by the producers. Your Tariff Board report to which you make reference is a producer's report. It deals exclusively with the difference in the cost of production, if any, here and abroad.

Hon. William Sulzer, of New York, on August 5, 1912, speaking on the tariff question, said:

The Democrats must keep the tariff to the front. It will never be settled until it is settled right—and it will never be settled right until it is settled by the friends of the consumers.

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, on June 10, 1912, said:

I believe in relieving the men who work in the factories and in the foundries and have to purchase their daily bread. * * *

What further evidence is needed to convince anyone that the farmer has nothing to hope for from the Democratic Party?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my purpose to occupy the time of the committee by participation in the debate upon the bill now before the House, my advent into this body being a matter of such recent occurrence and my experience so limited that I might well leave the expression of the views of my party to those of my colleagues whose knowledge and experience so much better fit them to the task. But after listening for more than a week, with much interest, to the frank and, I believe, sincere pronouncements by our Democratic friends of the policy which this bill is not only calculated, but intended to put into effect, and after reflecting upon the degree of departure of the policy declared from the policy by which the American people have seen fit to be guided in the past, I have been unable to forbear the temptation to take advantage of the rule under which the House is now proceeding to make a few observations upon the subject and the situation.

I am controlled in this respect not only from a consideration of the importance of the question itself but from a consideration of the causes which have made this radical change possible. The history of the American people bears striking evidence of their high degree of efficiency in the art of self-government. Throughout most of their political career we find practical acknowledgment not only of their willingness to submit to the will of the majority in matters of public concern, but of their keen perception of the necessity of so doing.

But the American people are not always infallible; indeed, they are not always wise. We stand to-day confronted by a spectacle the like of which has been rarely witnessed in our political career. A great commercial policy, inaugurated nearly a century ago, crystallized and developed through more than half a century of highly successful application, relinquished by a clear and controlling majority of the people while believing in its efficacy and its wisdom, and the privilege and power yielded to a minority to substitute another policy which is in every fundamental respect its antithesis. Controlled by considerations in a degree laudable in themselves, some of the majority have permitted themselves to lose sight of the common tie which bound the whole into efficiency of purpose and action. United they have refused to stand; divided their fall was inevitable. It remains for the future to determine whether reflection following in the wake of experience will bring wisdom; whether those whose common political faith is grounded on the time-vindicated principles and policies of the Republican Party will realize that in unity and tolerance lies the hope of reestablishing the things for which they stand and rebuilding the house of their country's prosperity.

The motto upheld by the Republican Party throughout all of its magnificent career has been that the American people must produce all that they consume; that, being blessed with a wealth of resources almost ample to feed and clothe the world, there is no rational excuse to be found in the economy of trade why we should buy the commodities which we can produce here from those who produce like commodities abroad.

The Republican Party has been constant in its advocacy of the protective policy because its membership believed that if the great opportunities of this country were to be conserved for the benefit of the American citizen and the welfare of their common country the oppressive competition of the labor of the Old World must be restricted. The Republican Party has been constantly for the protective policy because it believed that we could not constantly buy a large portion of the things we consume abroad without robbing our own citizens of their national and natural right to produce and sell those things at home.

The Democratic Party has been constant in its advocacy of the doctrine that the markets of the United States ought to be open to the world with the least possible restriction; that the products of the world's labor ought to be free to enter our markets at all times regardless of the effect upon our own production. The Democratic Party has affected to believe that we could maintain our present standard of living and compensation for labor, and at the same time buy a large portion of the things which we consume abroad, and thereby expose American labor to the full force of competition with the labor of European and Asiatic countries, notwithstanding that the labor of these countries receives on an average of less than half the American wage. In the report upon the present bill the Committee on Ways and Means has said that they believe that the pledge of the Democratic platform of 1912 contains two essential ideas: First, the establishment of duties designed primarily to produce revenue for the Government, and without thought of protection; and second, the attainment of this end by legislation which will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

It is the pretense of the majority that it has conformed its action to these essential ideas in framing the present bill. We must concede that the bill has been formulated with little thought of protection, except upon a few apparently favored industries. But as to its injurious effect upon legitimate industries, Republicans entertain some very positive notions. It would be a waste of time, however, to attempt to modify or change the conviction of the real apostle of free trade. The present generation of that school must learn as did the generations which preceded them—by the experimental process. It may not be a waste of energy, however, for those who have been believers in the protective policy in the past to carefully note the effect of the law which is to be enacted not only upon the various industries of the country when considered individually but upon the country and its prosperity as a whole.

The great agricultural section of the country from which I come has enjoyed a fair degree of prosperity under the protective policy in this country during the last 16 years. Its inhabitants have deserved all that they have received. It will be well and wise for them to understand now at the outset that they are to pursue their various avocations and conduct their business for a number of years to come under a commercial policy widely different from that under which they have operated in the past. This condition is brought about not by their choice nor as the direct result of their votes. Every State of the great Middle West north of the Mason and Dixon line cast its vote for protection. The people of those States believe in protection, and always have so believed. They are now, however, to experience the full force of an adverse policy. Practically every article produced by the western farmer is placed in open competition with like products from all other countries in their own markets. The great transportation and market facilities which the western farmer has built up and developed during the last half century are now to be utilized to bring the products of foreign lands to his markets for the purpose of competing with him.

The weak pretense is put forth that the farmer need have no fears; that, notwithstanding the fact that the protective duties are taken off his products, no material increase of importation will follow. To illustrate: The importations of barley in the year 1912 amounted to 2,768,474 bushels, under an import duty of 30 cents per bushel. The present bill reduces that duty to 15 cents per bushel, and yet the Committee on Ways and Means in its report upon this bill estimates future importations to be 2,000,000 bushels per year only. They offer no explanation for the assumption that cutting the present duty in half will decrease the importation of the commodity. I am at a loss to understand just why the reduction of the duty on barley from 30 to 15 cents per bushel will tend to restrict the flow of that commodity into the markets of the United States. I also notice that in this report prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means it is estimated that the duties will be decreased from $830,542 to $300,000 under the pending bill. I had assumed that this revision of the tariff was to be accomplished in a way that would bring a revenue into the Treasury of the United States, but I am unable to understand why gentlemen on the other side of the aisle so adjust the duties on this commodity as to reduce the revenue from $830,000 to $300,000. But, in my opinion, the duties will not be reduced. Importations of barley will not be reduced; on the contrary, there will be a great increase in importation. This is especially likely when we consider that the railroad rates from Canadian territory are so adjusted that the Canadian barley can reach Minneapolis markets at a rate actually less than the barley produced in a large portion of Iowa and Nebraska.

What is true of barley is likewise true of the wheat and oats items. Referring again to the report of the committee on this bill and to the quotation for the years 1910 and 1912, and comparing those figures with the figures of previous years, we discover that the importation of wheat into the markets of the United States has been increasing very rapidly during the past few years. In 1912, 2,684,381 bushels of wheat were imported under a duty of 25 cents per bushel. It is now predicted that with the reduction of the duty from 25 to 10 cents per bushel

importations will be decreased to 2,000,000 annually, and that the revenue will be decreased from $352,245 to $200,000. Mr. Chairman, this is mere pretense. Neither the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means nor the majority of the membership of this House can deceive the western farmer nor lead him to believe that a reduction of the duty on wheat, barley, and oats will decrease the importation of these commodities into our markets. The Canadian grain-producing territory is very largely populated by men who have gone from the western portion of our country. These farmers in Iowa, Nebraska, Dakota, Minnesota, and other Western States have sons, relatives, and neighbors who have gone to Canada and who are now engaged in raising these commodities. Intercommunication is constantly carried on between them; they are well acquainted with the conditions across the line, and they know that the Canadian grain of all varieties will seek the markets of the United States in preference to any other market of the world. They understand that the farmer of the West has an acre-unit value ranging from $75 to $200 per acre and must, under the free-trade policy, meet in even competition the products of Canadian lands, the market value of which is less than one-fourth the value of their lands.

There is another weak pretense put out in this bill to mollify the indignation of the western farmer. A duty of 10 cents per bushel is laid upon wheat imported into this country, and it is claimed that that duty will be sufficient to restrict any unreasonable importation or competition. It is clear, however, that this duty of 10 cents per bushel amounts to nothing when we consider that flour, the product of wheat and its competing commodity, is permitted to enter our markets free. But this is not all. The 10 cents per bushel is to be remitted upon all of the imported wheat which is ground by the American miller and exported in the form of flour. In other words, the American miller, unable to meet the influx of free flour from the North, will turn his attention to grinding wheat for the people of Great Britain and continental Europe instead of for the people of the United States. The law will be so framed as to permit him to engage in this industry without hindrance. These men can buy without limit the wheat and other grain products of the Canadian farmer, manufacture that product, and ship it abroad on a basis of absolute free trade. Assuming, then, that the United States is to produce a surplus, her farmers are not only deprived of the benefits of their own markets, but they are deprived of every advantageous facility which they now have to meet the Canadian farmer in the markets of the world.

The Democratic Party is being no more generous to the western farmer with respect to his meat products than with respect to his grain. The meat produced by the western farmer is on the free list; the meat products of Canada, Mexico, and Argentina are given access to your markets without even the restriction of proper and wholesome inspection laws which are applied in this country to our own citizens.

An examination of the bill makes it very clear that the Democratic Party has determined to direct against every product of the farmer the highest degree of competition possible. No duty is laid upon any article produced by the western farmer where the laying of such duty would in any considerable degree restrict importation. The low duty on cattle will not restrict importation of live cattle from Mexico—only that portion of such cattle as are killed and brought in as meat. I say that it will not otherwise restrict the importation of cattle because Mexico has no other place to send her cattle. Mexico has cheap pasture and can afford to send her live cattle across the line under a 10 per cent duty in preference to sending them to any other country.

I have explained why a 10-cent-per-bushel duty on grain will not keep that commodity out of the market. Grain that has been coming in in yearly increasing quantity under a 25-cent duty will not be restricted when that duty is reduced to 10 cents, and besides this, the railways will be very glad to absorb a portion of that duty in order to get the traffic. Now, what is the purpose of all this? Ostensibly to reduce the cost of living to the great consuming public, and especially the laboring class. But the majority of the Ways and Means Committee have not been able to show by facts or figures or course of reasoning how, by reducing the value of the farmer's bushel of wheat or oats or corn the cost of the loaf to the laboring man is going to be reduced. The great mass of the laboring people in the cities buy their bread by the loaf. The price of that loaf does not vary with the rise and fall of the price of wheat. What is true of wheat is true of all other commodities.

The price of meat over the butcher's counter in the city does not rise or fall with the variations of the live-stock market unless the variation be in wide degree. Considering the whole line of necessaries, food products as well as fabrics, I predict that the ultimate consumer will gain very little in lowering the cost of living. Facts brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means and to this House clearly indicate that the increased cost that has come about during the past few years very largely lies, so far as manufactured goods are concerned, between the manufacturer and the ultimate consumer; and so far as agricultural products are concerned, between the farmer and the ultimate consumer. It is the increased cost brought about by high profits to the middlemen, and in many instances retailers, that has in large degree increased the cost of living in this country. Our Democratic friends will realize their expectations, so far as the lowering the price of the food products, wool, and cotton at the farm is concerned, but in my opinion they will fall far short of their expectations in lowering the cost of living to the ultimate consumer. On the other hand, opening the American markets to the world, throwing the products of our entire country in open competition with the world and its low-priced labor, will reduce our production, will reduce opportunity for employment, will reduce the standard of compensation for labor; and, relatively measured, the cost of living will go up and not down. The real price of an article is not always measured in dollars and cents. The most serious question to be considered by the American laboring man is, How much can I buy with my day's wage? and, Do I have a fair prospect of getting a day's wage? The question which most concerns the American farmer is whether he shall have the first chance at the American market which he has developed during the last half century, or whether he must sacrifice its advantages, without any compensatory equivalent, to the farmers of other countries; whether the standard of values of his land and other property built up by generations of toil and development shall be equalized with the standard of inferior countries. In the meantime, and as we observe during the next few years the operation of this new policy, or rather this old and discarded one, it may be well for those who believe in the protective policy applied fairly and in a reasonable degree to reflect upon the question of getting together. [Applause.]

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment to this paragraph?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. A new paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph be now closed. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 50, after line 24, by adding a new paragraph, No. 192½, to read as follows:

"192½. Broom corn, $25 per ton."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to close all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 48, noes 52.

Mr. MURDOCK. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I would like to know if under the general consent that was given on the request of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to extend remarks in

the RECORD, it applies to all speeches that are made under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. It applies to all speeches made on the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

193. Barley malt, 25 cents per bushel of 34 pounds.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to paragraph 193: In line 1, page 51, strike out "25" and insert "45."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

194. Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment by way of a new paragraph, numbered 194½.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 4, page 51, insert a new paragraph, to be known as 194½: "Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that paragraph has been passed and voted on. A gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] offered an amendment on potatoes some time ago.

Mr. MILLER. I was out of the Chamber for a few moments and was not aware that that had been offered. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "25" where it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "20."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope the gentleman will not attempt to delay the consideration of the bill by offering amendments over again. It has been practically passed upon, and the House voted on it.

Mr. MILLER. Has it been discussed pretty thoroughly?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is on the free list, and the gentleman will have an opportunity to discuss it when we reach that part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

195. Macaroni, vermicelli, and all similar preparations, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend that section by striking out "1 cent" and inserting "1½ cents."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, paragraph 195, line 5, page 51, by striking out the words "one cent" and inserting "one and one-half cents" in lieu thereof.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I have in my home city a manufacturing establishment engaged in making macaroni. When House bill No. 10 was introduced into the House, as fast as I could get copies of the bill I forwarded them to the manufacturing establishments in my district, and requested them to advise me how the bill would affect the industry in which they were interested. I hold in my hand a letter received from the American Macaroni Co., which is rather a large concern, at 1023 Market Street, Camden, N. J., which I will read:

AMERICAN MACARONI CO.,
Camden, N. J., April 11, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM J. BROWNING,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of the 9th instant, would say that we received copy of the new tariff bill as framed by the Democratic Party, and note that the tariff on macaroni products has been reduced one-half cent per pound.

As we said formerly, this will practically mean that many American macaroni factories will have to go out of business, as it is impossible to compete with foreign manufacturers, because macaroni is a product that is used principally by foreigners, and they prefer to buy imported goods, especially if they can buy it cheaper than the American product.

We appreciate your efforts in our behalf, and trust that the party in power will not be able to carry out their bill as outlined, not only in our line, but in many others.

Yours, truly, AMERICAN MACARONI CO.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] offered this amendment. Had he not done so, I would have had pleasure in offering it myself.

The story is a very simple one. A large number of people, many of them citizens of the United States of foreign birth, are engaged in the manufacture of macaroni and vermicelli in this country. To a certain extent their occupation answers criticisms that have been made upon this floor with regard to people of foreign birth who have engaged in enterprises in the United States. These people are Italians very largely. They learned their occupation in Italy, many of them. They came to the United States to better their condition. They established these factories, and they have undertaken to do business in the American markets, and have done it, so that American wages are now paid to men who formerly received Italian wages, which are only about one-third of those paid in the United States.

Mr. LOBECK. They have bettered their condition, then, have they not?

Mr. MOORE. Unquestionably they have bettered their condition. They came here for that purpose, and that is the whole story. The alien who comes to the United States, and who has been very much inveighed against here during the last few days, comes here to improve his condition, and here is a case in point. Men of lowly foreign birth come in from Italy, desiring to improve their condition. They enter into the same occupation here in which they were engaged there. Here they get three times the wages they got there.

Mr. LOBECK. I will say for the Italians in my town who are in this business that they have made no complaint against this bill.

Mr. MOORE. The Italians in the gentleman's town may have understood full well that the Democratic caucus meant to put this bill through, and knowing the uselessness of protesting, they made no sign to a gentleman who was hopelessly bound by the action of his caucus, and who could not help them if he would do so. But the Italians in my district, who are doubtless the equals of the Italians in the gentleman's district, and all good citizens of the United States——

Mr. LOBECK. Sure.

Mr. MOORE. Have come to me, as they came to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] in his district, believing that the Members of the House of Representatives who are free from that thraldom to which the gentleman has subjected himself, would urge the Democracy to pass a bill that would really be in their interest.

Mr. LOBECK. I believe they need no coaching, having been to school.

Mr. MOORE. The real question is, Shall we maintain in this country these industries which have been induced to come here or shall we urge them to go back, taking their business with them and such capital as they have accumulated here?

Mr. LOBECK. They will not go back, Brother MOORE.

Mr. MOORE. I do not think they will. They may go back during the time that the Underwood bill is in force, but they will return the minute Republican prosperity returns to the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

A letter from some of my constituents on this question is as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *April 9, 1913.*

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed herewith find briefs pertaining to macaroni tariffs, of which, no doubt, you are very familiar and which are self-explanatory.

We again beg you to urge the necessity of at least maintaining the present duty of 1½ cents per pound on macaroni, as a reduction in duty of same would, as we see it, in no way benefit the American people, owing to the fact that the majority of the users of the imported article are prejudiced against the American-made product.

We trust, therefore, that you will exert your efforts in upholding this growing American industry.

Thankingly, we remain,

Respectfully, yours,

GUANO & RAGGIOS.
R. DE ANGELIS CO.
LUIGI VERNA.
ANTONIO BICCHEGGA.
D. CONI.
ANTONIO DI NAPOLI.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma). All debate on this paragraph is closed. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROWNING. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 60.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

196. Oats, 10 cents per bushel of 32 pounds.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 7, strike out "10" and insert "15."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I should like 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well; I will make it 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I should like 2 minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. I want 3 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well; I will make the request 10 minutes, and that it be divided up in accordance with the requests of the three gentlemen.

Mr. MONDELL. Can not the gentleman make it 15 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let us get along with the consideration of the bill. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request and make it 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 12 minutes, is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to this example of the extremely scientific manner in which this bill has been prepared. Oats are taxed in this bill at 10 cents a bushel. Rolled oats and oatmeal are on the free list. The fact of the matter is that oats in British Columbia are to-day worth $23 a ton and in San Francisco they are worth $30 a ton. It would seem that that is handicap enough for the manufacturing interests in this country which are quite largely engaged in the manufacture of oatmeal and rolled oats, but it is not sufficient apparently to satisfy our friends on the other side of the Chamber, and so they tax the raw material at 10 cents a bushel and put the product on the free list, which means that the process of preparing oats for human food will be transferred to the Canadian side of the line.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the reduction of this duty from 15 cents to 10 cents can not be alleged as a matter of revenue, and therefore it must be one of the cases where you propose to reduce the cost to the consumer. The question is, Can the farmer afford the reduction? I want to offer a statement from a farmer in my district as to the cost of producing 10 acres of oats, which shows that, not allowing for the years when there is a poor crop, the profit would be $9 on 10 acres of oats. The proposed reduction in tariff would be $17.50; therefore the poor farmer would be the loser to the amount of $8.50 from his crop. [Applause on the Republican side.] I will insert it in the RECORD:

Cost of producing 10 acres of oats.

(By Benj. Wade, Harbor Beach, Mich.)

Rental of ground, at $2.50 per acre	$25.00
Plowing, 6 days, at $2.50 per day (the price of man and team would be more if they were hired)	15.00
Harrowing, 3 days, at $2.50 per day	7.50
Sowing, 1 day for man and team, $2.50; for drill, $1	3.50
For cutting and shocking, 3 men, team, and binder	9.00
Hauling to barn, 3 men and team	7.00
For binder twine, 20 pounds, at 7½ cents per pound	1.50
Thrash bill, 2½ cents per bushel on 350 bushels	8.75
Driving to market	12.50
Total	89.75
10 acres of oats, at 35 bushels per acre, 350 bushels; the farmer receives a usual price of 30 cents per bushel, which is	105.00
Cost of production	89.75
Leaving a balance of	15.25
Less for seed	6.25
Showing a net profit of	9.00

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, further supplementing what was said about the loss of revenue on the oat reduction of tariff rate, I want to call attention to the statement as follows: There is forecasted under this change a reduction of duties 33⅓ per cent and the imports fall 21,037.64 bushels and the values $108,008.96. Duties fall off $138,155.75, making the United States pay by foregoing that which would have come in $1.27 for every dollar's worth of oats stimulated to stay at home and not be imported. Sometimes this inspired charter of the new era pays to bring it in, sometimes it pays to keep it from coming in. If we just knew when it was going to leap forward, balk, or back, it would help some. In regard to what the gentleman in charge of the bill said this afternoon—that he announced to the public last fall that you were in favor of free meats and cereals. The gentleman honored me by delivering about a score of speeches in my district. I took occasion on several of those occasions to have the speech taken down by my shorthand friend, and from the shorthand notes he does not mention free meats, free cereals, or free cattle, or anything of that kind, in any of the speeches he made around in my district.

Mr. RAINEY. I am sorry I forgot it; it was my bad memory.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, just a word in reference to the rates upon oats and oatmeal. The rate has been reduced, of course, upon oats. The equivalent ad valorem now is about 39 per cent and the equivalent ad valorem upon oatmeal and rolled oats about 17 per cent. There is, if you so term it, a differentiation, a difference at least of 22 per cent. That is, the oats carry a higher ad valorem by 22 per cent than the rolled oats. Now, in the reduction which we have made we have placed rolled oats and oatmeal upon the free list and our specific rate upon oats is equivalent to about 28 per cent, so that the difference between the two products under our bill is about 28 per cent, while under the present law it is 22 per cent.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield? Is not that because of the prediction you would lower the people's oats under the coming bill?

Mr. HAMMOND. No; I think not.

Mr. SCOTT. How do you account for it?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Was there not a vote here that all debate should close at a certain time, and has not that time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly; 12 minutes; but the time has not expired.

Mr. MANN. How much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. A mintue and a half.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, under the existing law oats are dutiable at 15 cents a bushel. This bill proposes to reduce the rate to 10 cents a bushel, not a very severe reduction. Rolled oats or oatmeal are now upon the dutiable list—I forget the rate, 1 cent a pound—and has a very large consumption in the United States, as it is one of the main articles of consumption in many families. This is a proposition to put that upon the free list and leave the raw material upon the dutiable list, again exemplifying the wonderful genius of the gentleman who made up the bill, to put the raw product on the dutiable list and the finished material, made from the raw product, on the free list in order to encourage the grinding of oats in Canada instead of in the United States. If you bring a bushel of oats across the Canadian line you pay 10 cents a bushel, but if you do the work over there and employ Canadian labor to do the work of grinding the oats into oatmeal or rolled oats it comes in free of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman——

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

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after paragraph 196, a paragraph to be numbered 196½ and to read as follows:

"Maize, 10 cents per bushel."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph close after five minutes' debate on the amendment.

Mr. SLOAN. I do not care to delay the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I will ask for a vote.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—and had had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 7.45 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 7.45 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, at 7 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

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. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

197. Rice, cleaned, 1 cent per pound; uncleaned rice, or rice free of the outer hull and still having the inner cuticle on, § of 1 cent per pound; rice flour, and rice meal, and rice broken which will pass through a No. 12 sieve of a kind prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, ½ cent per pound; paddy, or rice having the outer hull on, § of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is no rice grown in my district or in the State of Michigan. When, however, so eminent a Democrat as Col. Robert Ewing, Democratic national committeeman from the State of Louisiana, expresses his views upon the subject of rice, I think the same are entitled to respectful consideration. He says:

Rice in Louisiana must have a protective tariff or the industry will be absolutely ruined. We produce more rice in Louisiana than in any other State. The crop will approximate thirty thousand millions a year. Remove the duty and Japan, Honduras, and other countries would send enough rice to the United States to put the rice growers of Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas out of business. Unfortunately, rice is not consumed as much in the North as in the South. It is one of the most nourishing products grown in this country. The entire Nation could subsist on rice if it became necessary. We raise in Louisiana enough rice to supply the entire population, yet we import a considerable quantity for special purposes, which gives us a good revenue.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber are engaged, as they were last fall, in the laudable but brain-racking proposition of trying to convince the farmer that they are going to so legislate that he will continue to receive the same good prices for his products, and the laborer the splendid wages he has been receiving, and at the same time he and the consumer are to receive the products of the farm much cheaper. When the gentlemen have consummated their mastery, we will all be able to lift ourselves by our boot straps.

When this bill was being considered in general debate a few days since, I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to explain why rice was on the dutiable list. He replied by saying that he was then discussing the metal and the steel schedule, and that he did not care then to answer the question. I would now respectfully ask the gentleman from Alabama if he will explain why rice is on the dutiable list?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has already explained it in his own statement. He has just read a statement in which it is said that on account of large importations of rice it was a good revenue producer, and if the gentleman will carefully read this schedule he will see that rice is cut to about the same extent as the other agricultural products in the schedule, and it is a very much better revenue producer than most of the cereals or any of the cereals that are named in the schedule.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Alabama before he takes his seat that rice that is cleaned is on the dutiable list at a cent a pound. Rice that is in the hull, not cleaned, is half a cent a pound. Wheat is on the dutiable list at 10 cents a bushel. Flour is virtually on the free list. Why not put cleaned rice on the free list also in the interest of cheaper food for the American people, this being such a grand article of food?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that cleaned rice is cut from 54 to 33, and now produces $635,000 of revenue. It is estimated that under this cut it will produce $750,000—a very good cut and a very good revenue producer.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand the principle is not to reduce the food to the American people when there is enough of it imported to make any appreciable difference, and the revenue is $635,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York desires to be captious.

Mr. PAYNE. Captious?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But he will see that there is a tax on barley and wheat and oats and other cereals in this schedule, and there was no particular reason why rice should be placed on the free list.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, but the finished product.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not disposed to quarrel with the gentleman from New York about putting food products on the free list. I hope the gentleman will move up in that way himself. I do not mean to say that we ought to put them on in a moment, but I think the last thing that we ought to tax is the food that goes into the mouths of the people in order that they may exist. Although this bill does not give to the ultimate consumer free food, it is a very considerable reduction going in the direction of giving American people free food, and I am glad to welcome the gentleman from New York with that column.

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

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I see two gentlemen on their feet, and I suppose they desire to discuss the paragraph. I ask that debate on the paragraph close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama has been particularly interesting and peculiarly edifying in the last few minutes in the formula he has been using. Heretofore if a rate was reduced we did not need the revenue, and if it was raised we did need the revenue. Now all food products must be cheap unless you can raise revenue by making them dear, and then you are justified in making them dear. Rice, the product of Louisiana and Texas, is given a rate of 1 cent a pound, 75 cents a bushel. Potatoes grown in Colorado and elsewhere in the North are placed on the free list. Beans grown somewhere along the merry line of Dixie are assessed at 25 cents a bushel. This is the consistency of this Democratic tariff bill.

Now, the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that if there is an agricultural product that perhaps needs little protection in the United States it is rice. Down in Louisiana and Texas they sow rice as in the North we sow grain—broadcast or with a seeder. They cut it with a reaper; they thrash it with a steam thrasher. There is hardly another place on earth where rice ground is not plowed in the mud, waist deep, by a water buffalo drawing a crooked stick behind him or where the plants are not sown in seedbeds and transplanted by hand. There is not a place on earth competing with these United States in the growth of rice where the actual labor on every bushel of rice grown is not three or four times what it is here. And no matter how illy paid that labor may be, I doubt if there is rice grown anywhere cheaper than it is grown down yonder in the Southland.

Wheat is grown under practically the same conditions the world over—sown broadcast or with a seeder, cut with a reaper, thrashed with a thrashing machine—except in the Far East, where they thrash it on a thrashing floor. And yet wheat is given a rate of 10 cents a bushel and rice a rate of 75 cents a bushel.

Is it because they grow rice down in Louisiana while they grow wheat in Minnesota? Is that why there is the difference that we find in this particular schedule? If not, what is the reason? In my State we grow wheat under irrigation. We are compelled to turn on the water, after having prepared the land at great cost, to irrigate the wheat at great cost, so that we raise wheat under the same conditions of irrigation under which rice is grown in the South. And yet wheat, our great staple, has a duty of 10 cents a bushel, and rice, the southern staple, or the staple of a few southern districts, 1 cent a pound.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman voted for the Payne bill. Why did you put a tax on rice at 54 per cent? You did it by your vote.

Mr. MONDELL. We believe in protection. Under our duty we built up that splendid rice industry in Louisiana and Texas. We made possible the digging of the ditches, the draining of the land——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. MONDELL. And the time has now come when, under a Republican policy, if we were revising the tariff, we would probably reduce the duty on rice.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Wait a minute and let me ask you a question.

Mr. MONDELL. And doing it, we will do it consistently, and give the rice grower the same protection that we give the grower of other cereals.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But you gave wheat a duty equivalent to 14 per cent, and you put 54 per cent on rice. Now you ask us why we put a higher rate on rice than on wheat? Why did you do it?

Mr. MONDELL. We put a high duty on rice to build up the industry, because we believe in protection. You do not believe

in protection, and yet you leave a high protective tariff rate on a product of a section of the sunny South and you reduce the wheat of the North to a low-revenue basis, placing flour, the product of wheat, on the free list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You put a 50 or 60 per cent rate on barley, a product of your own section.

Mr. KITCHIN. Ten per cent more than they put on rice.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] this question: The gentleman said a moment ago that the duty on rice was reduced for the benefit of the consumer. Is it not a fact that you have reduced the duty on broken rice from a quarter to an eighth, when there is no broken rice used by the consumers of this country, when the broken rice is used by the brewers only, for the purpose of making beer? And is it not a fact that this difference goes to the brewers and not to the consumers?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We have reduced the rice schedule all along the line.

Mr. LAZARO. I know; but I am speaking of the broken rice known as the brewer's rice, which has a duty under the present law of a quarter of a cent. Now, you have reduced it in this bill to one-eighth of a cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We made about the same reduction all along.

Mr. LAZARO. I know; but there is not any of this rice used by the consumer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So far as the gentleman and myself are concerned we are not consumers of that product, but other people are.

Mr. LAZARO. But is it not a fact that you are giving this difference to the brewers and not to the consumers?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not intimately enough acquainted with the question to know whether that is a fact or not; but we reduced the rates equitably, both to one class of consumers and to another class of consumers.

Mr. LAZARO. Yet, when you reduced the duty on broken rice from a quarter to an eighth of a cent you gave the advantage to the brewers.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, is it a private conversation that is going on over there? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not tell, but if the committee will come to order he can ascertain. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I understand, there is a part of the time remaining unused.

I do not like the criticisms of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] on this subject of the duty on rice. I have believed with him and voted with him on this side, but I think his remarks with reference to this particular item are unjust. This bill was written by 14 Democrats—7 of them being from the South. They have put the southern sugar-cane industry on the free list at the end of three years; they have put corn and corn meal and raw cotton on the free list, which is a southern staple; they have put iron ore on the free list; they have put bauxite on the free list; they have put lumber and coal on the free list; and they have greatly reduced the duty on cotton goods, kaolin, pig iron, and zinc. We have practically given up everything in the South except the Angora goat in Texas and peanuts in North Carolina [laughter on the Republican side], and I appeal to my friend from Wyoming to let this item pass.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not offer an amendment at a reduced rate.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, is there any time left?

The CHAIRMAN. There is one minute remaining.

Mr. PAYNE. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that four years ago the rice industry had not been developed as it is to-day. There was some difficulty about getting some way to plug the water, and there was some trouble in Louisiana and Texas about pumping. But since that time they have discovered large rice-producing tracts of land in Arkansas, where the water is very near the surface of the ground and the pumping is very easy and inexpensive.

I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that if his bill should stay on the statute books for four years, long before that time we shall not be getting a penny of duty on rice, because we will raise every pound of it in the United States, and under better conditions than there are anywhere else in the world, and for less money, because we can use machinery from beginning to end, and they can not use it anywhere else in the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

198. Wheat, 10 cents per bushel.

Several Members rose.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Under the practice, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to see if we can agree on time on this wheat proposition.

Mr. MANN. Let us see how many gentlemen want three minutes each.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I took the floor for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there were five gentlemen rose on that side.

Mr. HAMMOND. I should like four or five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in half an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman include the request that the recognitions be for 3 minutes instead of 5?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have two gentlemen on this side who would like to speak. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] said he would like three or four minutes.

Mr. HAMMOND. I would like four or five.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the recognitions be for four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, and that the recognitions shall be for 4 minutes instead of 5.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. LANGLEY. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to point out that there are now over 10 Members on their feet.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We must get along with this bill. They can not all speak at one time.

Mr. MURDOCK. There will be more controversy over this than there will if you let us have the time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will tell the gentleman that if he will not take it he will not get it. I want to move along with this bill, and every man can not speak on every item.

Mr. LANGLEY. The Chair having recognized me for the purpose of offering an amendment, I desire to inquire if I am entitled to the floor for four minutes after this agreement is reached?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that if it is left in the power of the Chair he will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 15, page 51, strike out "10" and insert "25."

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this provision and other similar ones in this bill violate the traditional policy of the Democracy as I have always understood it. At to-day's session I read some resolutions that were adopted by the citizens of Buffalo, in which they asserted that the provision to which these resolutions referred, including this one, would seriously cripple, if not destroy, a home industry in that city, and either drive out of employment or greatly reduce the wages of thousands of laboring people employed therein.

I desire now to read a telegram from the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati along the same line. It is as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 30, 1913.*

Hon. J. W. LANGLEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

By unanimous vote the board of directors of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, at a meeting held April 29, adopted the following resolution, which is respectfully submitted for your attention:

Whereas the Underwood tariff bill imposes a duty of 10 cents per bushel upon foreign wheat and admits duty free the foreign-milled products of such foreign wheat;

Whereas this discrimination in favor of the foreign manufacturer is in contradiction alike of all accepted economic doctrine of the established tariff policy of all political parties and of all nations and in effect pays a bounty to the foreign miller on all products of wheat sold by him in the markets of the United States; and

Whereas if American flour millers have to pay a tax upon foreign-grown wheat, then a simple justice requires that the foreign-milled products of such wheat shall pay an equivalent tax, and if foreign-milled wheat products are admitted duty free foreign wheat should be admitted duty free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, believing the proposed legislation would inevitably destroy one of the most important manufacturing industries in the United States and that it would further result in most serious injury to the American farmer, the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, through

its board of directors, records itself as unalterably opposed and earnestly urges upon the President and Congress of the United States the necessity of placing both wheat and its products upon terms of absolute equality.

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, Senators and Congressmen from Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, the members of the Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

CINCINNATI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. C. CULKINS, *Executive Secretary*.

Mr. Chairman, our daily mail is filled with protests like this, from commercial bodies, corporations, firms, and individuals, appealing to us to protect them against the results of what they assisted in bringing about when they put the Republican Party out of power and placed our friends on the other side in power. If I desired to be ugly and revengeful about it, I might say that they deserved a few heroic doses of free trade for having brought about that result. I sympathize heartily with the people of Cincinnati in the sentiments which they express through this telegram, although I can not refrain from reminding them that this is what they get for turning out of Congress men like the able, patriotic, and distinguished Nicholas Longworth [applause] and men of that kind, who were their friends and champions, and putting in their places men who are here making assaults upon the industries of the great State of Ohio. I hope the good Lord will give them more light and that they will have the foresight next time to correct the grievous error they made last fall. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the gentleman from the tenth district of Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] has introduced an amendment to raise the tariff on wheat from 10 cents to 25 cents. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knows nothing about wheat, because they do not raise any in his district, and but little corn, the most of which is made into moonshine liquor. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman like the finished product? [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I admire the products, but not more than the gentleman admires his own products, and I do not use them one-half as much. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I will leave that to our associates.

Mr. THOMAS. If there is anybody upon the face of this earth that ought to be for free corn and free wheat it is the gentleman from the tenth district of Kentucky, for the greatest use that they make of corn and wheat in that district is to make liquor out of it, and they need corn and wheat shipped into that district for bread, and they ought to get it just as cheaply as possible.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Was the gentleman ever in the tenth district in his life?

Mr. THOMAS. Many a time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Then the gentleman did not observe very much.

Mr. THOMAS. And the next time the gentleman runs for Congress I will be up there. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. That is why I got a large majority, and the next time it will be unanimous. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. No; I have never been up there in the campaign when the gentleman was running for Congress, and when I do I will run him out of the district. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, the gentleman will certainly not do it while the moonshine lasts.

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

Mr. THOMAS. One at a time.

Mr. SWITZER. I would like to inquire whether the business of making moonshine whisky is a growing business in Kentucky?

Mr. THOMAS. In the tenth district it is. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. We make it to some extent in my district, but it is consumed largely in the gentleman's district, I understand.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, if there is any other Republican over there who desires to interrogate me, let him rise. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I am unalterably opposed to putting any food products of the people upon the tax list. I believe that everything that the American people eat and wear and consume should be on the free list, and I so intend to vote while I am in this Congress.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the dangers of a haphazard tariff are very clearly illustrated in the item upon which the committee is now working. The item is wheat, which bears here a 10-cent specific duty. Its product, flour, is given a 10 per cent ad valorem duty. It is my observation, from my part of the country, that nearly all industries, save the flour-milling industry, have concentrated. I have seen many different lines absorbed into the greater units of organization, taken over by the trusts or combinations and put under false capitalization. But it is true of the flour-milling business that it has remained segregated, that it has not moved away, but remains next to the wheat fields, that it is not overcapitalized, and as a rule the millers are not rich, as riches are now counted. Most of them are well-to-do, that and nothing more.

This bill, either by accident or design, or by the exigency of politics, wherein the members of the committee were trying to satisfy the people in the city on the score of the lower cost of living and at the same time pretending to do something for the farmer by giving him a duty, though a lower one than in the present law, on his products, have kept a specific duty on wheat and an ad valorem duty on flour of 10 per cent, which are absolutely unequal, and in this way: If wheat is worth $1 a bushel in Canada, then the duty on the flour made from it would be under this bill 50 cents a barrel, but if wheat should be in Canada 60 cents a bushel, and it has been 60 cents in Canada, then the duty on the flour from that wheat would be 30 cents. This is putting the American miller to a disadvantage of 20 cents. This is not fiction, it is not speculation, it is an actual condition which our millers will have to meet and it will injure miller and farmer. Canada in wheat production is growing. The western part of Canada produced in wheat in 1900, 17,000,000 bushels. In 1912 that 17,000,000 bushels had leaped to 198,000,000 bushels. Canada, in conformity with the idea that the mill stays close to the wheat field, is also developing wonderfully in the milling industry and as an exporter. In that way in 1900 Canada produced 455,000 barrels of flour, and in 1912, that 455,000 barrels of flour had jumped to a total of 2,388,000 barrels of flour. Now, in addition to this fact, it seems certain that on the admission of the flour through this discrimination of duties, the flour imported will enter into the fixation of the price of wheat in the United States.

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

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in the course of this debate I have been impressed with the ominous silence of the gentlemen on the other side of the House who represent districts where farming is the chief occupation of their constituents. The RECORD is little encumbered with their speeches in defense of this bill. The party lash has been vigorously applied during weeks of secret Democratic caucus, and I regret to say that those gentlemen most vigorous in the defense of this measure come from sections and cities where the products of the farm are consumed and not where they are produced. It is my confident belief that the gentlemen on that side have presumed too much on the tolerance of the men who till the soil. You know the farmer is not an agitator. You know that, comparatively, he is the least turbulent of all the elements of American citizenship. He is community loving, flag respecting, and patriotic; and yet you must not assume that he will submit without protest to any punishment you may inflict upon him in your discriminations in favor of the great consuming cities and centers of population. We make requisition upon him more than upon any other class for the moralizing and vitalizing influences of the Republic. He is the foundation rock. He is the greatest guaranty of perpetuity. He is the greatest influence for good and the most powerful restraint against evil. He is opposed to mob violence. He is an enemy of the Black Hand. He very properly has less respect for the criminal rich than he has for the criminal poor. He has little sympathy with the political demagogue, and much less with the demoralizing influence of Tammany methods, whether practiced one place or another. He believes in honest but not in dishonest capital, and will support it when it is employed honestly, but he will fight it to the death when it is employed dishonestly. The supporter and friend of the honest employer, as well as of the honest employee, but the employer who uses his means and capital to oppress the employed looks no better to him than the employed who carries the firebrand in the march of the mob. He is the enemy of both, because both are criminal alike. He is neither a snob nor a toady, but believes in equal opportunity and fair play. He has no sympathy with bigotry or caste, but believes instinctively that men or things are only entitled to consideration in proportion to their intrinsic value. The Decalogue is his guide. He believes in the sentiments expressed in the Declaration of Independence, and cherishes but does not abuse the liberties guaranteed by the Federal Constitution.

You must not overlook that a people of such splendid qualities must be taken into account, else the day of reckoning will come.

They are nearly forty million strong, or more than one-third of all the people of the United States. They are entitled to greater consideration than has been shown them in this bill and to a better defense from that side of this Chamber than you have made for them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Of the hundreds of amendments introduced by Republicans on this side of the House in the interest of the farmer you have not permitted one of them to pass, and this is conclusive evidence that you gentlemen from the farming districts have been bound hand and foot by your secret party caucus. You are afraid to speak against the amendments offered by Republicans, intended to sustain the price of farm products, because such a course would defeat you at the next election, and you can not speak for them because you have pledged in secret, behind closed doors, where the country can not see or hear you, to vote for this bill at any cost. You will not permit a yea-and-nay vote to be taken on the amendments offered by the Republicans, because such a course would put each of you on record and the people whom you represent would demand that you gentlemen from the farming sections repudiate this bill, and if you refused this demand they would force you out of public life. Your failure to speak for the measure as it affects the products of the farm is conclusive evidence that you know you are wrong. Your caucus rule will not let you speak against the bill and your constituents will not permit you to speak for it. You are having your way now, but the people will have their way later. You are repudiating the farmers now, but they will repudiate you at the ballot box and at the first opportunity. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am not opposed to party caucus on matters pertaining only to party interests, but you have no right as public officials and as representatives of the people and as the majority party of this House to debate and vote on this bill in secret caucus. The country is entitled to know what you are doing and saying when you are considering matters of public interest. Your constituents are entitled to know how much of this bill you are for and how much of it you are against. They will call upon you to explain why it is that you have kept this measure, so vital to the well-being and prosperity of every American citizen, for weeks in secret debate before it was permitted to see the light of day.

The country will not tolerate this piece of secret legislation, and the only reason you sought darkness rather than light was because your deeds were evil. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In the light of the history of this bill it may be of interest to the House to read briefly from the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, that you may understand something of the confidence that the southern Members have that the southern farmer will vote the Democratic ticket at any cost.

In volume 3 of those hearings there is the testimony before that committee of a gentleman by the name of Cowan, a distinguished citizen of the State of Texas, who was being interrogated. Mr. JAMES, speaking to Mr. Cowan, said:

Do you think free meat would ruin the cattle industry?
Mr. COWAN. It would.
Mr. JAMES. Did not all the Members of Congress from Texas vote for free meat?
Mr. COWAN. I think they all did.
Mr. JAMES. And were they not all overwhelmingly elected?
Mr. COWAN. They were. We vote the Democratic ticket there in spite of politics; in spite of platforms; in spite of anything that is said in the platforms. If the Democratic platform says prohibition, then we vote it. If it says anti, we vote that.
Mr. JAMES. I know that is true.
Mr. COWAN. You know that, Mr. JAMES, just like I do.

Since I have adverted to the cattle industry, I shall indulge a little further in the discussion of prices. The following figures taken from the census report of 1910 and also from reports made by the Agricultural Department will disclose to the farmers of my State and the country some startling facts, these figures being a comparison of the value of some of the principal products of the farm in Oklahoma under a Republican and Democratic administration, respectively.

CATTLE.

The Wilson bill, which ruined the country under the Cleveland Democratic administration, provided for a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on cattle. The present, or so-called Payne law, provides a duty of 27½ per cent ad valorem, and the present Underwood bill, which will become a law, only provides for 10 per cent ad valorem on cattle, or only one-half as much as the Wilson bill, which wrought such destruction to the farmers by the ruinous prices of cattle under it.

In May, 1896 and 1897, the price of cattle on the Chicago market was $2 to $4.45 per hundred. On May 1, or the last of April, 1913, the same grade of cattle which brought only $3 in 1896 and 1897 sold for $7.60 per hundred on the same market.

ROUND NUMBERS USED IN TOTALS.

For the sake of convenience we will use round numbers in giving totals rather than the detailed figures as we get them from the census report.

In the State of Oklahoma there are approximately 190,000 farms, according to the census report of 1910. The same report shows that there are a little less than 1,250,000 head of cattle in the State, an average of about 6 head to every farm. We will take these figures as a basis, and they are as nearly correct as is possible to procure. The Federal census report shows that beef cattle were worth about $30 per head more in 1911 and 1912 under a Republican administration and a Republican tariff than they were in 1896 and 1897 under a Democratic administration and a Democratic tariff, and the agricultural reports show that stock cattle were worth about $15 per head more in 1911 and 1912 than they were in 1896 and 1897, and that the average worth of all cattle under a Republican administration has been and is $20 more than under a Democratic administration and a Democratic tariff.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY DOLLARS' LOSS TO EVERY FARMER.

Taking these figures as a basis, it will be observed that the cattle of my State were worth about $25,000,000 more under a Republican administration and a Republican tariff than they were under a Democratic administration and a Democratic tariff, or $120 to every farmer in favor of the Republican administration.

HORSES.

The Federal census also shows that there were 800,000 head of horses in Oklahoma in 1910, or about 5 to every farm. Agricultural reports show that in 1896 and 1897, under a Democratic administration and Democratic tariff, horses averaged $30 per head. This would make Oklahoma's 800,000 head of horses worth $24,000,000. In 1912, under a Republican tariff, the same reports show that horses averaged $110 per head. Thus under a Republican tariff the 800,000 horses owned by the farmers of my State are worth $88,000,000, or $64,000,000 more than the same horses were worth under a Democratic tariff.

MEANS $400 TO EVERY FARMER.

This amounts to $400 to every farmer in the State. In other words, taking the facts and figures which can not be disputed, every horse owned by an Oklahoma farmer was worth under a Democratic administration just $80 less than the same animal was worth under a Republican administration.

MULES.

We will now take up some figures regarding mules, which are as startling as on other products.

In 1910 there were more than 270,000 mules in the State of Oklahoma, or about 2 to every farm. In 1896 and 1897 mules averaged $40 per head, all in the State being worth a total of about $10,000,000. In 1911 and 1912 mules averaged $120 per head, making the total of Oklahoma's 270,000 mules worth $30,000,000, a gain under the Republican administration of $20,000,000 over what they were worth during the Democratic administration and a Democratic tariff. This amounts to $160 to every farmer in the State; that is, his mules were worth $80 a head more under a Republican tariff than under a Democratic tariff.

Though this indispensable hybrid "can not boast of pride of ancestry or hope of posterity," these figures are quite sufficient to make it hang its head in shame at such treatment from its nearest kin, the Democratic Party, and with such lamentable lack of appreciation of party emblem one can not readily conceive how, in the light of such a record, an honest Democrat can look a mule in the face. [Applause and laughter.]

WHEAT.

Oklahoma produces about 30,000,000 bushels of wheat annually. That 30,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1896 and 1897 was worth 57 cents per bushel on the Chicago market, or a total of $17,000,000, under a Democratic administration. In 1910 and 1911 and 1912 the average was about $1 per bushel. Oklahoma's 30,000,000 bushels of wheat, then, would be worth $30,000,000 under a Republican tariff as against $17,000,000 under a Democratic tariff, or a difference of about $75 per year to every farmer in the State.

TOTAL LOSS TO EVERY FARMER IS $750.

The loss to the farmers of Oklahoma alone under a Democratic administration on only four commodities, viz, horses, mules, cattle, and wheat, is $122,000,000, or $750 to every individual farmer in the State.

This is not taking into account corn, cotton, oats, potatoes, chickens, butter, eggs, and almost innumerable other things produced by the farmer, the difference in price being quite as much as it was on cattle, horses, mules, and wheat.

STILL LOWER IN UNDERWOOD BILL.

There are very few people in my State and, in fact, throughout the country who do not remember the appalling conditions as they were under the only Democratic tariff law that we have had in three-quarters of a century, and it should be borne in mind that the present Underwood bill reduces the tariff still lower than under the Cleveland administration, and it may be well for the farmers of Oklahoma and the whole country to remember that you can not name one single article which you produce on your farm on which the tariff is not reduced. There are some few advances in the Underwood bill, but in not one case are they in the interest of the farmer, and we are told by the gentlemen who are inflicting this bill upon the American people that we are paying too much for the things that we eat, which is but another way of telling the American people that we are paying too much for what the farmer produces. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Within the last half century the country tried you once before and you failed, and the fact that you are in power again does not mean that you have the confidence of the people. On the 1st day of this month President Wilson, your chosen leader, spoke at Newark, N. J., and in the course of his remarks, while flaying his own party in that State, said, in part:

But I want to say a few words about the Democratic Party. I want everybody to realize that I have not been taken in by the results of the last national election. The country did not go Democratic in November. It was impossible to go Republican because it could not tell which kind of Republican to go.

In this connection it may be of interest to quote from another distinguished Democrat, and one who did more to elect Mr. Wilson than any other man in America, not excepting Mr. Bryan. I refer to William R. Hearst, who has the most powerful string of metropolitan dailies in the world. In an article condemning and repudiating this bill and criticizing President Wilson's free-trade policies, his papers, on the 13th day of April, said, in part:

Mr. Wilson's opposition to the protective tariff is not inherently or essentially Democratic.

WILSON AN ENGLISH FREE TRADER.

Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, recognized the principle of protection, and advocated discriminating duties in favor of American shipping and reciprocity treaties in favor of American trade.

Mr. Wilson is fundamentally opposed to the principle of protection, and his idea of radical, ruthless tariff reduction is but an expression of the English free-trade theories of Cobden and Mill.

Mr. Wilson is an English free trader.

He may obscure his utterances, but he can not conceal his acts.

Mr. Wilson's political economy is the political economy of another nation and of another age.

It is the political economy of a nation that is passing and of an age that is past.

Mr. Wilson's theories are the theories of books, and of British books, but of British books that are no longer believed by the patriotic and practical and progressive Englishmen of to-day.

The United States of America have given an example to the world in progress and prosperity, in advancement and enlightenment, in happiness and contentment.

The nations of the world have turned toward this country in admiration and amazement.

The methods and systems and institutions of our country have been studied and imitated in every foreign nation except, perhaps, in England.

FEDERALISTS ALONE IN THE DARK.

England is slow to learn and reluctant to learn, but, nevertheless, she is beginning to learn, and the most advanced and intelligent thought in England to-day is in favor of an imperial federation, with free trade among its component States and colonies, but with a policy of protection toward the rest of the world.

Germany and France have long prospered under protection and through intelligent appreciation and imitation of other American ideas and institutions.

The realization that this country is the greatest country in the world and the appreciation of the causes which have made it the greatest country in the world are almost universal throughout the world except among the few remaining Federalists of the United States of America.

If there is to be tariff modification, the modern American policy should be the original democratic policy of reciprocity and discriminating duties in favor of American products, American manufactures, American commerce, and American trade.

In our tariff we have a weapon with which we can withstand the tariff weapons of other nations, but we must not abandon our weapons until other nations are ready to abandon theirs.

WHAT BECOMES OF RECIPROCITY?

In the reduction of our tariff through reciprocity we have a method by which we can compel the reduction of the tariff of other nations, but of what value will be a policy of reciprocity which does not go into effect until after our tariff reductions have been made?

If we are to make tariff concessions which will be encouraging to the products and valuable to the producers in other nations, we should compel reciprocal concessions which will be equally stimulating to the products, equally beneficial to the producers, to the farmers, to the manufacturers, and the laborers in our own country.

Through reciprocity tariff reduction can be made coincident and coextensive with trade expansion.

Through reciprocity the injury to our manufacturers, to our farmers, to our laborers, through the invasion of our markets by foreign products, would be compensated for by the advantages obtained by our manufacturers, our farmers, and our laborers in the opening of foreign markets to our trade and to our produce.

MOTIVE AN UNSELFISH ONE.

In the advocacy of intelligent reciprocity, rather than reckless and ruthless tariff reduction and commercial destruction, I have no selfish motives.

I have cattle ranches in Mexico, and it is proposed under Mr. Wilson's policy to bring beef free into the United States.

It would advantage me considerably, from a merely sordid point of view, to have Mexican beef allowed free into the United States market.

But, as a patriotic American citizen and a Jeffersonian Democrat, I do not believe that Mexican beef, or any other Mexican product, should be allowed free into the markets of the United States until American goods are allowed free into the markets of Mexico.

Under Mr. Wilson's program it is proposed to allow white paper free into the markets of the United States from Canada.

I use over $6,000,000 worth of white paper every year, and from a merely selfish financial point of view it would benefit me enormously to have white paper admitted free into the markets of the United States.

NATION'S INTERESTS ABOVE PARTY.

But, again, as a patriotic American citizen and a Jeffersonian Democrat, I do not believe that white paper, or any other Canadian product, should be admitted free into the United States until the products of the United States, or at least corresponding products of the United States, are admitted free into the markets of Canada.

The Canadians scornfully rejected our proposals of reciprocity.

Are we in return to give them the full advantages of reciprocity without securing any reciprocal advantages for ourselves?

I am loath to criticize the policy of the Democratic Party, or of any man whom I labored to elect, but I am an American first and a Democrat afterwards, and I can not consider the interests of my party above the interests of my country.

I shall hope to see the Democratic Party fulfill its duty and rise to its opportunity.

I shall support it gracefully when it is right, but criticize it regretfully when it is wrong; and I shall continue to implore it not to be led by a Federalistic fetich away from the fundamental principles of Thomas Jefferson, who was always not only a great Democrat, but a great American.

WILLIAM R. HEARST.

The foregoing remarks coming from any other than a leading and distinguished Democrat would be regarded as most excellent Republican doctrine. But it means that Mr. Hearst has abandoned the free-trade-tariff-for-revenue-only policy of the Democratic Party and confesses that the Republican Party is and always has been right. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we should not overlook the fact that this splendid word picture of Mr. Hearst, portraying the acknowledged supremacy of the American people among the other nations of the earth, is the direct and legitimate result of the policies and supremacy of the Republican Party in this country. Protection and reciprocity have always been the watchwords of the Republican Party, and as long as we adhere to them the Nation will succeed; and when we abandon them, we will fail. [Loud applause.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 15, strike out the entire paragraph which reads "Wheat, 10 cents per bushel," and substitute therefor the following: "Wheat, wheat flour, and wheat millstuffs, 10 cents per hundred pounds."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people living in the tenth congressional district of Kentucky, and for the mountain people generally, I want here and now to deny the charge that it is the hotbed of the moonshiners. If the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] had seen fit to retaliate on Mr. THOMAS, the other Kentuckian making the charge, in all probability he could have said, with much truth in the assertion, that night-riderism runs mad in certain boasted sections of our Commonwealth, but I suppose he believed it to be his duty, and the duty of every Kentuckian, to defend the whole State of Kentucky and leave unsaid those things calculated to hurt or harm any part of it. [Applause.]

Now, a word in regard to this pending amendment. There is not a flour mill in the district I have the honor to represent. The charge, too often bandied back and forth on the floor of this House, that the Representative is speaking for certain interests in his district can not in this instance, at least with truth, be laid at my door.

The people of my district believe in equal opportunity in workshop, mill, factory, and farm, and equal and exact justice before the law. This present Underwood bill carries a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat and makes wheat flour and other products of the mill free of duty. Does the Democratic majority suppose that they are going to fool the American farmer by lulling him into the belief that he is being protected by a 10-cent duty on wheat while flour is put on the free list?

The distinguished Member from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], a gentleman for whom I have every respect, said in his speech this afternoon that the country had already indorsed the provisions of this bill, in substance, by indorsing the farmers' free-list bill and by returning to this House an overwhelming Democratic majority. I want to remind the gentleman from Illinois that there is all the difference in the world between making a campaign on promises and performances. The Democratic Party

two years from now will be compelled to make their campaign on actual performances. The old law under which the farmers of this country have had unbounded prosperity and under which they felt secure in the good prices they were receiving is to be supplanted, and this new measure is to be put in its place. What protection is there to the American farmer in the wheat he produces when you put flour on the free list? What protection is it to the American farmer to permit Canada to ship her flour to this country free of duty and then charge her 10 cents a bushel on the wheat she ships? Canada would no longer ship any wheat to this country. She would manufacture it at home and send the flour over, and the flour, when sent here, would have the same depressing effect on the price of the farmer's wheat as if Canada had sent her wheat here in the first instance. You are not protecting the farmers by this process. You can not fool them by this means.

Canada in 1910 produced 95,000,000 bushels of wheat available for export. Her total yield that year was 166,747,000 bushels. She therefore produced twice as much as she needed for her own consumption and actually exported that year 57,000,000 bushels of wheat, much of it coming to the United States.

In that same year the United States exported only 114,000,000 bushels of wheat. This gives some idea of what Canada will do when her 8,000,000 people reach the 100,000,000 point we boast of in this country to-day.

The Canadian wheat lands, of which there are 30,000,000 acres in the Provinces of Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan alone, average, when in cultivation, 22 bushels of wheat to the acre, while the average yield of the United States is only 15 bushels per acre. Do you suppose that you are going to protect the American farmer in his price of wheat when you let Canadian flour into this country free of duty?

And what has the American miller done to you that you should discriminate against him in favor of the Canadian miller? What have the wage earners in the American flour mills done to you that you should discriminate against them in favor of the wage earners in the Canadian flour mills? When great flood disasters, such as the recent ones in the States of Ohio and Indiana and through the Mississippi Valley, visit our country, destroying life and property and laying waste the land, who is it, through generous contributions, comes to their assistance and relieves their suffering? It is the American mill owners along with other patriotic and whole-souled Americans. Who do we look to to build up and maintain our free institutions, improve our highways, erect our churches, and build up our schools and colleges. It is Americans. Americans ought not to be discriminated against by other Americans and in favor of foreigners.

No doubt Canadian and other foreign newspapers and peoples are giving you much credit in your splendid work in favor of the foreigner, but our own American people will have a reckoning with you one of these days. I want to insert as a part of my remarks a telegram I received from the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce; also a letter from the Washburn-Crosby Milling Co., of Louisville, Ky.; also an editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Post, in its issue of April 14, 1913. The matters referred to are as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 30, 1913.*

Hon. CALEB POWERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

By unanimous vote the board of directors of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, at a meeting held April 29, adopted the following resolution, which is respectfully submitted for your attention:

Whereas the Underwood tariff bill imposes a duty of 10 cents per bushel upon foreign wheat and admits duty free the foreign milled products of such foreign wheat; and

Whereas this discrimination in favor of the foreign manufacturer is in contradiction alike of all accepted economic doctrine of the established tariff policy of all political parties and of all nations, and in effect pays a bounty to the foreign miller on all products of wheat sold by him in the markets of the United States; and

Whereas if American flour millers have to pay a tax upon foreign-grown wheat, then a simple justice requires that the foreign-milled products of such wheat shall pay an equivalent tax, and if foreign-milled wheat products are admitted duty free foreign wheat should be admitted duty free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That believing the proposed legislation would inevitably destroy one of the most important manufacturing industries in the United States and that it would further result in most serious injury to the American farmer, the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, through its board of directors, records itself as unalterably opposed, and earnestly urges upon the President and Congress of the United States the necessity of placing both wheat and its products upon terms of absolute equality.

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, Senators and Congressmen from Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, the members of the Senate Finance Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

CINCINNATI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. C. CULKINS, *Executive Secretary.*

LOUISVILLE, KY., *April 4, 1913.*

Hon. CALEB POWERS,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have just noted that the Ways and Means Committee has inserted a paragraph in the proposed tariff bill admitting flour and milled products free of duty, at the same time imposing a duty of 7½ to 10 cents per bushel on wheat.

We are addressing this letter to you with a view to soliciting your influence in opposition to legislation of this character for two very potent reasons: First, to admit a manufactured product to this country free of duty while imposing a duty upon the raw material would be legislation without equity or justice; second, such legislation would tend to ruin the milling interests of the United States, an industry that is to-day overdone some three or four times the necessities of the country, and, were the markets available, the United States has milling capacity sufficient to grind all the wheat produced in both the United States and Canada.

It can be readily seen how such legislation would injure the milling industry, because it would open our markets to Canada for the shipment of flour and feed into this country absolutely free of duty, while we as millers would be barred from buying wheat from Canada for the purpose of grinding it into flour.

You will understand that were flour and milled products put on the free list because of the call from certain sections for lower food products, these latter sections would possibly be satisfied, but it would hardly be protection to the farmer, and such action would not benefit the farmer in the end because the shipment of wheat from Canada into the United States in the form of flour would depress the market just as much as if sending in an equal quantity of wheat. The mills of the United States would require less wheat because of the Canadian mills supplying the market with flour. Such legislation would practically ruin the milling industry of the United States, as not only would it open the doors for the shipment of flour from Canada, where a vast surplus of wheat over consumption is raised, but would also open the doors for the possible shipment of flour from Argentina, either direct or through milling in transit in Germany, France, and England, where it could be manufactured into flour and shipped to New York, Philadelphia, Boston, etc.

We will greatly appreciate any efforts you may make with a view to having this paragraph in the proposed tariff bill modified by providing that wheat and its products—flour and mill stuffs—shall be placed upon an equal basis. If it is necessary let us have free wheat, free flour, and free mill stuff, but in order to protect the farmer we think that the duty should be made, say, 10 cents per 100 pounds on wheat, 10 cents per 100 pounds on flour, and 10 cents per 100 pounds on mill stuffs. If 10 cents is too much for some of our friends, make it less, but under all circumstances let the tariff on the raw material and the manufactured products be at least relatively the same.

This is an urgent appeal to you for your assistance in connection with a matter that if put through along the line proposed will certainly do greater harm to one of the leading industries of this country than any other legislation could possibly do.

Can we count upon you for your assistance?

Very truly, yours,

WASHBURN-CROSBY MILLING CO. (INC.).
W. M. ATKINSON, *General Manager.*

—

[From the Washington Post, Monday, Apr. 14, 1913.]

A WEEK OF THE TARIFF.

The tariff bill, at the end of its first week "on trial before the country," has not stood scrutiny imperviously by any means, but the volume of disapproval does not measure up to predictions, except in New England and the sugar and wool States. The usual difficulty is experienced in fixing upon the precise effect of the changes.

The publication of the bill, as it happened, found prices on a decline in practically all of the markets, financial and commercial, but the downward tendency was not traceable to the tariff appreciably except in the securities of the new industrials. The depressing effect of new issues of railroad stocks on one hand and the flattering reports of crop conditions carried the lists downward at a rate that quite obscured the effect, if any, of the new element of weakness. A lingering belief that the Senate will modify some of the severities favored by the House sustains the feeling of confidence to no small degree, so that until the attitude of the upper body is fully disclosed the final judgment of the people can not be known.

A number of cotton and woolen mills in New England have closed down until the new basis of manufacturing can be more definitely determined, and will remain closed, it is announced, if the outlook fails to brighten. Protests continue to pour in on Congress from all directions, but the work in caucus does not indicate that they are shaking the resolution of the leaders to put the bill through practically intact.

Foreign opinion of the bill runs strongly in the opposite direction, as was to be expected. English manufacturers are overjoyed at the prospect of vastly enlarged markets in America. The trade papers over there look upon the bill as certain to give a great stimulus to our imports, one of the publications declaring that it is the heaviest blow given to protection since the passage by Parliament of the Peel tariff 60 years ago. The German exporters also are on the tiptoe of expectation, and the same buoyancy of feeling prevails in almost all European and many Latin-American countries. Canada will profit proportionately to a greater extent than any of the beneficiaries, with the open door extended to her agricultural, live stock, dairy, manufacturing, and lumber industries.

Mr. RAINEY. The difference, Mr. Chairman, between the Democratic Party, I will say for the benefit of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS], and the Republican Party is this, in brief: The Republican Party makes promises before election and breaks them afterwards, while the Democratic Party makes promises before election and keeps them afterwards. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is what we are doing now. Now, 10 cents a bushel does not protect the wheat farmer of this country. They do not need protection against the wheat of Canada. Why, over in Canada they have a population of 7,000,000 while in the United States we have 6,300,000 farms and we have 12,000,000 farmers. We have almost twice as many farmers as they have of men, women, and children in all the Dominion of Canada. Talk about this great Republic cring-

ing before Canada and before this tremendous influx of wheat? Why, we raise in the State of Illinois 25 bushels of wheat every year for every one single bushel of wheat that comes into the United States from Canada, and we are not pretending to be the greatest wheat-raising State by any means.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. In a moment, if I have time. Talk about protecting the wheat farmers of the United States. Why, here are the figures of the present market. On April 29 in Chicago May wheat was selling for 92 cents. In Winnipeg it sold for 94 cents on that day. On the 28th day of this month May wheat sold in Winnipeg at 94 to 94½ cents and it sold in Chicago for 92 cents.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman please yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Not now.

Mr. MILLER. I can suggest something.

Mr. RAINEY. I can not yield now. On the 26th day of April wheat sold in Chicago for 92 cents (this is May wheat) and it sold in Winnipeg for 93 cents. On the 29th day of April July wheat sold in Winnipeg for 95 cents and in Chicago at 92 cents. On April 28 July wheat sold in Winnipeg at 95 cents, and it sold in Chicago at 92 cents. On April 26 July wheat sold in Winnipeg at 94⅞ cents, and it sold in Chicago at 91⅞ cents. And the same thing holds good with reference to September wheat. Why, the farmers of this country, if they want to sell their wheat on the highest market, and that has been the way all through this month, and it is usually that way—if they want to sell their wheat on the highest market they ought to break down the barrier between this country and Canada—induce Canada to repeal its tariff of 10 cents to 12 cents per bushel on wheat—their general tariff enforced against us is 12 cents—so as to let our wheat go there and sell on the highest market. The farmers of this country are not afraid of Canada. Three days ago contracts were made in St. Louis to sell flour ground here in the United States for delivery in Glasgow, where they have port mills, the port mills of England which, they say, threaten the mills of this country.

They were contracting in St. Louis three days ago to grind American wheat in this country and sell it in the port mills of Great Britain. That is the situation. Now I will yield.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to inquire of the gentleman—I suggest to him that if he had been as industrious in this as I know he would have been if he had had time he would find every year for the last 20 years——

Mr. RAINEY. I am not yielding for a speech, but just for a question.

Mr. MILLER. I want to make just a brief statement.

Mr. RAINEY. I can not yield except for a question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. For a question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The sales that were made for July were speculative sales; they were not cash sales?

Mr. RAINEY. That is the trouble. That is the reason why we ought to reduce the tariff on wheat. That is the reason why flour ought always to be free, to prevent the speculation in Chicago and up in Winnipeg. If it is possible to take it across the border either way, they can not tell how or when to corner markets—gamble in wheat. If this gambling could be prevented, it would mean cheaper bread there and cheaper bread here. We impose this tariff for the purpose of revenue, and that is all, and that is the only excuse for any of these rates. We get $200,000 out of it a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs the indulgence of the committee to state that because 30 can not be equally divided by 4 it makes it difficult for the Chair to divide the time evenly. The Chair will recognize the next gentleman for two minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the Chair allow me a suggestion? In order to be fair to each gentleman, I ask unanimous consent that the time may be extended to 32 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take the very short time granted me to say that I am pleased to support the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY]. I have the honor to represent the greatest wheat-producing State in this Union. Nothing that I may say here this evening, I know full well, will change one single jot or tittle of this Democratic tariff bill. I have, however, during the past week been interested in the discussions that have been had on the different schedules. I have been particularly amused at the statement just made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] that the Democratic Party always has kept its promises. Their concealed promises are about the only promises they have kept in the past, and I sincerely hope that during the next few years in this country they will not keep and carry into effect the kind of promises that our people in North Dakota know they carried into effect when they were given an opportunity to manage the affairs of this Government. We did not have the prosperity in Democratic days that we are now enjoying, and I want to say to my friends on the other side that the farmers of North Dakota did not at all understand the promises that you made in the last campaign, if they are such as are being carried out in this crazy-quilt patchwork of a tariff bill. They did not understand that you intended to throw the farmers' markets of this country open to the world. I am just as confident as that night follows day that these United States in the future are not going to continue as a free-tariff country or a Democratic tariff-for-revenue-only Nation; but that, on the other hand, it is going to continue as a nation of Americans, for American manufacturers, American laborers, and American farmers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] is recognized.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has four minutes.

Mr. HAMMOND. I desire to say a word particularly to certain of my colleagues from Minnesota to whom I made a statement the other day. I said that Mr. Crosby, of the Washburn-Crosby Milling Co., had stated to me that he preferred the present rates and provisions in this bill in reference to wheat and flour to free wheat and free flour. I so understood Mr. Crosby to state in a conversation I had with him. I desire to say that I have received a telegram from him in which he states that that is not his position, and that I must have misunderstood him. As he is a gentleman who makes no misstatements, I desire in this public way to correct, in so far as I may, any misapprehension that may have been caused by my misunderstanding of his remarks. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] has given us figures as to the number of barrels of flour made in Canada—in Canada, the great country to the north of us, from which we fear so much. Assuming that his figures are right—I do not know—Canada made, in 1912, a little less than 2,400,000 barrels of flour.

I desire to say that one flouring concern in the city of Minneapolis in six months will turn out that amount of flour and 50 per cent more; so that the amount stated, great as it may appear, is not so great an amount as would disturb conditions. Why, if that one milling concern should shut down for six months, 50 per cent more flour would be deducted from the flour product of the world than the amount given by the gentleman as Canada's yearly production.

Another thing: About 5½ bushels of wheat go into a barrel of flour.

Mr. ANDERSON. Four and one-half. Does the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The very least amount that goes into a barrel of flour is 4½ bushels and the highest is 5⅝.

Mr. HAMMOND. Well, 5 or 5½ would be a fair estimate, would it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is plenty.

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes. Well, assuming that it takes as much wheat up in Canada to make a barrel of flour as it does in other places, and making the liberal estimate of 5 or 5½ bushels to the barrel, there must be something less than 15,000,000 bushels of wheat ground into flour in Canada if the gentleman's figures are correct. Why, the wheat farmers of the United States furnish to the millers of this country all the flour they want to grind, and then send abroad twice as much wheat as that.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me just one question there?

Mr. HAMMOND. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Is not the gentleman aware of the fact that the average daily capacity of grinding in Canada is 111,000 barrels a day instead of the figures of the gentleman from Kansas? That is a fact, as I am telling you.

Mr. HAMMOND. I will say to my colleague that I do not know the grinding capacity of the mills in Canada, and I do not know the number of barrels of flour ground there last year.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. One hundred and two million bushels were ground last year.

Mr. HAMMOND. Then the statement of the gentleman from Kansas is incorrect, and it was upon that statement that I based my remarks.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Twenty-two million barrels, and that would require 102,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. HAMMOND. I was surprised at the statement. So I went to my friend from Kansas and asked him to show me his figures, and I took them as he gave them to me. But it serves to illustrate, at any rate, the comparatively slight importance of the wheat and flour of Canada as compared with the wheat raised in this country and with the flour made here.

Now, while we may think that it would be better if there were a straight rate upon flour in this bill in place of the contingent rate that is given, nevertheless I am satisfied that there is some advantage to the American miller in the plan proposed, and I believe it will be of benefit both to the raiser of wheat and the maker of flour. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HELGESEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HELGESEN. I would like to have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate has been limited by order of the committee. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Is this vote on the Powers amendment or the Langley amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. MANN. I thought it was the other way. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair said "the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky." He did not call the name.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment for the increase to 25 cents a bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. It is an amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. NORTON. I demand a division.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 60, noes 115.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to offer an amendment in the way of a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 15, after the word "bushel," insert as a new paragraph:

"198½. Wheat flour and semolina, 45 cents per barrel of 196 pounds."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, that is the exact rate necessary to equalize the duty of 10 cents per bushel proposed in the pending bill. I desire the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] for just a moment, if I may have it, that I may call his attention to a fact related to the prices on wheat that has hitherto escaped his attention; and I am afraid that lack of information is illustrative of many of the reasons why certain schedules in the bill are as they are. He read to us the present prices of wheat in Winnipeg and Chicago, and it was no doubt to his surprise and that of the House that the price in Winnipeg was higher, and upon that he based the statement that we should let down the bars so that our American farmers might sell their wheat in Canada. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman should learn now that every year for a period of four months, during which time not a bushel of wheat is sold, the quotations at Winnipeg are higher than at Minneapolis, Duluth, or Chicago, and that during the other eight months of the year, when every bushel of wheat grown in Canada or America is sold, the price at Minneapolis and Duluth is from 10 to 14 cents higher than it is at Winnipeg. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I am one who believes that the duty on flour is a protection to the farmer in the matter of his wheat. In round numbers, we raise in this country about 600,000,000 bushels of wheat each year. The mills consume for flour purposes about 500,000,000 bushels. If we strike a blow at the milling business, we certainly do an injury to the best market the farmer has for his flour. Wheat is grown for practically no other purpose but to make flour, and if we injure the milling industry we certainly injure the wheat industry.

Gentlemen have indulged themselves in the statement that wheat is not imported from Canada into the United States to-day in any considerable quantities. I would invite their attention to the fact that during the last season there were imported and shipped to the Duluth market, stored in boats and elevators at Duluth in bond, 22,000,000 bushels of wheat, although it is the first year the great influx has come. Mr. Chairman, if you knock down the duty on wheat still further, so that that imported wheat can pay the duty, instead of being exported out in bond, it will be milled in the States.

I am frank to say that what I am now saying is not for the welfare, perhaps, of the milling industry in my own city, but I believe it is for the welfare of the milling industry in the United States and the farmers of the United States. The miller then would like free wheat and free flour, but I believe in a protective duty on both. It may be easy for some to imagine that by reason of their great capitalization, great organization, and scattered condition over the land, the milling industry of the United States can compete with the world.

That is true when that industry can compete with the world on even terms, but handicap them by duty wheat and free flour and they can not possibly do so. Not in all sections can they compete now.

Mr. Chairman, at the head of Lake Superior there are to-day several mammoth flour mills that have not turned a wheel in 10 years. I do not ask that a duty be placed upon flour to enable those mills to start again. You can not do it. We stand at that point and listen to the whir of the flour mills at Kenora, Canada, across the line, where new mills have been constructed during the past year and many more are projected; but we do ask not to put this handicap upon the milling industry of the United States, that the flour mills in Minneapolis, in Kentucky, in Kansas, in Missouri, in Georgia, may not be like those of Duluth, with cobwebs in the machinery and panes out of the windows.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments close in 10 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like a couple of minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I should like two minutes.

Mr. MANAHAN. I should like five minutes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I should like some time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, everybody can not talk on every paragraph. I should like to accommodate some gentlemen on this side. I will ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in 20 minutes and that the time be limited to 4 minutes each.

Mr. MANN. That will take care of the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request. I ask that debate be closed in 24 minutes and the speakers be limited to 3 minutes each.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate close in 24 minutes, recognition to be for 3 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I regret the poverty of time accorded us on this great question. It does not strike me as fair, but it is as fair as the tariff is to the people of Minnesota. The tax on wheat at 10 cents a bushel with flour free is a fraud. It is dishonest. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is a "con" case, designed to obtain votes by false pretenses. The gentlemen who drew this schedule know that wheat must be ground into flour before it is used. Possibly the prehistoric Democrat used wheat before it was ground, but it only served to develop his teeth and grazing ability, and possibly developed his ears at the expense of his intellect. [Laughter.]

I never realized until this discussion came up the appropriateness of the great symbol of Democracy, represented by the stubborness of the mule. You can not convince these gentlemen on any proposition, and the reason given by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is that they promised the American people before election they would give them free flour and wheat and they have got to keep their promise, regardless of the merits of the proposition.

It may be good politics, but it is poor patriotism—in fact, it is wicked—to destroy the great industries of a great State for the sake of keeping a promise made for political effect.

Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I have not the time to show the iniquity of this proposition. I regret it exceedingly, because it is not only dishonest to the farmers of my State, but to the American people. To break down agriculture is the cruelest blow that can be struck against labor, and I am amazed that the Representative from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], the representative of labor, does not appreciate the great truth that if you make farming so miserable for the farmers and unprofit-

able, and so unsatisfactory to the farmer's boys and girls, they will keep on congregating in the city and making the laborer's lot harder and more fiercely competitive and the farms poorer and less productive and profitable, thus bringing wholesale depression and poverty to the Nation. You have got to have the farmer prosperous in order to have labor succeed, because if the farmers are prosperous the whole Nation is and the demand for labor is heavy. This is a dishonorable tariff as far as the agriculturists of the country are concerned, and an unfortunate tariff for men and women who work. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my opposition to this paragraph and the preceding one.

It matters not what is said on this floor, it matters not what may be said in the future, the farmers of this country understand thoroughly this proposition, and they believe that a reduction of duty on wheat or the placing of flour on the free list will seriously injure their business, and I agree with the farmer.

PETITION FROM OKLAHOMA FARMERS.

I want to present to the House a petition from the farmers of my district. It is as follows:

MOORELAND, OKLA., *April 26, 1913.*

Hon. DICK T. MORGAN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

Whereas the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has prepared a tariff bill for the revision of the tariff; and
Whereas by the terms of the said proposed bill all tariffs would be removed from flour; and
Whereas by the terms of the said bill it is provided that a tariff of 10 cents per bushel shall be maintained upon wheat; and
Whereas it is evident by removing the tariff from flour the price of flour will necessarily be lowered, and in that manner and to that extent will necessarily lower the price of wheat correspondingly; and
Whereas the effect of the removing of the tariff from flour will necessarily be to reduce the price of wheat, thereby reducing the price of the land upon which wheat is grown in the United States; and
Whereas the removal of the tariff from flour will necessarily reduce the price of wheat to an export value and maintain same throughout every month in the year, thus depriving us of our domestic value, which usually is from 10 to 15 cents per bushel higher than export values, and thus putting our wheat in competition throughout every month in the year with the vast wheat-growing countries of the Canadian Northwest, Argentina, and Russia, which countries can not produce anything but wheat, and which countries can produce wheat at a lesser cost of production than we can in our country; and
Whereas the removal of the tariff from flour will necessarily transfer the milling business from the mill centers in the United States to the Canadian mills and other countries producing a surplus of wheat, and in that manner depreciating the value of all milling property, and transferring the labor employed in the milling concerns in the United States to the milling concerns located in foreign countries; and
Whereas we, the undersigned farmers and pioneers of northwest Oklahoma, have helped develop northwest Oklahoma into a wheat-growing country, and the reduction of the price of wheat would naturally affect our accumulation of a lifetime:

Therefore we, the undersigned farmers, do hereby earnestly protest against the removal of the tariff from either wheat or flour, and do hereby urge you as our Representative in Congress to use your best efforts and influence in maintaining the tariff on both wheat and flour, to the end that we may not suffer disastrously from the passage of this bill.

Respectfully,

John J. Bouquot, Geo. Knittel, G. W. Tyford, F. J. Knittel, J. F. Butcher, W. M. Blevins, J. C. Triplett, A. B. Catlett, Albert Geerdet, H. M. Wyckoff, Joe Lowell, W. J. Shaw, Wm. H. Lintner, O. A. White, B. J. Durant, J. E. Taylor, J. G. Carter, Geo. F. Ruttman, O. P. Clifton, R. C. Robinson, A. S. Jenisch, L. E. Bouquot, E. L. Leighton, S. Luellen, D. I. Harper, A. P. Atkinson, M. L. Cobb, A. D. Bailey, M. Matthews.

I next present a letter from Mr. H. K. Schafer, manager of the Canadian Mill & Elevator Co.:

EL RENO, OKLA., *April 28, 1913.*

Hon. DICK T. MORGAN, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We sincerely hope that the grain producers' interests, together with the milling-industry interests, will be considered when the tariff bill is taken up in the Senate. We understand this bill is designed to protect the consumer of flour by having flour on the free list and to protect the producer of wheat by having a tariff on wheat. In this connection wish to say, however, that the producer gets no protection whatever, from the fact that immediately when flour is imported into this country the producer's wheat must necessarily recede in price to a level that will enable the miller in this country to cope with his foreign competitor, who imports the cheaper flour; and, speaking from the miller's viewpoint, there is no question but what it would be a direct discrimination to have flour on the free list and wheat protected by duty. If the interest of the millers and milling industry would be protected like the interests of other manufacturing industries, the miller should be entitled to free wheat and a duty on flour; however, if this can not be granted, we request that you urge by all means to at least keep flour and wheat and the products from wheat on a parity; that is to say, if wheat bears a duty, let flour and other products of wheat bear a proportionate duty.

We sincerely request that you give this matter serious consideration, and see to it that the producer of wheat as well as the miller gets protection he is justly entitled to.

Yours, truly,

CANADIAN MILL & ELEVATOR CO.,
H. K. SCHAFER, *Manager.*

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *April 15, 1913.*

Hon. DICK T. MORGAN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We notice that the new tariff bill places rolled oats, oatmeal, and oat hulls on the free list. In fairness and justice to the American manufacturer of rolled oats, we believe that Congress should place a tariff on the manufactured products in strict keeping with that of raw material which, according to schedule, will remain practically unchanged.

We believe a duty of 55 cents per hundred pounds on rolled oats and oatmeal and 15 cents on oat feed or oat hulls would be in the right proportions with the proposed duty on raw material, and constitute the measure of protection due the American manufacturer.

Under the proposed act the rolled-oats and oatmeal business of the United States would be wholly at the mercy of foreign competition, more especially with Canada, since the home manufacturer would not have the opportunity of importing his raw material on the same basis as his foreign competitor could ship into the United States his manufactured products.

It seems to us that from such an unjust discrimination between the raw and manufactured products, nothing short of a disastrous end can come to our home manufacturers.

In thus exterminating the home manufacturer, we can see in our imagination such destruction to the home market for raw material as to render the profit to the producer almost, if not quite, extinct.

Anything which you can conscientiously do in defeat of the proposed act, placing this item on the free list, we assure you will be duly appreciated, not only by ourselves and the home manufacturers, but the farmers as well.

Yours, very truly,

CARROLL, BROUGH & ROBINSON,
By J. T. ROBINSON,
Secretary and Treasurer.

EL RENO, OKLA., *April 5, 1913.*

Hon. D. T. MORGAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We received word that the new tariff bill about to be considered in Congress provides a duty of 7½ cents a bushel on wheat, while flour and feed are placed on the free list. We immediately wired you that this would be a deathblow to the milling industry of this country, urging that flour, feed, and wheat all be put on a parity.

We do not know the exact figures, but think on a 10 years' average the farmer receives 2 to 3 cents per bushel above the export price for his wheat. This is due to domestic requirements being so close to production. Domestic consumption, of course, is entirely by millers, and should they be eliminated the farmer would be forced to sell his entire crop for export at a considerably lower price than he has heretofore been getting.

The millers do not ask for any protection or favors of any kind, but they are surely entitled to the same advantage from our Government as the Canadian and English millers. This bill in effect, however, discriminates against us in favor of the foreigner.

Trust that you will see the injustice of this act and will succeed in securing this parity of duty on grain and flour and feed.

Yours, truly,

EL RENO MILL & ELEVATOR CO.,
K. E. HUMPHREY,
Secretary and Treasurer.

Mr. Chairman, upon this matter of a tariff upon agricultural products I like to look at it from a broad national viewpoint. There are 3,000,000 square miles of area in continental United States, 1,908,000,000 acres of land. Eight hundred and eighty-five million acres are included within our farms. Four hundred and eighty-five million acres of that land in farms are improved. In other words, only one-half of our farm lands to-day are improved. Three-fourths of the area of our country is not improved. The men who have given the greatest study to this agricultural question believe in intensifying our farming, in scientific farming, in aiding and developing the great farming interests of this country so as to enable them to produce what is necessary for all our people.

Give our farmers a fair chance, give them prices that will make their labor remunerative, and they will furnish products in abundance for all.

The farmers are entitled to the same protection we give the manufacturers. Competition is no more injurious to the manufacturer than to the farmer. The farmer is entitled to the home market as much as the owners of our manufacturing plants. To open our markets to the cheap farm products of Canada, Mexico, South America, and other countries where the price of labor is often not one-fifth what it costs the farmer in this country is unjust, unfair, and not for the welfare of any class of our citizenship. Farming is not only the chief industry of Oklahoma, but it is the greatest industry of the Nation. If our legislation makes the farmers prosperous, all other classes will share in that prosperity.

The provisions of this bill are also unjust to the millers of this country.

Why should we enact laws that will embarrass or endanger any industry? Why should we legislate in a way that will depreciate the value of the mills in this country? I protest against the provisions of this bill relating to wheat and flour as detrimental to both the farmers and millers.

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

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] to answer a question. He has just stated that May wheat was selling in Chicago for 92 cents and on the same day in Winnipeg for 94 cents. Does the

gentleman have reference to the present market and the 1912 crop?

Mr. RAINEY. That refers to the present prices in Chicago.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, you have been deceived, unless you have made an independent investigation. I trust that this House wants to be fair. I trust that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] wants to be fair, and I want to say to you that the prices of wheat that Mr. RAINEY gave are on a par with a great many other things that evidently have crept in here.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I read those quotations from the Chicago Inter Ocean, a Republican newspaper.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Very good. I am going to relieve the gentleman of the position in which he has placed himself. I want to say it is unfair, and I want to say that no man can take up one of these schedules and digest it within a year, while we are forced to pass upon the entire bill within a week. If we had a proper tariff commission, we would have authentic and unbiased information. I am going to quote to you the actual range of prices covering a sufficient length of time to warrant their use as actually showing the facts. I have here a table contained on page 425 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, prepared by the Tariff Board, which shows the price of wheat in Minneapolis and in Winnipeg for 6 years, and out of the 72 months only six times was the average price higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis. Eighteen times it was more than 10 cents higher in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg, and 45 times it was at least 5 cents higher in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg. When you confine yourself to one single year in getting statistics it is not fair. It is misleading, and it shows you have not investigated the subject, and anyone who relies on that statement is depending on information that is not reliable. Let me tell you why the price of wheat in Chicago and Minneapolis to-day is less than it is in Winnipeg. If you will just go out to the great States of North and South Dakota and Minnesota and see what we produced in 1912, you will understand. Out of 621,000,000 bushels of wheat produced in the United States we produced in those three States 263,000,000 bushels. Do you not think that that will affect those markets. We never had such a crop and probably will never have such a crop again. When you are estimating prices do not confine yourself to 1 year. Cover a period of 10 years if you can—the further back the better. When you take an isolated case and base your argument on that to show that the prices in Chicago and Minneapolis are lower than in Winnipeg, I say it is manifestly unfair; and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] should have known it, and especially since he is the member of the Ways and Means Committee having charge of this schedule and upon whom the membership of the House must rely for its information.

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

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to some of the remarks of gentlemen on the other side, particularly the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] and a few others who said that we have nothing to fear from Canada. Evidently they are proceeding upon the theory that when this bill is passed all progress is going to stop, not only in this country but in Canada. Canada is a new country, and I presume there is not a man on that side of the House who realizes that you can draw a line through the city of Winnipeg north and south, and that the Canadian territory west of that line will support the entire population of the United States. They do not realize that Canada is in the near future going to raise more wheat annually than the United States has ever raised in all its history, and that, Mr. Chairman, means that we will have something to fear, providing they can raise the wheat more cheaply than we can. On the subject of the price of wheat, let me illustrate: A neighbor of mine last fall took two samples of wheat from my home town to Saskatchewan, where some of his relatives live. One sample was graded as No. 1 northern in my town and the other was graded as No. 2. When he got to Saskatchewan, for the No. 1 northern he was offered No. 4, and the other, our No. 2, they would not grade at all.

Now, the way they grade their wheat in Canada, No. 1 hard is quoted at a high price, but no wheat is ever sold or scarcely any at the No. 1 price. The price they do sell their wheat at there is such that were they to cross this line they would get from one to four grades higher on this side than on the other. If you take that into consideration, my friends, there will be a vast difference in our favor between the Canadian price and the American price, and when you talk about their milling capacity they have more water power than we have, so that they can extend their milling capacity without limit. If you think for one minute they are not going to remove the duty on flour that goes into Canada in order to get the benefit of free flour there you are assuming they are a lot of idiots, and they have demonstrated in the last few years that there is no more capable, intelligent business men on earth than the Canadian, and they are going to remove the duty on our flour in order that they may enjoy the greatest market the world has got. We consume 20 per cent of all the manufactured products of the world, and you can rest assured it is not long before Canada is going to take advantage of what you are offering them in this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the position of the committee now, they promised free food in the original bill, and for that reason they put flour on the free list and they heard from the millers of the country. I heard some echoes of that in my own office, and for reason of these loud protests they concluded to break 10 per cent of their promises on flour and report a duty of 10 cents on wheat and 10 per cent on flour. As long as you have broken your promises, why not give a duty that would be proportionate, so there will not be any undue importation of free articles and you will raise the revenue that you are so anxious about. I heard some echoes about buckwheat, and a gentleman came into my office, who lives in my district, who said he had the largest buckwheat mill in the country, if not in the world, perhaps, which ground exclusively buckwheat flour, and they had a meeting of a large number of millers making buckwheat flour, from Pennsylvania, and they sent him down as the buckwheat spokesman. He said he wanted one of two things—either free buckwheat or a duty on buckwheat flour. They have got the buckwheat on the free list. He wanted to know what he should do. I told him I did not have anything more to do with this bill, thank God, than he did, and of all things that have been charged against me I was not responsible for a line of it. But I did tell him where I thought he should go to interview some men, and he seems to have gotten in his work.

I told him that it was an uphill job, because the Member from our State was more interested in some things down about Manhattan Island than in raising buckwheat and making buckwheat flour up in my district, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania had his hands more than full, but he went notwithstanding, and what was the result? Why, to even up things they put buckwheat on the free list as well as buckwheat flour, so you have another thing added to the inharmonious aspect of this bill running through every other line of it. Buckwheat free, buckwheat flour free, wheat on the dutiable list and 10 per cent on flour, but to be free in the end. They make promises and break them, because they know and everybody knows Canada will take off the little duty on flour in order to set to work the mills of Canada, which have the capacity to make 50 per cent more flour than they are making now. Oh, it is a beautiful bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the committee has already determined by a vote to keep the duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat. By all principles of fairness if there be a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat the amendment to place a duty on flour ought to prevail in the interest of having wheat milled into flour in our own country instead of in Canada. I was pleased, however, and somewhat surprised to hear my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] apparently advocate either a reduction on wheat or a duty on flour. The pending measure carries 10 cents a bushel on wheat and no duty on flour except under certain conditions.

When the duty on wheat was 25 cents a bushel instead of 10 cents a bushel, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] a year ago voted to place flour on the free list, while 25 cents a bushel still remained on wheat—much more onerous for the miller than the proposition of 10 cents a bushel on wheat and no duty on flour. He not only voted for the bill when it passed the House, but he voted to override the veto of the President after the President had vetoed the bill on the distinct ground that to leave a duty on wheat at 25 cents a bushel and then place flour on the free list would be destructive of American milling interests. And I am delighted and pleased beyond measure that we have gathered to this side of the House the gentleman from Kansas, now in favor of the proposition which he then voted against. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed——

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, has the time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has not expired. There are six minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] on the frankness

and squareness which characterized the statement which prefaced his remarks a few moments ago. The squareness was like him and worthy of him, and I want to express for myself and my colleagues our appreciation of his action. I only regret that his Democratic colleagues on the committee do not appear as willing to protect the interests of the State of Minnesota as he.

I realize that gentlemen on that side of the aisle will not pay much attention to what we Republicans may say, and so I want to read for your edification a letter which I received from a lifelong Democrat in my district. It is as follows:

PRESTON STOCK FARM,
Preston, Fillmore County, Minn., April 9, 1913.

Hon. SYDNEY ANDERSON.

DEAR SIR: As a lifelong Democrat, but never an office seeker, I want to protest against the financial idiocy that takes the tariff from flour and leaves it on wheat. I am devoted to Democratic principles, and have proven the fact by answering the call of Douglas and Logan to stand by the Union, wearing a blue uniform as a Democrat and remaining one since, while knocking out a living by hard work. This entitles me, in my opinion, to the privilege of protesting against being financially murdered by a bunch of Democratic theorists who never did an honest day's work in their lives. What are the dairy farmers of your district going to do for mill stuff with the mills shut down? We raise no wheat to speak of. Leaving the tariff on wheat and taking it off flour transfers the milling industry to Canada. Any fool can see that. Leave the tariff on both or take it of from both. Can not you make my bonehead brother Democrats see this? Or will the owners of the Democratic donkey have to pull its ears? We who own it are competent to do the job.

What satisfaction will it be to a city consumer to buy Canadian flour after our mills are shut down? Will he get it any cheaper? By no means; he will pay more. After the 10-cent tariff on wheat has closed our mills, consumers will have to pay the penalty that monopoly exacts. When we can not get bran and shorts for our cows, except from Canada, dairy farming will suffer a more severe blow than my fellow partisan, Burleson, has sought to inflict upon us in his oleo propaganda.

Slaughtered in the house of our friends is the legend I suggest for the tombstones of Democrats crushed by a tariff provision that benefits no American, and I wonder what there is in Democracy that goes to some men's heads and makes them foolish. Don't hesitate to read this to my fellow Democrats. I am not an office seeker, only a voting Democrat with calloused hands, who swallowed Greely and offered to carry arms again for Tilden.

I hate a rascal, but a fool is worse, and the men who can not see that a tariff on wheat and none on flour is foolish are simply fools; and you are mighty welcome to tell them so for a Democrat who was a fighting Democrat 50 years ago.

Yours, truly, M. T. GRATTAN.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment——

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, has all time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. There are three minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, we have been reminded by some gentleman on the other side of the aisle that the United States has nothing to fear from wheat production in the Dominion of Canada. I want to remind them that in the year of 1910 Canada produced 166,745,000 bushels of wheat. Canada had available for export in that year 95,000,000 bushels of wheat. The United States in that year——

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman permit me to state how much the United States produced in that year?

Mr. POWERS. What is that?

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman permit me to state how much the United States produced in that year?

Mr. POWERS. I have no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. It produced 621,338,000 bushels.

Mr. POWERS. While that is true, the United States exported in that year only 114,000,000 bushels of wheat, and Canada exported in that year 57,000,000 bushels of wheat, a good deal of it coming to the United States. And I would remind them further——

Mr. RAINEY. There could not be more than 1,000,000 bushels come to the United States.

Mr. POWERS. I said 57,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. RAINEY. You just said that 1,000,000 came to the United States in that year.

Mr. POWERS. Canada exported in the year 1910, 57,000,000 bushels of wheat, a good deal of it coming to the United States.

Mr. RAINEY. Does the gentleman object to my stating how much came to the United States in that year?

Mr. POWERS. I have only three minutes.

Mr. RAINEY. One million one hundred thousand bushels came to the United States in that year.

Mr. POWERS. Canada has 3,000,000 acres of wheat land. She produces on an average of 22 bushels per acre, while in the United States we are only able to produce on an average of 15 bushels per acre.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman permit me to state what the wheat acreage was in that year? According to the Canadian Year Book it was 9,299,000 acres.

Mr. POWERS. Canada, nowithstanding the fact that she is producing this enormous quantity of wheat, and notwithstanding the further fact that she has 30,000,000 acres of wheat lands available for the production of wheat, has a population of only 8,000,000 people, while the United States has a population of about 100,000,000 people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on that.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 73, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

100. Biscuits, bread, wafers, cakes, and other baked articles, by whatever name known, when combined with chocolate, nuts, fruit, or confectionery of any kind, and without regard to the component material of chief value, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, line 17, after the word "articles," insert the words "and puddings."

Mr. MANN. You will be a pudding for us!

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] presents a committee amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, line 17, strike out the words "when combined with" and insert the word "containing."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

200. Butter and butter substitutes, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 21, page 51, by striking out "3" and inserting "3½."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the item refers to the duty on butter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, has that paragraph been read?

Mr. MANN. Yes; it has been read.

Mr. GOOD. The bill places the duty at 3 cents per pound. The amendment which I have offered places the duty at the rate carried in the Payne law of 3½ cents.

Mr. MANN. It is given here as 6 cents in the Payne law.

Mr. PAYNE. According to this print it is 6 cents.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a circular, circulated in the cities of the United States in the campaign of 1910, a part of which reads as follows:

Voters and householders, read the within carefully. How to save your money. Take it into the booth with you when you vote. Vote for your families. High-cost-of-living facts. Read carefully and ponder well. Vote right. Eighteen hundred and ninety-six prices—1910. The Republican Party has been in complete control of every department of the Government since 1896—President, Senate, and Congress. They have given you a government of trusts—Beef Trust, Sugar Trust, Flour Trust, Clothing Trust—and the daddy of them all, the Tariff Trust.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

See the result below.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], the expert on this committee, made a statement a few moments ago to the effect that the difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party lay in the fact that the platform pledges of the Democratic Party were redeemed when that party got in power. Let us examine the facts with regard to this schedule.

The Payne law did not alter the duty on butter at all. The duty on butter under the Dingley bill was 6 cents a pound and, if the gentleman is correct, it was 6 cents a pound in the Payne bill. The statement which your committee sent out in 1910 is that butter in 1896 was 10 cents a pound, and you say that the price in 1910 was 30 cents a pound, an increase of 300 per cent, resulting from what? From not doing a single thing with regard to the tariff on butter, but by leaving it just as it was.

Mr. RAINEY. The Elgin Butter Trust.

Mr. GOOD. Now, I want to ask the gentleman if the action of that Congress in not changing the duty on butter, in not lowering or increasing it at all, increased the price to the ultimate consumer 300 per cent, how much will the reduction of 40 per cent proposed in the bill increase the price to the ultimate consumer?

Mr. RAINEY. The price of butter has been increased by the Elgin Butter Trust.

Mr. GOOD. How about the millions of farmers who are making butter and selling it in the markets?

Mr. RAINEY. They do not make that kind of butter.

A MEMBER. They make better butter.

Mr. RAINEY. Before the gentleman qualifies as a farmer——

Mr. GOOD. Perhaps they make a better kind of butter.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the price of butter now?

Mr. GOOD. I am not an expert on that. The gentleman who prepared that campaign document perhaps can tell what it is.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Forty cents.

Mr. RAINEY. It keeps getting higher and higher. It will commence to get lower now.

Mr. GOOD. How much lower will it commence to get after this bill passes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the committee and of the gentleman from Alabama to the report on this bill, page 162, butter and substitutes therefor. The duty is reduced from 6 cents a pound in the Payne bill to 3 cents a pound in the Underwood bill, presumably for the purpose of raising revenue, which is reduced from $60,000 under the Payne bill to $39,000, estimated, under the Underwood bill. But as to the cost of living, the unit value of butter under the Payne bill is given at 23 cents a pound, and under the Underwood bill, the duty being reduced, at 25 cents a pound. I should like to ask whether that is a typographical error? The price of the commodity to the consumer seems to be raised under this system. Before the gentleman answers that question I will call his attention to cheese and substitutes therefor, reported on the same page. There is a reduction of duty there from 32 per cent ad valorem under the Payne bill to 20 per cent under the Underwood bill.

The duty, of course, is reduced for the purpose of revenue only, but the price of cheese to the consumer, this being an article very much needed by the poor consumer, is apparently raised from 18 cents in the Payne bill to 19 cents in the Underwood bill. This may also be a mistake. It may be purely typographical; but it would appear on looking at eggs, page 165, that the duty on eggs in the Payne tariff bill was 5 cents a dozen, and the duty is to be reduced to 2 cents a dozen in the Underwood bill. The unit value of the eggs in the Payne bill is given at 13.7, and in the Underwood bill, the duty being lowered, the price of the eggs is increased to the consumer to 14 cents a dozen. Now, it may be that these are all clerical errors and that the committee has made a mistake. It would seem so, because the purpose of the committee, as I understand it, is to take the duties off in order that the price of living to the consumer may be reduced.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will allow me to refer to rose plants and things of that kind, I think I can show that throughout this series of tables as the duty is taken off and the opportunity to the producer to obtain a fair profit for his commodity is reduced the price to the consumer, whoever he is, is increased, as proven at least by the figures in these three tables I have quoted. It is an interesting study in statistics, and might possibly be explained by the philosophers on the other side who are teaching us how to keep wages up and prices down.

Mr. GOOD. Perhaps this campaign circular disclosed what is meant on that subject.

Mr. MOORE. I have heard the gentleman refer to that several times, and I am inclined to think that campaign circular was one of those 1,100,001 lies that were circulated so successfully through the newspapers and handbills that they completely deceived the people in the last campaign as to the real intent of the Democratic Party to reduce the cost of living.

Mr. GOOD. With regard to eggs, they propose by the same reduction——

Mr. MOORE. To raise the price to the consumer.

Mr. GOOD. Reduce the price 15 cents a dozen to the consumer.

Mr. MOORE. When the poor consumer gets his end of it, as he will in the course of time, he will understand the circular which the gentleman has read.

Mr. GOOD. First they propose to reduce the duty 3 cents a pound on butter and they propose to reduce the price to the consumer 10 cents a pound.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman represents the producer in butter, and I represent the consumer. The gentleman says his producers are going to be hurt, and I say the price to the consumer is going to be increased. That is true Democratic philosophy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

201. Cheese and substitutes therefor, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, we produce in this country under this paragraph and the preceding one dairy products amounting to $250,000,000 worth a year. It so happens that the amount of consumption is practically the same equivalent, around the figures of one-quarter of a billion dollars every year. Of course, the purpose of our Democratic tariff blacksmiths is to increase importations of these articles and all others that they have made these great reductions of the tariff upon.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of blacksmiths in my district, and on behalf of those blacksmiths I object. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. They stated that as a governing principle forming the basis of their reductions, they have no regard for protection. In the second place, they make such reductions as will lead to a material increase of importations. They have not favored the country with a statement of what the total amount of increased importations is to be. They have in some respects. As to articles left on the dutiable list, they have estimated that the imports will be $39,000,000 more than in 1912, but they have taken off the dutiable list and put on the free list articles of value imported in 1912 to the amount of $102,000,000. It goes without saying that if you take articles off the dutiable list and put them on the free list the quantity of importations will very much increase.

Take the sugar question. Sixty million dollars in round figures of beet sugar is grown in this country, and it will in time under free trade come near disappearing entirely. The nearest we have had to an estimate from these responsible gentlemen who are rearranging the tariff, was when the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] was addressing the House, and I asked him what was their estimate of the probable increased importations, and after consulting at his elbow the gentleman from Alabama, my understanding of the estimate was that in round figures it amounted to $286,000,000. That is a very great disturbance in the amount of consumption of American products. What is to become of the equivalent of the goods of American products to be displaced by that amount of foreign goods? They say that this tariff is made for the consumer. The Republican tariff was always made for the producer. Our idea is that if you can keep everybody a producer the country is growing wealthy, and every man worth his salt is a producer as well as a consumer. It is only the idle rich and the weary Willies, who count the ties on the railways, that are not producers. We do not make tariffs for those people. What are you going to do with the labor and the products that are to be displaced by the $300,000,000 worth of foreign goods to take the place of the American manufactures? One of two things must happen, either that much production must cease or else that much of production must find a market abroad.

The schoolmaster from New Jersey occupying the White House assured us that by sharpening up our wits and by allowing these people to come in and compete with us and take a portion of our market we will be able to drive them out of some other market, and in conformity with the same theory the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] says, in his report, that, in his judgment, the future of American commerce will be found across the seas. Evidently it will not be found at home, and if the gentlemen who have suggested this marvelous proposition about sharpening our wits by allowing foreigners to come in and drive us out of our own markets will suggest a way whereby we may drive them out of their markets there would be some hope in the proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

202. Beans, not specially provided for, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 24, after the word "beans" insert the words "and lentils."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 24, after the word "for," strike out the figure "25" and insert "45."

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for this reason: The amendment, if adopted, would restore in this bill the rates in the Payne law. The State of Michigan is one of the great States of the Union in the production of beans, covered by this paragraph. A normal crop of beans in the State of Michigan is about 15,000,000 bushels a year. The importations of beans last year, as given in the handbook, were valued at $1.76 per bushel. That is the foreign value. The estimated value of beans under the new proposed tariff law would be $1.60 per bushel. A reduction of 20 cents a bushel to the farmers of Michigan means $3,000,000 a year. I submit that on that single crop alone it is a rather high price for the people of the State of Michigan to pay for Democratic rule. This is one of the important crops of the State. Michigan lies along the border of Canada. Canada is the greatest bean-producing country in the world.

The Michigan farmers, therefore, would be more affected than the farmers of any other State in the Union except the States in the Northwest. Therefore I submit it is unfair to reduce the duty on this product. If it does not lower the price 20 cents a bushel, then the farmer is not in any way injured, and neither is the consumer benefited, but the Treasury of the United States would be deprived of just that much money in duties to which it is justly entitled under such circumstances. If by reducing the duty 20 cents a bushel the price is brought down from $2.21 duty to $1.85, under the figures given in the handbook, I submit it is rather a high price for the people of Michigan to pay for their own folly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

203. Beets, 10 per cent ad valorem; sugar beets, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Some time ago the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] read an excerpt from an article in a California newspaper in reference to the labor conditions on the beet farms in Sutter County. The truth of the matter is that some time ago the Alameda Beet Sugar Co. contemplated erecting a beet-sugar factory in the town of Meridian, in Sutter County. They contemplated spending $2,000,000 on the factory and in the acreage. They have $45,000 worth of steel on the ground now, but knowing that this bill will be enacted into law, the construction of that factory has been abandoned.

There are in California 25,000 people engaged in the beet-sugar industry. Of that number less than 500 are orientals, and most of them are employed on the beet farms. We do not want the orientals. California has recently shown to the world that she is willing to go to the limit of her constitutional authority to stop the immigration of orientals into this country. We want the help of the people of the United States, for this country always has been and is now, and, I pray God, always will be a white man's country, enjoying a white man's civilization, which is the result of the best thoughts and best efforts of the best minds that have inhabited and benefited the earth by right living and exalted thinking.

While the desire for liberty is as old as the aspirations of the human heart for higher and better conditions, the liberty we enjoy is a new thing in government, and dates practically from the Revolutionary War. It cost unnumbered precious lives and untold treasure. It is our obligation to transmit it to posterity as pure as we received it from the founders and preservers of the Republic, who suffered so much and mutually pledged their lives, their fortunes, and sacred honor in order that they and we might be free. The people of a republic can only maintain their liberty as long as the people are homogeneous, speak the same language, and occupy contiguous territory, worship the same God, and are intelligent, law-abiding citizens who love liberty and are willing to defend it. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman desire to speak on this paragraph?

Mr. MANN. About three minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in three minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph provides for a rate of duty on sugar beets of 5 per cent. The committee this afternoon voted to place sugar on the free list at the end of three years, although this duty of 5 per cent on the beets from which the sugar is made would still remain. I would like to know upon what theory it is proposed to put beet sugar on the free list and retain the duty on sugar beets from which it is made. If anybody can explain that theory I take off my hat to the gentleman if the explanation is satisfactory. [Applause on the Republican side.] You are proposing—I am not appealing to the intelligence of some of the gentlemen on the other side, because I know how vain an appeal would be to their intelligence. [Applause on the Republican side.] You propose to take off the duty on sugar, thereby rendering probable the closing of the sugar-beet factories, and at the same time say that the raw material from which they make the sugar shall remain upon the dutiable list. Upon what theory? Is it protection or revenue? What revenue do you expect to derive from 5 per cent duty on sugar beets? If it is not for revenue, is it protection, and when did you become protectionists? Now, I defy gentlemen to give a sensible or reasonable explanation of the self-apparent contradiction. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

204. Beans, peas, prepared or preserved, or contained in tins, jars, bottles, or similar packages, including the weight of immediate coverings, 1 cent per pound; mushrooms and truffles, 2½ cents per pound.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, in line 202, page 51, I move to strike out the figures "25" and insert "45," and upon this question I would like to be heard for a brief time.

The bean crop is one of the most important in the State of Michigan, as well as in the sixth congressional district of that State. This bill reduces the tariff on beans from 45 cents per bushel to 25 cents per bushel. If the bill is permitted to become a law in its present form, I fear that Canada, whose border line is just across the river from Michigan, and produces beans in great abundance, will take possession of the Detroit and other markets, as she did under the Wilson-Gorman bill, and greatly injure, if not practically ruin, the industry in Michigan.

Michigan raises 70 per cent or more of the bean crop of the United States, or more than 6,000,000 bushels out of the ten million or more bushels raised in the United States. The farmers of Michigan receive a handsome return annually, aggregating between ten and fifteen million dollars each year for their bean crop.

Scattered along the railways at many stations throughout my district one can find bean houses, where many women are employed at splendid wages. I fear that if this bill becomes a law that not only the farmers and local buyers will be greatly injured, but that the splendid wages which have been paid to women for work in the bean houses will be greatly reduced.

In the consideration of this bill it is worthy of note that the Japanese beans are making greater and greater inroads upon our shores every year, and that when the Panama Canal is opened, as is expected in the near future, this will allow the Japanese to raise and carry their beans direct to the best markets in this country in their own vessels.

This question is of unusual importance in my district, and especially to the farmers in the counties of Livingston and Genesee, and in portions of Oakland, Wayne, and Ingham Counties.

Some of our farmers have been engaged in raising sugar beets, and if it is your determined intention to destroy this industry in the next three years, then the farmers of Michigan will have lost two great and profitable industries—beans and sugar beets—and as a result will not have as wide a field in which to diversify their crops, but will be limited to corn, oats, potatoes, and wheat, which on the whole is no longer very profitable to the farmers of Michigan; so I hope that this bill

will not be enacted into law in its present form, but that the duty will remain at its present rate.

Mr. Chairman, I want to avail myself of this opportunity to point out conditions as they existed in this country in the closing years of the tariff act of 1846.

It has been asserted more than once in this debate that legislation similar to this which we are about to enact has heretofore been successful in this country. I want to assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that such is not the case, and that every tariff for revenue or free-trade act that has been passed in this country since its birth has been a failure, and if time and opportunity permitted I could cite many instances. At this time I want to call your attention to an article which appeared in the New York Tribune in December, 1854.

THE PROPHECIES FULFILLED.

On December 18, 1854, the New York Tribune published a collection of facts which showed the dreary and prospectively desperate condition of industry and commerce. It showed that the chief industries necessary to the life of the Nation were partially or wholly collapsed through the influences and effects of the British free-trade doctrines put into operation here by the tariff of 1846; that our people had been brought to a condition which in Europe is attendant upon revolution; and that in every occupation and branch of business the depression was so terrible that one-half or more of all employees had been thrown out of employment. The Tribune added:

"What a picture is here presented! We have supported European manufacturers and artisans and middlemen to the neglect, loss, and destruction of our own men of industry and talent, of whatever kind, and that is the sole reason of our difficulty."

One year later, January 15, 1855, the New York Tribune printed the following pathetic article, which explains itself:

"Who is hungry? Go and see. You that are full fed and know not what it is to be hungry—perhaps never saw a hungry man—go and see. Go and see thousands, men and women, boys and girls, old and young, black and white, of all nations, crowding and jostling each other, almost fighting for a first chance, acting more like hungry wolves than human beings, in a land of plenty, waiting till the food is ready for distribution. Such a scene may be seen every day between 11 and 2 o'clock around the corner of Orange and Chatham Streets, where charity gives a dinner to the poor and soup and bread to others to carry to their miserable families.

"On Saturday we spent an hour there at the hour of high tide. We have never seen anything like it before. Upward of a thousand people were fed with a plate of soup, a piece of bread, and a piece of meat on the premises, and in all more than 1,600. On the same day 1,130 portions of soup were dealt out from Stewart's 'soup kitchen,' corner of Reade Street and Broadway. At the rooms on Duane Street for the relief of the poor, on the same day, they gave food to 2,256. In the sixth ward alone over 6,000 persons were fed by charity on Saturday, January 13. And this is only one day in one ward. Meanwhile scenes of a like nature are being enacted all over the city.

"The cry of hard times reaches us from every part of the country. The making of roads is stopped, factories are closed, and houses and ships are no longer being built. Factory hands, road makers, carpenters, bricklayers, and laborers are idle, and paralysis is rapidly embracing every pursuit in the country. The cause of all this stoppage of circulation is to be found in the steady outflow of gold to pay foreign laborers for the cloth, the shoes, the iron, and the other things that could be produced by American labor, but which can not be so produced under our present revenue system. The convulsion would have come upon us sooner but for the extraordinary demand in Europe for breadstuffs, growing out of huge famines and big wars, and but for the dazzling and magnificent discovery of gold mines in California, by which hard money, sufficient to buy an empire, has been called into existence and exported to Europe. If we could stop the import of the foreign articles the gold would cease to flow out to pay for them, and money would then again become more abundant, labor would then again be in demand, shoes, clothing, and other commodities would then again be in demand, and men would then cease to starve in the streets of our towns and cities. If it be not stopped the gold must continue to go abroad, and employment must become from day to day more scarce, until where there are now many thousands we shall see tens of thousands of men everywhere crying: 'Give me work! Only give me work! Make your own terms—my wife and children have nothing to eat!'"

As one reads the above, are they not forcibly reminded, especially if they lived during those days, of another Democratic tariff-for-revenue, free-trade period—the dark days from 1893 to 1897, under the Wilson-Gorman bill? During both of these periods there were similar experiences—the soup houses, factories closed, thousands of honest but idle laboring men who were willing to work, but there was no work for them. Listen to the cry of the laboring man in a land of plenty like this, or, at least, where there ought to be sufficient for all to eat and plenty of work to do: "Give me work; only give me work; make your own terms; my wife and children have nothing to eat."

I wonder that in the debate upon this important legislation that no Democrat has sought to explain these conditions as they have occurred from time to time under legislation similar to that which you are about to enact. Can you not give us some hope or consolation for the future, pointing out specifically where we can expect that the results will be different than they have been heretofore under similar tariff acts?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto now close.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from California was shut out before.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We must make progress on the bill. I did not start until gentlemen insisted on continuing political speeches. I want to say that if gentlemen want to debate the paragraphs in the bill they must confine themselves to the subject matter of the paragraph. I ask unanimous consent to close debate on the paragraph in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate be closed on the paragraph in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYES. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the State of California has for many years grown a very large quantity of beans and we come in direct competition with the Orient. Until five years ago we had no competition from Asia, but beginning then we began to receive beans from Japan and Manchuria and during the last few years the average importation from the Orient of beans has averaged over 100,000 bushels per year. If with the tariff at 45 cents per bushel this competition has constantly increased, what will happen to the bean producers of the Pacific if the tariff is reduced to 25 cents per bushel? Now, in spite of the conditions that have existed the price of beans has not been excessive and during the past four or five years they have never gone above 3¾ cents a pound. One county in my district has half its arable acreage planted in beans each year—the county of Ventura.

Those beans are generally lima beans. And not only are we menaced with the competition from the Orient, but beans have been coming from South Africa in the last few years to compete with our farmers of the Pacific coast. Under these circumstances I can not understand upon what theory the Committee on Ways and Means proceeded when reducing the tariff on beans from 45 to 25 cents per bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

205. Vegetables, if cut, sliced, or otherwise reduced in size, or if parched or roasted, or if pickled, or packed in salt, brine, oil, or prepared in any way; any of the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, and bean stick or bean cake, miso, and similar products, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In July, 1911, an act was passed by the Congress of the United States known as the reciprocity act——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order; that is not on the paragraph.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not desire to hear the gentleman on the point of order, and he will proceed in order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is somewhat of a mind reader if he knows what I am going to say.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I knew what the gentleman was saying, and it did not pertain to this paragraph.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I propose to discuss this paragraph, and I intend to keep nearer in order than the gentleman was for half an hour yesterday in discussing his personal interests in this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill we have here before this committee, upon which I wish to make some remarks if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] will permit and not indulge in political speeches himself, permits practically every product of the fields, the forests, the mines, and the waters of Canada to come in here free of duty or at a greatly reduced rate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not confining himself to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. These provisions have been enacted without asking anything whatever from Canada in return. We have taken off the duty entirely on flour, on potatoes, and they have reduced it in a large number of particulars as to agricultural products. They have taken it off of sawed lumber without, as I have said, asking for anything whatever in return.

Now, I would like to know of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] what justification he can give for this and the other reductions in the duties which are made by this bill without asking anything from foreign nations?

Some time ago, about two years—and the gentleman from Alamaba can interrupt me, if he desires, and I will stop if he does not like to hear it—this House passed what was known as the Canadian reciprocity act. It was one of the most unpopular provisions among the farmers of this Nation that ever went through this House, and it contributed more than anything else to the defeat of the Republican candidate for Presi-

dent. I have always wondered, Mr. Chairman, why it was when this agreement was so advantageous to the Canadians that they rejected it, but I can understand it perfectly now. They knew the gentleman from Alabama, leading the Democratic hosts here in this House, would give them everything they had by that provision of reciprocity, so called, and a great deal more in addition, and ask nothing whatever in return for it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending paragraph now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on the pending paragraph be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

207. Cider, 2 cents per gallon.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Now we have something very important. I wonder who is the author of this great reduction. Cider in the present law, which, by the way, is imported at the price of $1.02 a gallon, carries the enormous duty of 5 cents a gallon, very nearly 5 per cent, and the distinguished authors of this provision—and I hope the authorship is scattered around among the whole 14 members of the majority—has seen fit to relieve the cider drinkers in the United States by reducing this 5-cent duty on a gallon down to 2 cents a gallon. I wonder if any of them figure out and are able to say just how much that would relieve the man who drinks a glass of cider out of this gallon when it comes into the United States. Why, we have reached to-day, Mr. Chairman, a condition of microscopic things in the revision of the tariff duty. What a wonderful reduction this is! How welcome it will be to the consumers of the United States to reduce the duty on cider from 5 cents a gallon to 2 cents a gallon!

Oh, it is another illustration of the wonderful mechanism displayed in regard to this bill, which was said a few moments ago to have been made by blacksmiths. [Laughter on the Republican side.] But that is a mistake, for blacksmiths do not use jackscrews in their work to a very alarming extent. [Laughter on the Republican side.] It was a microscopist that did this thing [renewed laughter on the Republican side], and it was the smallest, finest kind of a microscope. Oh, the man that conceived that—what a statesman he would make! [Laughter.] He ought to be President of the United States.

Mr. BLACKMON. He may be. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. He will be a president if the country ever discovers [applause on the Democratic side] the mind that is responsible for the authorship of this bill. They will make him president [renewed applause on the Democratic side] of some village debating society in one of the rural counties of some backward State. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

208. Eggs not specially provided for in this section, 2 cents per dozen; eggs frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved in tins or other packages, not specially provided for in this section, including the weight of the immediate coverings or containers, 2½ cents per pound.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the numeral "2," in line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "3," so that it will read "3 cents."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 17, strike out the figure "2" at the end of the line and insert in lieu thereof the figure "3."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the reason a reduction was made from 5 cents a dozen to 2 cents a dozen was to reduce the cost of living. The price of eggs has been reasonably high for the last 15 years, and during that time the farmers of the country have reaped a very large benefit from their poultry yards. The average income to the farmers for the last two or three years has been in the neighborhood of $322,000,000 for eggs.

Now we are about to enter upon an era of low prices, low cost of living, and cheap things, and I take it that you want to make eggs just as cheap as possible. There never was a time within my recollection when eggs were as cheap as they were the last time the Democrats made a tariff law.

Mr. MANN. They sold then at 5 cents a dozen.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And there was a duty of 3 cents a dozen on eggs under the last Wilson bill. If the importations that are invited by this bill to come into the country displace the products of American labor, and therefore displace American labor itself, to the amount of over $300,000,000, there will be a lot of men out of work in this country who will need things just as cheap as they can get them.

They will need the flour just as cheap as you can make it, and if they can make flour cheaper in Canada than in the United States under the provisions of this bill the people who are out of work will need it. So that, after all, I am not so sure but that many of the provisions of the agricultural schedule are in perfect harmony with the rest of the bill as it has been prepared, because you are getting ready to feed the idle men that you are going to deprive of work by the provisions of this bill and by cheapening the things that the farmer raises to sell to the people of the country who are employed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Two things are essential to a country's prosperity, namely, steady employment at the highest possible wage to the American laborer and good prices for the products of the American farmer, and you are making both of these conditions absolutely impossible during the time that the provisions of this law shall remain in effect. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and pending amendments close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that all debate on this paragraph and all pending amendments thereto close in five minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is a typical Republican argument. He outlines the theory upon which the Republican Party revises the tariff. A Republican revision is always in the interest of the trusts. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The gentleman attacks this very paragraph, and makes an amendment that would not help the farmers any if it went through, but which would be of immense value to these fellows who run cold-storage warehouses in the great cities. The farmer always sells his eggs on the lowest possible market, when eggs are the cheapest, and these cold-storage warehouses store them up, and the gentleman does not want eggs to come in from any other country to interfere with the cold-storage trust in this country.

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

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; I will.

Mr. MANN. Does that argument apply also to the 2-cent duty that is carried in this bill?

Mr. RAINEY. No.

Mr. GOOD. It takes 3 cents to make that argument apply.

Mr. RAINEY. Let us see what the gentleman from Kansas is going to do. He raises the duty on eggs and makes it 3 cents, and he leaves in this paragraph frozen eggs at 2½ cents per pound. Now, the effect of the gentleman's amendment, if it should prevail, would be this—and it is a typical Republican way of revising the tariff, and that is the reason the people rebelled against the Republican Party, and that is the reason so few of them are found on that side of the House now. [Applause in the galleries.]

The CHAIRMAN. The galleries will refrain from any manifestations of approval or disapproval.

Mr. RAINEY. The frozen-egg industry is just commencing. They bring in frozen eggs from Manchuria. They break the eggs and put them in containers, and freeze them and bring them over here. Frozen eggs in this country are a by-product. When eggs are broken in transit in this country they freeze them and sell them in that way.

Now, the gentleman proposes to raise the tariff on shell eggs until it is higher than the tariff on frozen eggs, and by doing that he excludes from this country the only kind of eggs that can compete with the cold-storage warehouses, and he invites into this country these broken eggs from which the shells are removed, which come into the country from Manchuria. That is what he is trying to do, and that is a typical way of revising the tariff, and that is the theory upon which the Payne-Aldrich tariff was built all the way through.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was that in the Wilson bill tariff of some 16 years ago?

Mr. RAINEY. In those days they did not have the frozen-egg industry.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, they did not!

Mr. RAINEY. And if the gentleman knew anything about the industry he would know that.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman think they freeze eggs in cold storage?

Mr. RAINEY. Oh, the gentleman did not catch my argument at all; but that is not my fault.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

209. Eggs, dried, 10 cents per pound; eggs, yolk of, 10 per cent ad valorem; dried blood, when soluble, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to obtain some information with regard to this agricultural schedule. I should like to get some information as to the theory on which it is constructed, without being accused of playing politics. In all earnestness I want to ask the gentleman how much he proposes to reduce the cost of eggs to the consumer by the reduction that is proposed in this bill, both dried eggs and fresh eggs? If the gentleman can not answer the question, here is the handbook of the Democratic party in 1910 on that subject, if he wants to refer to it.

Mr. PAYNE. Read it to him.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman in his handbook in 1910 said that the price of eggs was 10 cents a dozen.

Mr. RAINEY. I will state, if the gentleman wants me to answer his question——

Mr. GOOD. And that the tariff had increased the price to 30 cents a dozen.

Mr. RAINEY. If the gentleman will permit me to answer his question—the gentleman knows about as much about the tariff as the average Republican tariff maker. Dried eggs are not used in food at all. They are used in the industries.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman answer my question as to fresh eggs? How much does he propose to reduce the cost to the consumer?

Mr. PAYNE. Let us see what he knows about it.

Mr. GOOD. I want to know what the gentleman knows about it.

Mr. RAINEY. How much do you think it will reduce it?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman said I did not know anything about it. I am coming now to the source of all information.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman can wait and see. We will all find out.

Mr. GOOD. Well, does the gentleman know how much it will reduce the cost of eggs?

Mr. RAINEY. If I did not know more about the tariff than the gentleman who is interrogating me does I would not disclose my ignorance.

Mr. MANN. Keep still then.

Mr. GOOD. It is because I do not know that I appeal to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAINEY. It is not my fault that the gentleman does not know. The gentleman must not expect me to furnish him too much information.

Mr. MANN. We do not.

Mr. LANGLEY. There is no danger of that.

Mr. GOOD. But can the gentleman furnish me any information at all on the egg schedule?

Mr. RAINEY. We are not running a kindergarten school for the benefit of the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. I want to know something about this question of the high cost of living and its relation to the tariff as far as eggs are concerned, and if the gentleman knows anything about it I hope he will enlighten me.

Mr. RAINEY. I will say that I do not want to burden the gentleman's apparently limited intellect with too much information to-night. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. No danger of that.

Mr. GOOD. I have appealed to the gentleman time and time again for information in regard to the tariff schedule as far as agricultural products are concerned, and have failed to elicit from him a spark of information or even of intelligence as to the price to the ultimate consumer. I will say that the statements contained in the circular I have referred to are absolutely false. It was circulated by the Democratic committee, and the gentleman knows that it is false. I have appealed to the gentleman, and he refuses to tell the Members of the House what effect this proposed bill will have on the price of eggs or on the prices of any other articles mentioned in the agricultural schedule. Does he know?

Mr. FORDNEY. Silence is consent.

Mr. GOOD. The silence would indicate that the gentleman knows absolutely nothing in regard to this subject.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I stand for an immediate substantial downward revision of the tariff. I think it only fair to be reasonable and moderate in making the cuts till conditions can adjust themselves. I am printing with these remarks a table prepared and handed to me by Mr. F. R. Hathaway, of Detroit, Mich. It shows the products and the industries of the State of Washington that are affected by the tariff. I am willing for the rates to be reduced in every case where excessive, but I hope the committee will be fair and will make cuts by such degrees as will do the greatest good to the greatest number.

I have listened to the stock arguments of the Republican Party on the various phases of this tariff question till I have come to realize that there is a lack of genuineness of purpose in the things that are said. My friend over there has read from the campaign argument of the Democratic Party about the high cost of living, and his colleagues on the Republican side seem to think they score most convincing points when they show that the cost of living can not be greatly affected by certain reductions in tariff rates under consideration at this time.

To begin with, campaign pamphlets are not reliable and should not be deemed convincing in a discussion of this kind. We all heard of "the full dinner pail" of the Republican Party, and yet under the Republican Party program the poor have grown poorer and the rich richer. The burdens of life have continued to bear harder upon the backs of those who toil.

We know, everybody knows, that relief can not come alone from a revision of the tariff. The laborer and the farmer knows that it will take more than that. The work now being done in this poor and unsatisfactory manner is merely the beginning.

The high cost of living will come down, you can depend on it. The people will take hold of the Government in such way that present methods of revising the tariff will be improved, and finally the people will have their way about that. For my part I am glad of an income tax against the incomes principally of the rich. I know that will help reduce the high cost of living. But there are other things to be considered. Take the great fuel problem. The vast coal deposits of Alaska lie there, the property of the people, untouched, out of reach, while all classes, whether poor or rich, are compelled to pay exorbitant prices for fuel to men who have grown rich and flourished under the Republican rule. We propose to build railroads in Alaska and operate them by Government money. We will open the mines and bring the coal to market over Government rails and let the Government sell it at cost to the ultimate consumer.

Hon. Walter L. Fisher, former Secretary of the Interior, spoke recently concerning the Alaska situation as follows:

> Responsibility for the condition of Alaska rests squarely on the shoulders of Congress and no place else. The necessity for legislation to open up the Territory has been pointed out time after time, but nothing whatever has been done. It seems to me that no candid student of the situation of Alaska who is at all free from personal and pecuniary interest can have the slightest doubt of the propriety of the Federal Government conducting one or more railroads in Alaska to open up that Territory. The Government operation of the Panama Canal Railroad has proven satisfactory and much of the machinery used at Panama can be used to great saving in the construction of the Alaska Railway. There can be no development in Alaska unless the Government constructs a railroad from tidewater to the interior. Private interests might build as far as the coal fields or the copper mines, but no farther.

It is appalling to think how the people of this country have been betrayed by the giving away of the fuel—the coal deposits. We are going to develop and mine and use in our own homes the vast coal and fuel supplies of Alaska.

I hear my Republican friend over there, yes, and my Democratic friend over here, say "Why, that would interfere with private business. It would put the Government into competition with property investments of citizens." Well, what if it would?

I say the cost of living must come down. The people will not accept your answer to their demand for relief that they eat too much, recreate too much, live too high. They have a mind to the fact that your party has permitted the coal deposits of this country to get into the hands of the railroads and into other private hands. They know that the vast timber resources of this country have been worse than squandered, so far as the people's title thereto is concerned. The present commercial value of the standing timber of this country is $6,000,000,000, exclusive of the value of the land on which it stands. The standing timber is estimated at 2,826,000,000,000 feet, of which 2,197,000,000,000 feet is privately owned. The value of this timber has enhanced in the last 10 years almost beyond the dreams of its owners. Why should all these billions of increased value, an unearned increment, go to these few men and be in their hands forever, an added means of extortion from those who must pass through the struggle for existence in ages yet to come? I publish in connection with these remarks some figures which may well startle the reader of them.

Yes; the cost of living must come down. In Alaska, thanks to Gifford Pinchot and his fellow conservationists, the people still own the coal; but the hand of greed stands guard, and all the little dandies here and there who are on the pay rolls of the special interests proclaim that the conservationists have

locked up Alaska. It is the greediest band of cutthroats in the world that now has a strangle hold on the throat of fair Alaska. They tell us they will build the railroad if we will give them the coal. No; a thousand times no. Uncle Sam is strong enough to bring down the high cost of living. Let us have a Government road, bearing Government coal to our fellow citizens at the cost of mining and transportation, instead of a Guggenheim road bearing Guggenheim coal to the people at exorbitant and unjust prices.

Will not the lowering of the cost of fuel help reduce the high cost of living? I hear you laugh and say, "Not much." All right. When we have reduced the tariff and lowered the price of coal, does anyone suppose we will stop there? The high cost of living must come down. The people want the telegraph and telephone lines and the express monopoly done away with right now. I mean what I say. The Government is ready to handle all this business. By a slight development of the parcel post the express business will belong to the people. That will help some more; and the telegraph and telephone lines. There was a time when the people generally were not concerned with these utilities, but to-day it is the consumer alone who is ultimately charged up with the millions of dividends that are enriching the monopolistic owners of the telephone and telegraph. How easy it would be for telegrams to be sent from and received at our post offices. Think of the millions upon millions of the people's money invested in public buildings. Why not use them for the telephone and telegraph business, and thus further lower the cost of living?

That is not all. The people demand the ownership of their local utilities—the traction companies, the light companies, the water and gas companies. Why not? The high cost of living must come down.

Oh, you need not laugh or question; we will not stop there. Already we have started to squeeze the water out of the railroad capitalization, and, if those who own the railroads do not help reduce the high cost of living by lowering the universal tax on everybody for transportation, both freight and passenger, the people will take the railroads of this country and we will have a railroad passenger and freight office in every post office in the land. Yes; and we will supervise the trusts and demand lower prices. We will know what it costs to make a garment or a hat or a pair of shoes, and the Government will tell the great operators and manufacturers how much they can charge the people, and again we will stop unusual profits. Will not this help? Will the Republican Party stand in the way? Then its funeral procession will be told to trot along. Will the Democrats try to fool the people? That party will be brushed away. The Progressive Party can have an enduring future and render service to the people just in proportion as it gets down to the people, studies their wants, and relieves them.

Washington industries and tariff rates.

	Quantity.		Value.	Dingley law rates.	Payne-Aldrich law rates.	Underwood bill rates.
Cereals, etc.:	*Acres.*	*Bushels.*				
Oats	269,742	13,228,003	$5,870,857	15 cents per bushel	15 cents per bushel	10 cents per bushel.
Wheat	2,118,015	40,920,390	35,102,370	25 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	Do.
Flour			17,852,944	25 per cent	25 per cent	Free.
Barley	171,888	5,834,615	3,331,930	30 cents per bushel	30 cents per bushel	15 cents per bushel.
Potatoes	57,897	7,667,171	2,993,737	25 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	Free.
		Tons.				
Hay and forage	742,137	1,391,664	17,147,648	$4 per ton	$4 per ton	$2 per ton.
Fruits:	*Bearing trees.*	*Bushels.*				
Apples	3,009,337	2,672,100	2,925,761	25 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	10 cents per bushel.
Plums	823,082	1,032,077	600,503	do	do	Do.
Cherries	241,038	131,302	278,547	do	do	Do.
Pears	290,676	310,804	328,895	do	do	Do.
	Sheep of shearing age.	*Pounds wool.*				
Wool	295,264	3,135,348	536,708	11 to 36 cents per pound	11 to 36 cents per pound	Free.
Live stock and dairy products:	*Number.*					
Cattle on farms	402,120		12,193,465	$2 to 25 per cent per head	$2 to 25 per cent per head	10 per cent.
Horses and mules on farms	292,930		31,539,551	$30 to 25 per cent per head	$30 to 25 per cent per head	$15 to 10 per cent per head.
Swine on farms	206,135		1,674,927	$1.50 per head	$1.50 per head	Free.
Sheep on farms	475,555		1,931,170	75 cents to $1.50 per head	75 cents to $1.50 per head	10 per cent.
Domestic animals on farms			47,370,775	All on dutiable list	All on dutiable list	Mostly free.
Domestic animals not on farms			7,558,077	do	do	Do.
Poultry on farms	2,272,775		1,367,440	3 cents per pound, live; 5 cents per pound, dead	3 cents per pound, live; 5 cents per pound, dead	1 cent per pound, live. 2 cents per pound, dead.
		Dozen.				
Eggs		16,472,575	4,311,291	5 cents per dozen	5 cents per dozen	2 cents per dozen.
Dairy products			8,746,041	All on dutiable list	All on dutiable list	Milk, free.
		Pounds.				
Butter		6,761,575	1,992,249	6 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	3 cents per pound.
Cheese		52,970	6,787	do	do	20 per cent.
	Number.	*Number of wage earners.*				
Manufacturing establishments	3,674	69,120	220,746,000			
Mines, quarries, and wells	170	7,343	10,537,556			
	Number of operators.					
Soft coal	32	6,155	9,226,793	67 cents per ton	45 cents per ton	Free.

EXTRACTS FROM "THE LUMBER INDUSTRY"—PART 1—STANDING TIMBER. ISSUED JANUARY 20, 1913, BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR, BUREAU OF CORPORATIONS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Southern pine sold by the Government for $1.25 an acre; much is now worth $60 an acre. Large amount of Douglas fir in western Washington and Oregon which the Government gave away or sold at $2.50 per acre now range from $100 to $200 per acre (p. 18).

The Southern Pacific Railroad, the Weyerhauser Timber Co., and the Northern Pacific Railroad own 238,000,000,000 feet of timber, or nearly 11 per cent of all the privately owned timber in the United States (p. 20).

Present commercial value of the privately owned standing timber in the United States is estimated at $6,000,000,000. This does not include the land (p. 2).

Output of lumber by 46,584 sawmills in 1909 amounted to 44,509,000,000 feet (p. 3).

Total standing timber in the United States is estimated at 2,826,000,000,000 feet, of which 2,197,000,000,000 feet is privately owned. Owned by the Government in forest reserves, 539,000,000,000 feet; by States, Indian reservations, etc., 90,000,000,000 feet (p. 6).

Total timber standing on Pacific coast is 1,512,900,000,000 feet, as follows:

	Feet.
California	381,400,000,000
Oregon	545,800,000,000
Washington	391,100,000,000
Idaho	129,000,000,000
Montana	65,600,000,000

Of this amount 1,013,000,000,000 feet are privately owned (p. 10). Eleven Southern States contain 634,000,000,000 feet, and in Lake States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota there are 100,000,000,000 feet (p. 11).

Southern Pacific Railroad owns 105,600,000,000 feet, the Weyerhauser Timber Co own 95,700,000 000 feet, and the Northern Pacific 36,200,000,000 feet, all on the Pacific coast (p. 16).

The Southern Pacific, Northern Pacific, and the Weyerhauser Timber Co. own 23.5 per cent of the privately owned timber on the Pacific coast (p. 19).

One-half of the privately owned timber on the Pacific coast is owned by 37 holders (p. 20).

Sixty-seven holders own 39 per cent of the long-leaf pine of the South, 20 per cent of the cypress, and 11 per cent of the hardwood (p. 21).

Six holders have 54 per cent of the standing white pine and Norway pine in Minnesota, together with 16 per cent of the other conifers. In Wisconsin 96 holders have three-fourths of the timber and in Michigan 110 holders have two-thirds (p. 22).

Increase in value of standing timber has been large, as will be seen by the following examples:

	Bought.	Price.	Sold.	Price.
Wisconsin	1891	$5.00	1904	$22.00
Louisiana	1882	1.25	1909	59.50
Washington	1900	11.84	1907	115.00
Idaho	1901	240.00	1909	2,500.00
Washington per acre	1882	20.00	1909	150.00
Oregon do	1896	5.00	1908	108.75
California do	1900	18.00	1909	100.00

In Minnesota the price received for timber on State lands was $1.47 per 1,000 in 1880 and $7.63 per 1,000 in 1909 (pp. 26–27).

Fifty-four per cent of the total timber of the United States is found in the five Pacific Coast States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and California (p. 66).

The 1,013,000,000,000 feet privately owned timber on the Pacific coast are made up of the following species:

	Feet.
Douglas fir	521,900,000,000
White pine	19,600,000,000
Western pine	153,400,000,000
Sugar pine	34,700,000,000
Redwood	101,900,000,000
Red cedar	56,700,000,000
Hemlock	57,400,000,000
Spruce	21,900,000,000
All other species	45,500,000,000

The 634,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber in the 11 Southern States are made up of the following species:

	Feet.
Long-leaf yellow pine	384,400,000,000
Short-leaf yellow pine	152,100,000,000
Cypress	40,400,000,000
Hardwoods	209,200,000,000

The 100,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan are made up of the following species:

	Feet.
White and Norway pine	17,700,000,000
Hemlock	26,600,000,000
Other conifers	13,800,000,000
Hardwoods	41,900,000,000

Referring to page 77, there are 17,700,000,000 feet of white and Norway pine in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. According to the output of these species in the same States in 1909 (p. 88), the supply should be exhausted in 1918. At the same ratio the short-leaf and long-leaf pine (p. 76) should be exhausted in about 25 years (p. 88).

Fifteen holders own 62 per cent of the California redwood; 14 holders three-fifths of the cypress in Louisiana (p. 155).

In Louisiana 37 holders own 48.7 per cent of the total timber (p. 154).

The average stand per acre on the Pacific is 42,000 feet; in the South, 6,100 feet; and in the Lake States, 5,600 feet (p. 168).

No States in the South or the Lake States average 10,000 feet per acre. The average for the country is 11,300, largely made up from the heavy stand on the Pacific coast (p. 169).

Stumpage values per 1,000 feet.

	1899	1904	1907
White pine	3.66	4.62	8.09
Cedar	1.32	1.49	4.63
Cypress	1.58	3.42	4.37
Yellow pine	1.12	1.68	3.16
Redwood	1.06	1.55	2.35
Western yellow pine	.....	.....	1.66
Douglas fir	.77	1.05	1.44

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

210. Hay, $2 per ton.

Mr. GOODWIN of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 52, line 25, strike out, after the word "hay," the figure "2" and insert the figure "4."

Mr. GOODWIN of Maine. Mr. Chairman, this simply restores the duty now carried by existing law, which is $4 a ton. It changes it from $2 in the proposed bill to $4 a ton, as carried in the Payne bill.

I do not want to take the time of the committee to-night at this late hour, but it is the one agricultural product in which the people of my State are the most interested. If it were not for the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], who has charge of the agricultural schedule, is evidently so tired and so much displeased with what has been said to-night, I would like to speak upon this subject, but under the circumstances, and at the request of my constituents, I simply ask that a vote be taken on the amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the few remarks I am going to make will be in order. I tried a moment ago to get recognition to say a word in defense of the American hen, but the gentleman from Alabama cut me off with his motion to close debate. Eggs are a very important product, and valuable product, in my district. The hens down there frequently lay them in the hay; and I think, therefore, that a discussion of the question will be in order upon this hay paragraph. [Laughter.] The hen is a very generous, good-natured fowl, and we ought to be kind to her and protect her. I am reminded of a limerick that went the rounds in the days of Henry Ward Beecher which illustrates the noble generosity of the hen, which ran something like this:

Said a Congregational preacher
To a hen, You are a beautiful creature.
And the hen, just for that,
Laid an egg in his hat,
And thus did the hen reward Beecher.

[Laughter.]

If we want to encourage the egg industry in this country we ought not to be too hard on the hen and her product. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto now close.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address the committee for three minutes upon this subject.

Mr. FORDNEY. And I would like to have two minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in five minutes, three minutes to be given to the gentleman from Minnesota and two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat confused on first scrutinizing this paragraph to know why hay was reduced in duty to $2 per ton. It did not occur to me then how anxious Democracy is to furnish cheap food for the countless bull moose it needs to pull it through in the next campaign. Two dollars per ton is a "consumers' rate" sure enough, and likely under it "competition," which the Democratic leader urges so incessantly, will result. There will be such political competition, if he has his way, between the elephant and the bull moose as to leave the haystack, in fact the whole pasture, in possession of the mule.

Seriously speaking, however, I protest against the lack of reasons for reducing the rate of duty on hay. The production of hay should be encouraged for broad reasons, comprehending the conservation of the soil of the American people. No farmer properly cultivates his soil unless he rotates his crops and periodically uses his fields for the production of hay. I wish to urge this point earnestly—I do not expect to urge it successfully—to this committee. I repeat that hay ought to be protected and its growth encouraged; prices should be such as to compel farmers, by self-interest, to extend their acreage of hay not alone for the profit to them presently, but rather for the broader and bigger purpose of conserving the American soil for the future Nation.

I shall not dwell upon the importance of this industry as such. The hay crop of the United States and home value thereof, from the year 1895 to 1911, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture, ranged as follows:

	Crops in tons.	Home value per ton.
1895	47,078,541	$8.35
1896	59,282,158	6.54
1897	60,664,876	6.61
1898	66,376,920	6.00
1899	56,655,756	7.27
1900	50,110,906	8.89
1901	50,590,877	10.00
1902	59,858,000	9.06
1903	61,305,940	9.08
1904	60,696,028	8.72
1905	60,531,611	8.52
1906	57,145,959	10.37
1907	63,677,000	11.68
1908	70,798,000	8.98
1909	64,938,000	10.62
1910	60,978,000	12.26
1911	47,444,000	14.64

This production of approximately 60,000,000 tons per annum shows the importance of this item. Hay in considerable quantities has been imported into the United States in spite of the present tariff of $4 per ton. The imports from 1900 to date were, annually, in tons, as follows:

	Tons.
1900	143,890
1901	142,627
1902	48,413
1903	293,112
1904	114,388
1905	46,214
1906	668,540
1907	61,116
1908	10,063
1909	6,712
1910	96,829
1911	336,757

With a rate of $2 per ton enormous quantities of cheap Canadian hay would be imported into this country, and our farmers would have to sell their hay at a loss or let it rot in the stack or stop raising it. With any substantial reduction in prices the farmer could not pay the expense of cutting, baling, and the heavy t ansportation charges to the terminal markets. It is extremely difficult for him to make any money in the business as it is. If the farmer finds himself losing money on his hay crops under this bill, as he certainly will, he will naturally stop raising hay to the serious permanent injury of the land.

The cultivation of hay, potatoes, onions, and similar crops should be encouraged rather than discouraged by law. Too large a production of grain and corn by the farms of the Nation oftentimes depresses prices by overproduction, and also occasions great peril to business generally in the event of a general grain or corn crop failure. Heavy yields of secondary farm produce, like hay, potatoes, onions, and so forth, tend to balance and sustain prices generally, and obviate danger of panic that always waits upon the failure of any of the great staple articles of production. This bill not only strikes a severe blow at hay, an important product of Minnesota, but is even more severe on the potato growers of the country. It is cruelly unfair to our farmers to put potatoes on the free list. The growing of potatoes is precarious, so much depending upon the weather, but there is a very large acreage of land in Minnesota where the soil is poorly adapted to raising any other crop. Minnesota produces an average annual yield of about 17,000,000 bushels. On account of the perishable character of this commodity no part of one season's crop can be held over until the next year. This makes it necessary for the potato growers to dispose of their crop during the season, regardless of prevailing prices, and this tends further to make the business precarious. An examination of the prices at which potatoes have been sold for the past 15 years will show that on an average one year out of every three resulted in an actual loss to the farmer.

Mr. Chairman, there is another element to be considered regarding the rate on potatoes. It has reference to labor. Potato growing gives employment to many men. The average cost per acre of labor in producing and delivering potatoes to the shipping station is approximately $35, some six times as much as in the case of grain. Free trade in potatoes will drive many of our farmers out of that business and consequently throw out of employment a large number of men who will have to compete with toilers in other occupations and thus depress the price of labor generally. This is a great potato-consuming Nation, and it is wiser to have the money we pay for potatoes go to our farmers and laborers on the farms rather than to the farmers and workingmen of other countries.

As I stated, the potato crop is uncertain, and therefore if our potato farmers are put out of business, as to a large extent they will be if this bill in its present form is enacted into law, and there occurs a general potato failure in other potato-producing countries, unreasonable prices will be exacted from the consumers, defeating the very purpose claimed for this bill.

Examination of the prices that have prevailed for years under the present tariff on potatoes shows that the average price to the farmer has been reasonably low. Any exaction of fancy prices from consumers has been by the retailer, and they would have a better opportunity to charge unreasonable prices to consumers if local producers were put out of business and the bulk of our potatoes were imported.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, that my time is limited in this discussion. I would like to state fully and in detail the importance to the people of my State of both the hay and potato crops. All I can do now is to protest, and I do protest earnestly and emphatically against this bill as it stands. It favors cotton and the South; it hits hay and potatoes as well as grain and beef, mutton and wool production in the North. It is a sectional bill, selfishly made by the solid South of the Democratic majority, and I believe like any selfish sectional law it will in time work its own destruction. In the meantime I suppose the farmers of Minnesota and the great Northwest will have to do the best they can to raise their crops and compete with the Old World.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment principally for this reason: The State of Michigan, which I have the honor in part to represent, is a great hay-producing State. The value of that crop in the State ranges annually from forty to fifty million dollars. A reduction of $2 per ton in the rate of duty on between three and four million tons of hay means a reduction on the income of the farmer of from six to eight million dollars a year. I again submit that that is a rather high price for the farmers of the State of Michigan to pay for Democratic rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

213. Garlic, 1 cent per pound; onions, 20 cents per bushel.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 4, after the word "onions," strike out "20 cents per bushel" and insert "35 cents per bushel."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard various learned and interesting disquisitions on various subjects, running from cider to hay and from honey to hops.

I want to submit some observations upon the much abused, yet festive and always fragrant, onion which is produced in such liberal quantities in the district which I represent. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, speaking seriously for a moment [laughter], the rate that is provided in the existing law, together with the existing rates of prices upon onions, disproves absolutely the contention that has been made upon this floor many times since this debate began, namely, that the amount of tariff was added to the price of the product. The existing law provides a tariff of 40 cents per bushel upon onions, and yet if any gentleman wants to supply himself with that odoriferous vegetable, if he will come to the county in which I live he can buy him any quantity, a bushel or 20 carloads, at 30 cents per bushel.

As a matter of fact, onions have been sold in large quantities in the great onion-producing district in Ohio in the past year at less than 20 cents per bushel. That has been less than one-half the amount of the tariff. The effect, Mr. Chairman, if this duty is carried into effect as proposed in this bill, is to ruin the onion farmers. They are men who carry on business upon a small scale. This product is not raised upon great farms, but it is raised upon the small farms by small farmers, and if this bill should be enacted into law it simply means that the farmers of the onion-producing districts of Ohio and the other 17 States in the Union that produce this vegetable will be brought into direct competition with the products of the farms of Spain, the farms of Egypt, and the farms of Bermuda.

The onion farmers of Bermuda appeared before the Ways and Means Committee (Hearings, pp. 2778, 2784) and strongly urged the reduction of our duty on onions. Why are they so interested? Evidently they know who pays the tariff. Apparently the committee was more disposed to favor them than the onion farmers of our own country, for the duties were reduced in accordance with the recommendations of the Bermuda onion growers.

I had always supposed that it was best to legislate in the interest of our own people, not the foreigner; but the majority in control of this Congress takes the contrary view and discriminates against our own laborers and our own farmers. This bill builds up no American industry, gives no increase of wages to any American laborer, makes no market for any American producer. This bill if enacted into law will be good for the foreigner and he knows it, but bad for our own people and they will soon find it out.

What shall we say about the rate of wages? The rate of wages paid in the American onion fields is about five times as much as the rate of wages paid in the fields I have mentioned, at least five times; but to be more exact, in the Spanish onion fields the average rate of wages is about 20 cents per day. The rate in the onion fields of Ohio is nearly ten times that amount, between $1.50 and $2.50 a day. Then another fact that I wish to present, Mr. Chairman, is the freight rate. The freight rate upon onions from the Bermuda fields to New York is only about half what it is from the onion fields of Ohio and Indiana to that same market, so it must be apparent that with that immense advantage in lower wages, with the immense advantage of the freight rate, that if this shall be enacted into law it simply means that this industry will be transferred from this country to another, and that instead of American labor and American ingenuity and American capital being employed the business will be transferred to the foreign farmer.

Then there is another proposition to which I wish to call the attention of the committee, and that is the fact that the tariff upon this particular vegetable has very little to do with the price of it. Men say that they want to reduce the cost of living. I can invite their attention to the fact, as I did a day or so ago when I made some remarks upon the bill, that in the case of this vegetable it has been shown by a careful investigation made by the Department of Agriculture that of the amount paid by the consumer the producer gets less than 28 per cent.

A Democratic farmer friend in Hardin County, Ohio, writes me as follows:

> We are selling onions at from 20 to 30 cents per bushel, are delivering onions in the cities, freight prepaid, at from 30 to 40 cents per bushel, and yet these same onions go to the city trade at $1 per bushel and 20 cents per half peck, or at the rate of $1.60 per bushel. Yet it seems that the farmers are the ones whom Congress proposes to regulate. We are blamed for the high cost of living; yet the fact remains that nearly all our vegetables are delivered by us to the large cities at about 25 per cent of the prices actually paid by the ultimate consumer.

Who gets the profit? The commission man, not the farmer.

The onion growers of Ohio submit the following considerations, which clearly demonstrate the fact that the existing tariff of 40 cents per bushel on onions should not be disturbed.

First. This year's crop of onions demonstrates beyond a doubt the fact that this country can henceforth easily produce all the onions that this country can possibly consume. There is no occasion whatever to open the door for foreign onions. In fact, onions are now being sold in this country at prices below the cost of growing them.

Second. The onion growing in this country is in the hands of farmers in quantities from 1 acre up, from Massachusetts to Iowa, and also in Colorado, on the Pacific slope, and Texas, and to a small extent in Missouri, Kentucky, and Louisiana. Large growers market their crops direct to car-lot buyers and small growers sell to local buyers, who in turn compete with each other and with the large growers in each section, each section competing with other sections, so that there is sharp competition all along the line, and no combination to fix or control prices is possible. Prices will absolutely be fixed by supply and demand.

Third. The present tariff of 40 cents per bushel is necessary to suitably protect the American onion grower from the cheaper grown onions from foreign countries.

A gentleman connected with a very prominent European produce house recently stated that he had personally visited the onion fields of Spain and Egypt. He stated that labor could be obtained for the onion fields in Spain at about 20 cents per day and in Egypt for even a lower price. Here in Ohio and in Indiana from $1.50 to $2 per day of 10 hours is paid for men in the field and women and children in proportion.

The freight rate from Spain to New York City direct is about 36 cents per 100 pounds, and from Egypt about 40 cents. Freight from Ohio and Indiana points to New York is from 22 to 25 cents per 100 pounds. It can readily be seen from these figures that with the tariff removed Spain and Egypt can lay onions down in New York City for a lower price than we can, even if we move them at actual cost of growing. Freight on onions from Bermuda is 14 cents per 100 pounds. We do not know the cost of labor in Bermuda, but it is certainly below the prices paid in this country.

Mexico has recently begun the development of onion industry and promises to be a very important factor in the future, especially if the onion tariff be either removed or reduced.

Fourth. The removal of the onion tariff entirely would strike a deadly blow at the American onion industry, that has grown from small beginnings to its present large proportions, an industry that will continue to grow as fast as the needs of the country demand it. Vast tracts of land now of but little value will be developed into onion farms if prices secured for onions will warrant such development. Any material reduction in the tariff must cripple this industry seriously.

The intensive farming required in growing onions makes necessary large investment of capital in developing the land, erection of suitable buildings and storages and necessary equipment, and the employment of many thousands of men, women, and children, who depend upon this industry for their livelihood, and women and children so employed in the country could not procure employment elsewhere.

The serious crippling of this industry would mean the practical loss of a very large capital invested, as above described, throughout the country, as in such cases the property would be greatly reduced in value and suitable returns for labor and investment could not be secured.

Fifth. We do not contend that with the tariff removed the foreign onion grower could at once fully supply the American market, but the removal of the tariff would cause the foreign production to be rapidly and enormously increased, and enough would in the near future be thrown upon the New York market to drive prices down to a point that would be seriously damaging if not ruinous to the American grower.

New York City practically fixes the prices for the entire East, and with the low prices at the seaboard, onions in western New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio that usually go east would be thrown upon the western and southern markets usually supplied by the onion States west of us, and thus prices in the South and West would also be forced down to nearly or quite the low prices in New York City.

Sixth. If it be urged that the low prices herein suggested will be for the benefit of the consumer, the obvious reply is that the recent amazing increase in onion acreage in this country and the large tracts of land that will be developed and devoted to onion growing in the future, if prices will warrant it, makes it certain that as low prices will rule in the future as the American grower can stand, and that it is poor policy to force prices so low that the grower can not secure cost for his produce.

Seventh. The importations of onions for the two fiscal years 1910–11 and 1911–12 were about 1,500,000 bushels each year. With the tariff removed, the importations will soon be doubled, and therefore, if the tariff be removed, eventually and soon the foreign importations will force American prices to a point below the American cost of growing.

Eighth. If with a reduction of existing onion tariff the cost of foreign onions plus the tariff would be equal to the absolute cost to the American grower, the American grower would be compelled to retire from the business or scale his style of living down to the level of the Spaniard, Egyptian, and Mexican, and surely that can neither be expected or desired.

Why take the risk of strangling or seriously crippling the American industry by removing or reducing the onion tariff, when the only person in the world who would be benefited by it would be the foreign grower?

Mr. MANN. I desire to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question. Was the quantity of the bushel of onions intentionally or accidentally left out? The existing law carries a bushel as consisting of 57 pounds. I notice, and very properly, in most places of the bill it defines the quantity of a bushel, and as the bushel is different in different States I think it would be desirable——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the regulation at the Treasury Department has established so fully that 57 pounds is a bushel of onions that it was not necessary to place it in the bill.

Mr. MANN. Of course the regulation of the Treasury Department would have no effect. It has been the law heretofore that established 57 pounds as the bushel, not a regulation of the Treasury Department.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The established rate is so uniform——

Mr. MANN. They had no occasion to establish it because the law has provided it, and practically in every other place in the bill the gentleman has defined the quantity of a bushel. We had up in the House a proposition to define the quantity of these measures, and it is one I think that should be passed, and we discovered that in many of the States there was a variation in regard to a bushel of onions or a bushel of other vegetables.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think we have done that as a rule in the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say that the gentleman's disinclination to accept any suggestions from this side of the House may lead to confusion in the Treasury Department in the future.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will look into it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and amendments be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and amendments be now closed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

215. Orchids, palms, azaleas, and all other decorative or greenhouse plants and cut flowers, preserved or fresh, 25 per cent ad valorem; lily of the valley pips, tulips, narcissus, begonia, and gloxinia bulbs, $1 per thousand; hyacinth, astilbe, dielytra, and lily of the valley clumps, $2.50 per thousand; lily bulbs and calla bulbs, $5 per thousand; peony, Iris Kaempferri or Germanica, canna, dahlia, and amaryllis bulbs, $10 per thousand; all other bulbs, bulbous roots or corms which are cultivated for their flowers or foliage, 50 cents per thousand.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 11, strike out the letter "s" in "azaleas," and insert the word "Indica."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 14, after the word "hyacinth," strike out the comma and insert the word "bulbs."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 16, after the second word "bulbs," strike out the comma and insert the words "or corms."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 16, before the word "peony," insert the word "herbaceous."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman a question about the last amendment, where he inserted the word "herbaceous." What becomes of the duty on the other peonies?

Mr. PALMER. They go into the next paragraph under nursery stock. The herbaceous peonies are the fine——

Mr. MANN. I know what they are.

Mr. PALMER. And the other peonies are heavier plants, which come in under nursery stock in the next paragraph.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 18, strike out the word "bulbs."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 18, insert, after the word "roots," the words "root stalks."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what the occasion is for all these amendments?

Mr. RAINEY. These are suggested by the Treasury Department, most of them—in fact, all of them—in order to dispose of a lot of conflicting questions there. They have decisions both ways.

Mr. MANN. Of course, if the Treasury Department recommended them, I have no question in regard to it, although, having some practical knowledge of these matters, I think possibly that instead of settling disputes they will be apt to cause them.

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] who says "No" does not know the difference between "dielytra" and "peonies."

Mr. PALMER. Oh, I am an expert on peonies. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. What is "dielytra"?

Mr. PALMER. It would take too long to educate the gentleman. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 11, at the end of the line, strike out the word "or."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 19, after the word "corms" insert the words "and tubers."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared an amendment, which I will present later. I would like to have the attention of the members of the committee for just a moment. Near Bellingham, in the State of Washington, is the only place in the United States that I know of where they raise bulbs. The Government has a bulb farm there, and the authorities in charge of it expect within the next few years to furnish all the bulbs necessary for distribution by Members of Congress.

I have received a good many communications from people in that neighborhood, saying that if they could get bulbs from Holland free, for propagating purposes, it could be made a profitable industry, because that is in the line, as I understand, of the policy of both parties—to bring in bulbs or other seeds for purposes of propagation.

I will suggest to the gentlemen that they consider it, and I will submit to them the question, when we reach the free list, whether they will not see fit to insert an amendment of that character. I do not think it is covered by this language.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that I do not see any serious reason why it should not be adopted, but the committee has not had the opportunity to consider it and see the effect of the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is the reason why I make the suggestion now and ask the committee to consider it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have this telegram read into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be inserted.

There was no objection.

Following is the telegram referred to:

BELLINGHAM, WASH., *April 29, 1913.*

Congressman ALBERT JOHNSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Desire tariff removed bulbs imported propagating purposes only. Commercial bulbs to florists and greenhouses remain as now. Impossible start bulb growing in Washington State unless mother bulbs are admitted free. Bulbs grown nowhere in United States save Whatcom County. Expansion commercial bulb industry here demands removal tariff because present tariff precludes possibility. Should not object to tariff being replaced five years. We believe contrary to policy Government to impose tariff which will hinder new enterprise. Acceding to our request would in no manner disturb present bulb business.

BELLINGHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

216. Stocks, cuttings, or seedlings of Myrobolan plum, Mahaleb or Mazzard cherry, Manetti multiflora and briar rose, three years old or less, $1 per thousand plants; stocks, cuttings, or seedlings of pear, apple, quince, and the St. Julien plum, three years old or less, $1 per thousand plants; rose plants, budded, grafted, or grown on their own roots, 4 cents each; stocks, cuttings, and seedlings, of all fruit and ornamental trees, deciduous and evergreen shrubs and vines, and all trees, shrubs plants, and vines commonly known as nursery or greenhouse stock, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 53, line 23, by inserting after the word "rose" the words "Rosa Rugosa."

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I have another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois presents another committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, line 5, strike out the words "or greenhouse."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what is the effect of that, may I ask the gentleman? What would greenhouse stock come under if that were stricken out?

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman from Illinois will notice that in the bill now, under paragraph 215, occurs the language, "Orchids, palms, azaleas, and all other decorative greenhouse plants and cut flowers," while paragraph 216 provides for "plants and vines commonly known as nursery or greenhouse stock." Inasmuch as these two paragraphs carry a different rate, there would be a conflict between greenhouse plants and greenhouse stock, it being impossible to distinguish between the two. The object of the two paragraphs is to have greenhouse plants in paragraph 215 and nursery stock in paragraph 216.

Mr. MANN. Well, but a great deal of this greenhouse stock is just as easily distinguished as nursery stock.

The same conflict would exist in reference to that as to nursery stock. Now you propose to increase the rate on greenhouse stock from 15 per cent to 25 per cent, which I believe is the existing rate. A very large amount of this greenhouse stock is necessarily imported.

Mr. PALMER. If the gentleman will observe, nursery stock is not provided for in paragraph 215. That only covers bulbs,

tubers, corms, and greenhouse plants and cut flowers. The words "or greenhouse" are taken out of paragraph 216 in order to avoid the conflict. The conflict is in the present law and has resulted in a great deal of difficulty at the customhouses.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that the difficulty will still exist, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. PALMER. I should like to know how.

Mr. MANN. Because there will be a constant conflict whether a plant is a greenhouse plant or nursery stock.

Mr. PALMER. No; there will not be any such conflict. Nurserymen say that nursery stock and greenhouse plants are easily distinguished; that they are trade names which are perfectly plain in the trade, however vague the distinction may seem to my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I am somewhat familiar with the trade, and I question whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania is as familiar with it, and that is no reflection on him.

Mr. PALMER. I am not expert in the trade, though I am fond of these things and have paid some attention to them; but I am advised by experts in the trade that nursery stock and greenhouse plants are very easily distinguishable.

Mr. MANN. I am unfortunate enough to raise for my own amusement several hundred thousand of these plants a year, and I know something about them.

Mr. PALMER. I congratulate the gentleman on having constantly at his side a source of great happiness.

Mr. MANN. That is the only fun I have, except what I get out of you gentlemen over on that side.

Mr. PALMER. I trust the gentleman gets more fun out of his plants than he does out of this side.

Mr. MANN. Well, I get a good deal out of both.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

217. Seeds: Castor beans or seeds, 15 cents per bushel of 50 pounds; flaxseed or linseed and other oil seeds not specially provided for in this section, 20 cents per bushel of 56 pounds; poppy seed, 15 cents per bushel of 47 pounds; mushroom spawn, and spinach seed, 1 cent per pound; canary seed, ½ cent per pound; caraway seed, 1 cent per pound; anise seed, 2 cents per pound; beet (except sugar beet), carrot, corn salad, parsley, parsnip, radish, turnip, and rutabaga seed, 3 cents per pound; cabbage, collard, kale, and kohl-rabi seed, 6 cents per pound; eggplant and pepper seed, 10 cents per pound; seeds of all kinds not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no allowance shall be made for dirt or other impurities in seeds provided for in this paragraph.

[Mr. FOWLER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the seeds named in this paragraph are collected in the same manner that the seeds are in the existing law—by description and name. I believe in the existing law the description and differential of rates were made largely at the request of the seedsmen. I have no criticism of the gentlemen for following that description, because their attention has probably not been called to the fact that there is no known method of distinguishing between seeds named in the paragraph carrying different rates of duty except by planting them.

Two or three years ago I obtained from the Agricultural Department some 20 different samples of seeds which had been purchased by that department. They came in bottles, and I took out half of each bottle and put them in a number of other bottles, so that when I had finished I had 40 bottles of seed taken from half of those sent me, all carrying distinguishing numbers.

I sent the 40 bottles of seed to the Agricultural Department with a request that they furnish me with a statement as to what kinds of seed they were. In reply they admitted that as to a number they could not tell, except that they were of a character of, say, cabbage seed or belonging to that family. In about one-third of the cases, or nearly one-half, the analytical seedsman of the department differed from the men who had sold the seed to the department.

I then asked the department to take the remaining packages of seed which I had all numbered and plant them as a final test and find out what those seeds were, the one who had bought them not agreeing with the one who had analyzed them. I again found a great variation. An easy illustration is beet seed carried in this paragraph at 3 cents a pound, except sugar-beet seed. The man does not live who can tell sugar-beet seed from market-beet seed, except by planting them and watching the result.

Since the law went into effect there has been very little ordinary beet seed imported, but great quantities of sugar-beet seed imported, which comes in free. The same is true of various other kinds of seed carrying different rates of duty which can not be distinguished.

The Clerk read as follows:

221. Fish, except shellfish, by whatever name known, packed in oil or in oil and other substances, in bottles, jars, kegs, tin boxes, or cans, 20 per cent ad valorem; all other fish in tin packages, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; caviar and other preserved roe of fish, 30 per cent ad valorem; fish, skinned or boned, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after the word "fish," in line 4, page 55, the words "except shellfish."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should offer an amendment which I think ought to be adopted, even on the principle the Ways and Means Committee approve, of admitting all green fish, as we call them, into this country free of duty. Even on that principle they ought to allow a duty on partially manufactured fish. They have, as a matter of fact, allowed a duty of three-quarters of a cent on fish skinned and boned, but they have allowed no duty whatever on smoked and cured fish. If it were not for the fact that I should be afraid of prejudicing the case before the conferees by having an amendment voted down in the House, I should offer an amendment providing for a duty on fish, smoked and cured, of one-half a cent a pound. I wish to call the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means to the effect of this discrepancy, that they recognize one kind of manufactured fish and not the other.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

222. Apples; peaches, quinces, cherries, plums, and pears, green or ripe, 10 cents per bushel of 50 pounds; berries, edible, in their natural condition, one-half cent per quart; cranberries, 10 per cent ad valorem; all edible fruits, including berries, when dried, desiccated, evaporated, or prepared in any manner, not specially provided for in this section, 1 cent per pound; comfits, sweetmeats, and fruits of all kinds preserved or packed in sugar, or having sugar added thereto or preserved or packed in molasses, spirits, or their own juices, if containing no alcohol, or containing not over 10 per cent of alcohol, 20 per cent ad valorem; if containing over 10 per cent of alcohol and not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem, and in addition $2.50 per proof gallon on the alcohol contained therein in excess of 10 per cent; jellies of all kinds, 20 per cent ad valorem; pineapples preserved in their own juice, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question in reference to pineapples preserved in their own juice, as to whether this permits any addition of sugar at all?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; the paragraph was drawn so that it would not do that. That was the purpose.

Mr. MANN. I do not just this minute recall, and does the gentleman, what the duty would be where any sweetening material was added?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is provided for in another portion of the bill. I can not tell just where it is now.

Mr. MANN. I remember. I tried to find out yesterday by examining the bill whether it was intended to be covered by—

comfits, sweetmeats, and fruits of all kinds preserved or packed in sugar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the place where it is supposed to be covered.

Mr. MANN. I am not sure whether that would cover it, or whether it would come in under the basket clause.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the point where the committee intends it to be covered.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how that could be. That provision carries 20 per cent ad valorem.

Fruits of all kinds preserved or packed in sugar, or having sugar added thereto or preserved or packed in molasses, spirits, or their own juices, if containing no alcohol, or containing not over 10 per cent of alcohol, 20 per cent ad valorem; if containing over 10 per cent of alcohol and not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem, and in addition $2.50 per proof gallon on the alcohol contained therein in excess of 10 per cent.

I call it to the attention of the gentleman, and I wish that the gentleman would have it looked into.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I recall that the committee did differentiate between pineapples that were not sweetened and those that were sweetened. It is in the bill somewhere.

Mr. MANN. I am not disposed to say to the gentleman that it is not in the bill, because I accept his statement. However, I have examined the bill carefully for the purpose of endeavoring to ascertain what the rate would be under the bill for pineapples preserved in their own juice with a slight addition of sugar. I do not find any paragraph that seemed to cover it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, unless there is to be some debate on some of the remaining paragraphs in this section, I would like to finish it to-night. If there is to be debate, I will move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. MANN. My impression is there would be some debate on paragraph 225.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to offer an amendment to paragraph 223.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, 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. 3321—the tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 2973. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. In the Evening Star newspaper this afternoon appears an article entitled "Lafferty ends speech with loud applause—the Representative from Oregon takes advantage of leave to print"——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 2, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of Newport Harbor, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Matawan Creek, N. J., with plan and estimate of cost of improvement (H. Doc. No. 43); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4536) to reopen the rolls of the Choctaw-Chickasaw Tribe and to provide for the awarding of the rights secured to certain persons by the fourteenth article of the treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, of date September 27, 1830; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4537) prescribing offenses committed in the United States Army and fixing the punishment thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4538) prescribing offenses committed in the United States Navy and fixing the punishment thereof; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4539) providing for a survey for a military and post road from the city of Washington, D. C., to the Naval Academy at the city of Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 4540) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 4541) to consolidate the veterinary service, United States Army, and to increase its efficiency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4542) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to the town of Ripley, State of West Virginia, for the use of the Carl Shatto Post, No. 28, Department of West Virginia, Grand Army of the Republic, two condemned bronze or brass cannon or field pieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 4543) to amend sections 4924 and 4927 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 4544) to reserve certain lands and to incorporate the same and make them a part of the Caribou National Forest Reserve; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4545) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 4546) to abolish the Commerce Court, and for other purposes; to the Commttee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOGUE: A bill (H. R. 4547) for the preparation of a plan and the erection on ground belonging to the United States Government, in the city of Washington, of a memorial or statue, to be furnished by the State of Pennsylvania, of Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DIFENDERFER: A bill (H. R. 4548) to prevent a combination of firms or individuals from conspiring to raise, or raising, prices of supplies furnished the United States Government, or combining to put up prices for structural work, and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 4569) to amend section 4 of the interstate-commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 4573) authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution (H. Res. 84) to authorize the expenditure of balance of fund authorized under H. Res. 587 adopted June 18, 1912; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, petitioning Congress to provide for the building of a bridge across the Chena River at the town of Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying Congress to provide for the immediate development of the coal and railroad resources of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, praying Congress to authorize the city of Juneau, Alaska, to issue $50,000 school bonds; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska, praying Congress to provide a salary for commissioners, justices of the peace, probate judges, coroners, and recorders in Alaska Territory; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying for the repeal of the law of Congress taxing railroads in Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying Congress for a survey and to build a breakwater at the harbor of Snake River, Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying for a reduction of the excessive telegraph and cable charges of the United States military telegraph and cable lines in Alaska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying for the repeal of the statute entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the Territory of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying for better mail service in that Territory; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Alaska Territory, praying Congress to provide an appropriation to pay the deficiency in the mileage allowed members of the Alaska Legislature; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of the Senate of the State of California, favoring the Lever agricultural education extension bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4549) granting a pension to Edwin V. Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4550) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Fortney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 4551) to authorize the President to appoint Archy Wright Barnes an assistant paymaster in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4552) granting a pension to Annie Neate; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4553) granting an increase of pension to James Frank Sanderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 4554) granting an increase of pension to William V. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 4555) granting a pension to John L. Churchill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4556) for the relief of May Stanley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4557) granting an increase of pension to John Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4558) granting an increase of pension to Elijah J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4559) granting an increase of pension to John Carley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4560) granting an increase of pension to James W. Tuckerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4561) granting an increase of pension to John Herr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4562) granting an increase of pension to William W. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4563) granting an increase of pension to Harry L. Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4564) granting an increase of pension to John C. Ernst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4565) granting an increase of pension to Baker Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4566) granting an increase of pension to James Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 4567) granting a pension to William Feavel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 4568) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Comstock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 4570) granting a pension to Margaret Bretney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4571) granting an increase of pension to Stephen G. Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4572) granting an increase of pension to Ludlow Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 4574) granting an increase of pension to Linda S. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4575) for the relief of the heirs of Lewis E. Parsons, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 4576) for the relief of George A. Nowland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 4577) granting a pension to Noah Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Missouri, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of the Pennsylvania Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Association, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against any change in the present national system of forest control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of J. H. Atkinson, Fulton, Mo., and Webb Strange, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of A. W. Barnett and 4 other merchants of Doylestown, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation to compel concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Alvin Rich, Wooster, Ohio, and J. W. Lytle, Uhrichsville, Ohio, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of Thomas L. Fekete, jr., and Milo R. Clanahan, St. Louis, Mo., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: Petition of sundry trade-unionists of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the removal of the duty on Philippine tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Petition of the city council of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petitions of sundry citizens of Alabama, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring the retention of the present tariff rates on laces and lace curtains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 4528) for the relief of the estate of Perry P. Benson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the Trades and Labor Council, Vallejo, Cal., favoring the passage of legislation to extend the eight-hour law to include labor used by those who receive Government grants and franchises; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Henry Lotz and Schmidt & Co., of New York, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty applying to the lithographic trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Linnæan Society, of New York, N. Y., favoring the feather provision in Schedule N of the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Progressive Knitting Works, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on the sweater, coat, and knit-goods industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Sherer-Gilbert Co., of Chicago, Ill., against the duty on saffron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Montague Castle-London Co., of New York, N. Y., against placing stained glass on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of Irvy Card, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mary Schwaner and E. Scott, of New York, N. Y., protesting against the placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Baer Bros., New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposed change in the tariff on bronze powder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, against taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation of $4,500 for blanks for the use of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co. and 5 other companies of San Francisco, Cal.; the Stewart Dawes Shoe Co.; the Pacific Wire Rope Co., of Los Angeles Cal.; and the Holt Manufacturing Co., Stockton, Cal., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of W. J. Mulligan, of the National Fuse Co., San Francisco, Cal., favoring a reduction in the tariff on safety or blasting fuses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Petition of the Navi Chamber of Commerce, Hawaii, against the reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, favoring an item of $4,500 in the ap-

propriation bill for blanks for the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the C. E. Floating Society, San Diego, Cal., favoring an increase in the number of chaplains in the United States Navy and to protest against a change in naval code regarding church pennant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of the fifteenth congressional district of the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVY: Petitions of sundry citizens of New York, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Republican Club of New York City, favoring the passage of House joint resolution No. 1, to enfranchise the women of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Sherer-Gilbert & Co., of Chicago, Ill., against the duty on saffron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Business Congress, favoring reform in banking and currency laws, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the National Business League of America, favoring the retention in the Consular Service of efficient officials, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Miss Sarah Thomas, Hilda Nielson, and H. K. Jedidian, of New York, N. Y., against placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Duralumin Co., of New York, N. Y., against an increase of the duty on duralumin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Montague Craft-London Co., New York City, against placing stained glass on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Butler Ward Co., of New York, N. Y., against the reduction of duty on bound books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Austin Nichols & Co. and the Standard Importing Co., of New York, against assessment of fee for filing protests against assessment of duties by collector of customs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of manufacturers of pianos of New York, against the proposed 20 per cent duty on ivory tusks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry workers in the fancy feather trade, against the clause prohibiting importation of aigrettes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of 2 members of National Audubon Society, favoring the clause prohibiting importation of aigrettes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of William Dennith & Co., New York, N. Y., favoring the placing of brier root or brierwood and amber or amberoid on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frank Wacker, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on lithographic goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Madison K. Finley, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Miss Mabel Clark, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Abartemie Eberle, Ludlow Griscom, and other citizens of New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of the legislation prohibiting the importation of the feathers and plumes of wild birds for millinery purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas F. McCook, Lowell M. Palmer, Joseph Kemmere, F. L. Higgins, F. L. Thomas, William M. Reid, Daniel A. Dolan, John J. King, Harry E. A. Gibbs, Morris Altchuler, and Joseph H. Scannell, of New York, protesting against including mutual life insurance in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Andrew Werth, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the placing of a duty of 15 per cent on books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirtieth district of New York, against the income tax on life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petitions of C. F. Hager and others of Pennsylvania, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petitions of sundry citizens of New York, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *May 2, 1913.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Once more, Almighty God our heavenly Father, source of every blessing, we come to Thee for inspiration, wisdom, strength, guidance, that we may go forward without fear doing whatsoever Thou has given us to do. And let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not, the fruits of righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Amen.

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

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON USELESS EXECUTIVE PAPERS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following appointment in the House end of the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Talbott of Maryland and Mr. Kelley of Michigan.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS LEGISLATION.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS] rise?

Mr. DOREMUS. To ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD a paper prepared by Hon. Richard Olney, Secretary of State under Grover Cleveland, on the question of Panama Canal tolls and the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, recently read in this city at the annual meeting of the American Society of International Law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS] asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a paper prepared by ex-Secretary of State Hon. Richard Olney on the question of Panama tolls. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan why he does not have that printed as a document?

Mr. DOREMUS. Well——

Mr. HARDWICK. How much will it cost? Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to its being printed as a document, I do not object to its going in the RECORD——

The SPEAKER. Nobody asked to print it as a document.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman was stating his request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the gentleman change it.

Mr. DOREMUS. I have not changed the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a paper prepared by Hon. Richard Olney, ex-Secretary of State, on Panama Canal tolls. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The paper above referred to is as follows:

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS LEGISLATION AND THE HAY-PAUNCEFOTE TREATY.

"In construing the Hay-Pauncefote treaty it is necessary to remember that there have been several different phases of American opinion and American policy touching the ownership, construction, maintenance, and use of the canal. The canal has always been conceived of as a work of world-wide interest and importance, which all nations without exception or discrimination should be able to use, subject, of course, to all rights of the owner of the canal, including that of charging reasonable tolls. Among the earliest declarations of policy by the United States Government, perhaps the earliest, was an intimation that the work should be accomplished, not 'by the support and unassisted efforts of any one power,' but 'by common means and united exertions'—whether of all civilized powers or of American powers exclusively is not perhaps clear. Secretary Clay's idea that the canal be built by a combination of the powers interested seems never to have taken any real root.

"This first phase was succeeded by the view that the canal should be built by the State owning the route of the canal or by a company or association having from the State the necessary concessions for that purpose. The United States was to assist by appropriate guaranties, and by the treaty with New Granada of 1846, in consideration of New Granada's granting citizens of the United States equal treatment with citizens of New Granada as respects any mode of transit across the Isthmus, the United States guarantied the perfect neutrality of the Isthmus and also New Granada's rights as sovereign and owner of the Isthmus.

"A third phase of American opinion and policy appears four years later in a treaty then made with Great Britain. The United States was moved to enter into it by various considera-