

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. Jeddian, 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.; Abar-temie 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 Alchuler, 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-

tions—by the improbability of the canal being built by the territorial sovereign, by Great Britain's claim of a protectorate over the eastern terminus of the Nicaraguan route then universally accepted as the most eligible route, and by the natural and reasonable belief that financiers would more readily engage in the canal enterprise if Great Britain joined the United States in becoming sponsor for the safety and neutrality of the canal and for its equal use by all nations. The outcome was the famous Clayton-Bulwer treaty, the essential features of which are these:

"First. A canal built by the State owning the canal route or by its concessionaires.

"Second. A compact by the parties that neither will build nor take part in building the canal, directly or indirectly, nor obtain nor maintain exclusive control over it.

"Third. A specific agreement as to the modes in which both parties may aid in the construction of the canal—as by each using its influence for such construction with local governments and for the establishment of a free port at each end of the canal, and by each undertaking to protect the canal while in process and after completion to guarantee its neutrality, and to thus safeguard the capital invested.

"Fourth. An undertaking by each to enter into contracts with Central American States with the view to carry out the great purpose of the treaty, to wit, the construction of a ship canal between the two oceans 'for the benefit of mankind and on equal terms to all,' and for the purpose of protecting the same.

"Fifth. Enjoyment by the citizens or subjects of each party of the same 'rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the canal,' charges and conditions of traffic to be approved as just or equitable by the Governments of the contracting parties.

"Sixth. An invitation to all friendly States to join in contributing to the construction of the canal, coupled with the declaration that the equal terms and conditions secured to the citizens or subjects of the contracting parties shall be enjoyed by the citizens and subjects of every other State 'which is willing to grant thereto (to the canal) such protection as the United States and Great Britain engage to afford.'

"The two notable features of this phase of American canal policy are, *first*, the self-denying ordinance preventing the United States or Great Britain from building or controlling the canal, and, *second*, the clear recognition of the right of a State constructing on its own territory an artificial waterway like the canal to dictate the conditions of its use, as by permitting the use to some parties on conditions of their undertaking to protect the canal and denying its use to other parties not willing to undertake such protection.

"The next phase of American canal opinion and policy was foreshadowed as early as 1869, when Secretary Seward officially 'expressed the very deliberate conviction' (1) that 'henceforth neither any foreign Government nor the capitalists of any foreign nation, except the Government and capitalists of the United States, will ever undertake in good faith to build the canal across the Isthmus of Darien'; (2) that 'the neutrality most desirable for Colombia is to be found in a combination of the power, authority, and influence of the United States of America and the power, authority, and influence of the United States of Colombia to protect the canal and make it productive of the largest commercial benefit to all nations'; and (3) that 'not only would the United States be unwilling to enter into an entangling alliance with other foreign nations for the construction and maintenance of a passage through the Isthmus, but also that the idea that other commercial powers could and would consent to enter into a combination with the United States of America for that purpose is impracticable and visionary.' About the same time a convention was actually negotiated at Bogota by which the United States was to build the canal. On various grounds not necessary to state the convention failed of ratification at Washington.

"Meanwhile, and before Secretary Seward's prophetic words were generally accepted as verity, there ensued the de Lesseps attempt to construct the canal over the Panama route. The final abandonment of that attempt, in 1889 forced upon the country the conviction that Secretary Seward was right, and that if the canal was to be built it must be built by the United States, both because the United States was the only American power with the necessary resources and because the construction and control of the canal by any European power would conflict with our settled policy respecting European interference in American affairs. President Hayes, in a special message to Congress in March, 1880, justly interpreted American sentiment by declaring: 'The policy of this country is a canal under American control; the United States can not consent to the surrender of this control to any European power or to any com-

bination of European powers.' He condensed the whole argument for the policy into the fewest words by adding that the canal would be 'virtually a part of the coast line of the United States.' President Cleveland, in his message of December, 1885, was equally explicit as to the inadmissibility of any control of the canal by a European power.

"The final phase of American opinion and policy being that the United States must build and control the canal, and that any share in its construction or control by any European power was to be excluded, the first step to be taken obviously was the removal of the obstacle presented by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. That object was meant and thought to be attained by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901. It clearly permits the United States to build the canal. Does it also debar Great Britain from any control of the canal except such as results from the express provision that the canal shall be open for use to Great Britain and all other nations on terms of entire equality? The answer is to be found in the terms of the treaty itself interpreted according to their true intent. They can be so interpreted only by reverting to the previous relations of the parties to the canal enterprise, to the new relations to the enterprise the parties meant to assume, and to the objects each had in view in making the treaty.

"1. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty of November 18, 1901, it is to be noted, does not merely authorize the United States to build the canal through the territory of some other power, though such would have been a possible construction of the rejected Hay-Pauncefote treaty of February 5, 1901, but the treaty of November 18, 1901, adds a clause not found in the February treaty to the effect that no change of territorial sovereignty of the country or countries traversed by the canal shall affect the obligations of the parties to the treaty, thus assenting in advance to the acquisition by the United States of the territory needed for the canal. Hence, since the United States did afterwards acquire the Canal Zone, the terms of the November Hay-Pauncefote treaty apply to the case of an artificial waterway constructed by a State on its own territory.

"2. It is to be further noted that by way of asserting the exclusive control of the canal by the United States and eliminating any semblance of control by other powers the November Hay-Pauncefote treaty omits article 3 of the February treaty, by which other powers were to have notice of the treaty and be invited to adhere to it.

"3. The facts being, then, that the United States has rightfully built the canal through territory of its own; that besides having become the owner of the canal route, the treaty expressly accords to the United States all the rights incident to construction; and that in undertaking the canal as a United States enterprise the United States did so with the manifest purpose of excluding all foreign control beyond that resulting from the stipulation for equality of terms to all users of the canal—what is there in the language of the treaty to justify the claim that the United States has made a further submission to foreign control by a stipulation which prevents it from allowing the use of the canal by its own vessels or those of its nationals on any terms it chooses to fix?

"4. The one provision possible to be relied upon for that purpose is rule 1 of article 3, declaring that 'the canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality * * *.' And the single point is, Are the words 'all nations' inclusive or exclusive of the United States?

"It seems difficult to successfully contend that the United States is included.

"(a) The treaty is a contract by which the proprietor of a canal fixes the terms upon which it grants the use of the canal to its customers.

"(b) It was needed for that purpose only—it was not needed to fix the terms upon which the United States and its nationals—its *cestui que trust*—should use the canal, because its use without tolls or otherwise, as the United States might choose, is a necessary incident of its ownership of the canal.

"It can not reasonably be argued that, in fixing the terms for the use of its canal customers, the United States looked upon itself as one of the customers.

"(c) The words under construction are in substance the first of a set of six rules adopted by the United States as the basis of the neutralization of the canal.

"But the other five certainly apply only to parties other than the United States, so that there is the strongest reason for holding that the first of them is to be given a like application.

"(d) And if the British construction be correct, instead of liberating the United States from all foreign control of the canal and from all duties to foreign powers in respect to its use—except not to discriminate between them—the Hay-Pauncefote-

fote treaty compels the United States to reverse its established policy and to devise a plan for subsidizing its own vessels in order that they may have such free or other use of the canal as the United States may decide to be demanded by United States interests.

"(e) The claim sometimes made that by building and owning the canal the United States engages in a public calling and thereby undertakes to serve all comers without discrimination and at a reasonable rate would seem to have no application to the present case. The principle affects only the users of the public work and only prescribes entire equality as between them—it in no way prevents the owner of the work, or those for whom it holds the work in trust, from using it in any way and to any extent that the legal or beneficial owner or owners may determine.

"Besides, so far as international law on the subject can be regarded as settled, the rule is that 'while a natural thoroughfare, although wholly within the dominion of a government, may be passed by commercial ships of right, yet the nation which constructs an artificial channel may annex such conditions to its use as it pleases.' (3 Moore, 268; The Avon, 18 Int. Rev. Record, 165.)

"(f) Great stress is laid upon the preamble of the treaty and its reference to the neutralization of the canal as defined in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which, it is claimed, compels the United States to forget that it is the owner of the canal, and, as regards its own vessels, forces it to look upon itself as a canal customer bound to pay for its use the regular tolls. It is elaborately argued that neutralization of this sort is a policy to which the United States has been committed from the earliest times.

"But the argument ignores necessary distinctions and fails to note that 'neutralization' of a canal describes a policy applicable as between the canal owner and customers of the canal, but in no way touches or restricts the canal owner's rights or the canal owner's policy as to the use of the canal by itself. The several phases of American opinion, official and otherwise, respecting the construction and control of the Isthmian Canal have already been pointed out. While merely in the position of a probable user of the canal, the United States always and consistently claimed that the terms and conditions of use should be the same for all comers, but in no way denied or disputed the inherent rights of the canal owner. Those rights, as already shown, are expressly recognized by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which allows the owner to fix terms at will for the use of the canal by States, withholding the protection to the canal given by the United States and Great Britain, and even permits the owner to deny to such States the use of the canal altogether. Since accepting its inevitable rôle of the canal builder and owner, the United States has always and consistently stood on its rights as such, and, beyond agreeing to the neutralization of the canal as between customers, has repudiated the idea of any control of the canal except its own.

"How clearly such is the case is shown by the briefest examination of the neutralization provided for in article 8 of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, the principle of which is not to be impaired by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. What sort of neutralization is it? First, the United States and Great Britain are to determine what are just and equitable charges for the use of the canal by their citizens or subjects; second, the canal shall be open on those same terms to citizens and subjects of other states; but, third, the citizens and subjects of other states shall have the benefit of those terms only if such other states grant the same protection to the canal as the United States and Great Britain engage to afford. Now, there is no element of this species of neutralization which the Hay-Pauncefote treaty leaves unimpaired, since the United States alone fixes reasonable and equitable rules for the canal traffic; since the canal may be used by all nations on no other condition than that they observe those rules; and since—as shown by the elimination from this treaty of article 3 of the unratified Hay-Pauncefote treaty of February, 1901—adherence to the treaty by the other powers is not to be invited. If by construing article 8 in connection with other articles of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty any controlling principle of neutralization is to be deduced, it is the simple requirement that the same terms shall be made to all customers of the canal, a requirement restricting the rights of the canal owner to just that extent and no more and not disabling it from treating its own shipping in any way it sees fit. The like result follows from the Constantinople convention of 1833, which is declared to be the basis of the neutralization of the canal and of the rules laid down in article 3 for its navigation. By that convention identical rules are to apply to all vessels using the Suez Canal in time of war or time of peace without distinction of flags, but 'the rights of Turkey as the territorial power are

reserved,' together with the sovereign rights of the Sultan and the rights and immunities of the Khedive.

"It has been contended that the Senate of the United States understood the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to mean what Great Britain now claims it to mean, because of the Senate's failure to pass the Bard resolution in favor of American coastwise shipping. But the claim seems to be thoroughly disposed of by proof that the reason of the failure was the opinion of Senators that the resolution was superfluous, that nothing in the treaty prohibited the United States, as the builder and owner of the canal, from exempting its coastwise shipping from tolls. Senator Bard himself has since so stated in a letter which was publicly read in the House of Representatives. He is emphatically corroborated on that point by other Senators.

"It is also contended that American vessels must pay tolls, because otherwise the reasonable and equitable tolls provided for by the treaty can not be ascertained. The contention assumes, of course, the very thing at issue, namely, that in the contemplation of the treaty and by its true construction American vessels are bound to pay tolls. But no other answer seems to be required than that, for the purpose of computing reasonable tolls for the use of the canal, it is not necessary that American vessels should pay tolls, but only that the amount they would pay if they were not exempt should be calculated and used in the computation as if paid.

"To sum up the conclusions resulting from the foregoing considerations it is submitted that—

"1. The United States, as builder and owner of an artificial waterway within its own territory, is entitled to dictate the conditions of its use unless and only so far as it has contracted the right of way.

"2. It has made no such contract, except with Great Britain and by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and by the clauses of that treaty which stipulate for the use of the canal by 'all nations' on equal terms and for reasonable and equitable tolls.

"3. As the term 'all nations' comprehends not only states, but their nationals, the crucial question is, Are the words 'all nations' inclusive or exclusive of the United States and its nationals?

"4. The principle is well settled that a state conveys away its rights of sovereignty or property only by terms which are clear and express and are not susceptible of any other reasonable construction. If the terms are vague and of doubtful import, the presumption is against the state's intention to part with or abridge its jurisdictional or property rights.

"5. Hence, as the term 'all nations' as used in the treaty may be taken to mean either all without exception or all except the United States, the latter meaning is to be accepted as the true one, because the least restrictive of the normal rights and powers of the United States.

"6. But it is unnecessary to rely upon presumption. The treaty assumes the United States to be the owner of a canal to be built by it on its own territory and must be taken to have had as its natural and legitimate aim the fixing of the terms, upon which other nations might use it. Except as necessarily abridged by such terms, nothing in the treaty indicates any purpose to further abridge the rights of the United States as canal builder and owner.

"7. In short, the treaty is an instrument by which the proprietor of a canal fixes and states the terms of use to its customers.

"There is an utter absence of evidence that the United States regarded itself as one of its customers.

"8. The neutralization proposed by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty resembles that proposed by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty only in the idea that the operating charges and rules for use of the canal shall be the same for all nations. It differs, of course, in the vital feature of conditioning such equality of terms upon protection being afforded to the canal.

"9. When five out of six of the treaty rules for the use of the canal do not apply to the United States it is a reasonable conclusion that the sixth also was not meant so to apply.

"10. The different phases of American public and official sentiment respecting the canal are noteworthy and not to be overlooked in construing the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

"While the United States was expecting to be merely one of the users of the canal, it strenuously insisted upon equality of rules and charges for the use of the canal and did not concern itself about the rights of the canal owner.

"When the rôle of builder and owner of the canal was forced upon it, it as strenuously insisted upon complete ownership and complete control, and complete elimination of all foreign participation or control.

"Its purposes and views are completely defeated if the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is to be construed according to the British

contention, and the United States has lost the ordinary and normal right of the canal owner to be exempt from the tolls and charges it makes to customers.

"On the grounds and in view of the considerations above stated, the United States may contend—and it is believed can rightfully contend—that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of November, 1901, does not, as justly interpreted, prevent the United States from exempting its coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls for the use of the Panama Canal. But to the English contention that the controversy should be referred to arbitration there seems to be no sufficient answer. Both countries are firmly committed to arbitration as the best method for the settlement of international disputes. It may be safely assumed without argument that if the matter in difference is not otherwise disposed of it will be left to an arbitral tribunal. It does not follow that resort must be or should be had to The Hague or The Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration. Our existing arbitration treaty with Great Britain, article 1, expressly excepts from reference to that court differences which 'concern the interests of third parties'—and in the case of the present difference over the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty the 'third parties' with interests concerned, but without legal standing in respect of them, include almost all the countries of Europe. That the present difference should not go to The Hague Permanent Court is as clear as that the parties are not bound to send it there. International arbitration derives its chief value from confidence in the arbitral tribunal and in its ability and purpose to do justice—an award lacking that confidence is not only likely to work unfortunately as regards the particular case, but also to discredit the cause of arbitration generally—and the fact must be reckoned with that in this country there is a widespread conviction which has been publicly voiced in high official circles that all Europe is interested in the success of the British contention, and that submission of the controversy to arbitration under The Hague convention would be in the nature of a farce. American sentiment on this point is no doubt in part due to the nature of the subject matter in controversy. The claim of Great Britain is, in effect, a territorial claim. The United States possesses no more costly and perhaps no more valuable piece of territory than the Panama Canal, and Great Britain's claim is that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty not only encumbers that territory with equal rights of use by all other nations, but impresses upon it a servitude by which the United States loses the free use of its own canal for its own vessels. It is rights of that nature as to which both countries are especially sensitive and which both countries have been peculiarly careful to safeguard. Thus, for territorial claims the general arbitration treaty of 1897 (perfected as such on the part of Great Britain, but killed in the United States Senate) provided a tribunal of six arbitrators, three of whom should be chosen by each party, and whose award should be final only when made by not less than five arbitrators. The same general idea governed in the case of the Alaska boundary, though the final award might be by four out of the six. A more important difference, however, is that in the case of the Alaska boundary the arbitrators were to consist of 'impartial jurists of repute,' whereas by the 1897 treaty they were to be taken from the judges of the highest courts of the respective countries. That such a tribunal should be made the interpreter of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty if arbitration of its terms becomes necessary and would be greatly preferable to a tribunal constituted as in the Alaska boundary controversy is unquestionable. It would be superior in dignity, in impartiality, and in general competency. It would be infinitely more likely to be regarded as beyond the reach of any but the most correct motives and influences, and the results would be infinitely more likely to command the cheerful acquiescence of both countries."

GEORGIA REFORMATORY.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from Miss Lathrop, Chief Children's Bureau, relative to the imprisonment of Ollie Taylor in the Georgia Reformatory for stealing a bottle of coca cola. There has been so much publicity in the papers about the matter that in justice to the Georgia prison reformatory I ask to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from Miss Lathrop touching the case of Ollie Taylor for stealing a bottle of coca cola. [Laughter.] Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

MAY 1, 1913.

MY DEAR SIR: I have just returned from Atlanta, Ga., where I went to attend the Southern Sociological Congress. While there I made personal inquiry into the case of Ollie Taylor, of whom you wrote me. The

bureau has also had considerable correspondence with the Georgia authorities. I believe the following to be a fair statement of the facts: Georgia has a juvenile court law, applicable, however, only in counties so electing. Fulton County, in which Atlanta is situated, has adopted this law and deals with children under it. Unfortunately the procedure and phraseology of the juvenile court follow closely those of the criminal court, and the use of this phraseology is apparently the cause of the wide misunderstanding of the case, although the actual provisions of the law are in line with most juvenile court laws, and section 885 especially states—

"This article (law) shall be liberally construed, to the end that the care, custody, and discipline of the children before the court shall approximate as nearly as possible that which they should receive from their parents and that, as far as practicable, they shall be treated not as criminals but as children in need of aid, encouragement, and guidance. Proceedings against children under this article shall not be deemed to be criminal proceedings, except where the child is committed to trial according to law."

The State of Georgia has a reformatory to which children from other counties are sent, but Fulton County maintains an institution of its own for boys, popularly known as the Fulton County Industrial Farm. It is not a penal institution, the superintendent reports to the State board of education. This farm is about 8 miles from Atlanta and consists of about 150 acres. There are now in the institution about 100 boys, who are in school half the day and at work in various farm occupations the other half of the day. The average length of stay at the farm is stated as about two years.

An agent visits the boys who are sent from the school and keeps the superintendent acquainted with their progress. If they are not doing well, they are brought back. The chief probation officer of the juvenile court, Mr. W. W. Tindall, states the history of Ollie Taylor as follows:

"Ollie was running the streets, idling and loitering, and stealing small edibles from groceries and wagons and hopping on and off moving trains. On his first appearance in court he was put on probation, and for a time he satisfied the probation officer, but on reappearance in court later, under new charges of running the streets and purloining articles indiscriminately, among which was a bottle of coca cola, he was committed to the industrial farm, since he had already been tried on probation, which had failed to reform him, and especially since his father complained that he could not do anything with his son."

While, according to the words of the statute, the child was sentenced, the actual fact seems to be that he was committed to the guardianship of the school during minority, as children are committed in the juvenile courts of other States to quasi-public industrial schools or to State schools for a period not longer than minority, to be placed out or discharged, at the discretion of the superintendent or trustees of the schools.

While in Atlanta, I visited this school and met the superintendent, who has been a professional teacher all his life. He seems to have the boys' interests sincerely at heart, and inquiry showed that he has the general confidence of the community. I saw the boys as they were marching out of the dining room on Sunday, dressed in their gray Sunday uniforms. The atmosphere of the place was that of a school. Some of the boys I spoke with, among them the child in question. He was a bright, cheerful-looking lad of about 13. All the information I gained personally in Atlanta, from my own observation, and from people with whom I spoke about the matter, convinced me that the boy is receiving proper care.

Very respectfully,

JULIA C. LATHROP,
Chief Children's Bureau.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LAFFERTY. To ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes to answer an article appearing in the Evening Star of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes in regard to an article in some paper. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this with reference to the matter that he has inserted in the RECORD, including the gentleman's biography—

Mr. LAFFERTY. It is.

Mr. FOSTER. And other matters, stating what wonderful things the gentleman has done in Congress?

Mr. LAFFERTY. They are somewhat remarkable, I will admit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman having five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAFFERTY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: There appeared in the Evening Star of yesterday an article which would probably be a proper basis for a question of personal privilege, but I do not care to dignify it by asking to reply to it upon that ground. It is headed, "Lafferty ends speech with loud applause" and "loud applause" is quoted. "Representative from Oregon takes advantage of 'leave to print' section." Further along the article states:

The "loud applause" said to have followed this dictum is anonymous. The RECORD discloses naught of its origin.

Now, there has been a great deal said in the newspapers about Members of the House of Representatives inserting printed speeches in the RECORD that were never delivered, and sprinkling applause through those speeches and sending them out to an unsuspecting public. I say that any Member of Congress who would indulge in a deception and fraud of that kind ought to be retired by his constituents at the first opportunity. The speech in question was delivered by me on the floor of this House on last Saturday evening in the presence of nearly all of you whom I am now facing. I spoke for 25 minutes, and the full speech

would have required about 30 minutes. At the conclusion of my remarks, the official stenographer inserted in the speech "Loud applause," in accordance with the facts, and instead of inserting it at the point where my time shut me off, which was a few paragraphs before the conclusion of the speech, he, and not I, inserted that "Loud applause" at the end of the manuscript speech which he had in his possession.

Now, then, I have had considerable experience with the Associated Press, of which Mr. Frank B. Noyes, one of the owners of the Evening Star, is president. I have defied that organization from the time I first announced myself as a candidate for a seat in this honorable body. I defy it now, and I shall continue to defy it so long as I am in public life. The Associated Press boasts that it has nearly 1,000 newspapers in the United States. I have no kind of respect for any Member of Congress who comes here to serve the people and is afraid to speak upon any subject that will not bring forth laudation from the Associated Press, and there are such in this House of Representatives. If you are going to represent your constituents, sooner or later you are bound to defy the Associated Press, the same as you are bound to defy special privilege in all of its forms, for the Associated Press is controlled by special privilege.

I have introduced a bill, which was mentioned in this article, and to which my unsophisticated friend from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] has referred in a deprecatory manner. That bill, to control the Associated Press, appeared in this speech as an appendix, and there is certain correspondence had with Mr. Frank B. Noyes in regard to that bill which I beg leave to insert as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] asks unanimous consent to insert as a part of his remarks the correspondence to which he refers.

Mr. FOSTER. I object. I think we have had enough of this.

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) 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. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

223. Figs, 2 cents per pound; plums, prunes, and prunelles, 1 cent per pound; raisins and other dried grapes, 2 cents per pound; dates, 1 cent per pound; currants, Zante or other, 2 cents per pound; olives, 15 cents per gallon.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, line 1, by striking out the figure "2" and inserting the figures "2½."

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered restores the present rate on figs. Until very recent years the Smyrna fig has had a monopoly not only in the United States, but throughout the world, and it has only been through the persistence and the nerve of Californians that there is to-day a real competitor of the Smyrna fig. California has for many years raised figs, but these figs did not compete with the imported Smyrna fig. Since 1882 private parties in California have been expending large sums of money for the purpose of introducing a fig in California that would be a real competitor of the foreign fig. Not until the year 1900, when a certain insect called the *Blastophaga grossorum*, without which the Smyrna fig can not be successfully produced, was introduced into California, have we produced a fig that is a real competitor of the imported article. Since the House increased the duty one-half cent in the last tariff bill the industry has received an impetus and the acreage set out to fig trees in California has practically doubled. An increased production of this fig will cause the price of the imported product to be reduced throughout the entire country.

In framing this "scientific" tariff revision bill there appears to have been a studied effort to overlook no section or industry of California, and throughout the 58 counties of California there will not be a man, woman, or child who will fail to have brought to his or her attention the full significance of a Democratic attempt to tinker with the tariff.

I realize that probably these remarks will have no effect whatever upon the Members upon the other side of the House,

but I want to say that so far as those citizens of my State are concerned who have expended thousands of dollars in placing this industry upon a paying basis, those who have in the last two or three years doubled their fig acreage—and I want to call attention to the fact that it takes six years for a fig tree to become a producer—to these people this item of half a cent is a matter of great importance.

In the northern part of the State of California you have struck at the lumber industry and the wool industry. You have reduced the duty upon citrus fruits. You have also reduced the duty on beans, and you have reduced the duty on olives, and upon olive oil, and you have reduced the duty upon sugar, to the injury of the 13 beet-sugar factories, employing over 25,000 men. In three years sugar will be free, and when you have destroyed the only competitors of the Sugar Trust by closing these beet-sugar factories, the price of sugar will be no lower and an American industry will have been destroyed.

This bill is calamitous, so far as the State of California is concerned, and I am glad at this time to go on record by offering this amendment, although I know it will have no effect upon the other side of the House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, line 3, by striking out the figure "2" and inserting the figures "2½."

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores the present duty of 2½ cents per pound upon raisins. Heretofore there has always been a slight differential in favor of raisins as against the Zante currant. The Zante currant is really a seedless raisin, and the one-half cent a pound which this bill removes has been of great benefit to the raisin growers of California. If you vote down this amendment, you make the duty upon Zante currants the same as it is upon raisins, to the disadvantage of the California grower, for Zante currants compete with seedless raisins. The Zante currant is a foreign product.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

Mr. HAYES rose.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Oh, my colleague will excuse me. I did not know he was present. I yield to my colleague, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the figures "15," in line 4, and inserting in lieu thereof "25."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 4, page 56, by striking out the figures "15" and inserting "25."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to restore the present duty on olives.

We raise in California about 4,000 tons of olives fit for pickling. As I said in regard to the olive-oil industry, if the present duty could be continued, in time to come, not very far distant, we can produce practically all the olives that are consumed in this country, whether pickled green or ripe.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman intend to restore the present duty?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Then you do not quite do it. In the present law olives, in bottles, jars, kegs, tins, and other packages containing less than 5 gallons each, have a duty of 25 cents a gallon; otherwise, 15 cents a gallon. I think the gentleman ought to put that in; otherwise I could not vote for it.

Mr. HAYES. Very well. I will ask that that be included to restore the present law. I have the language right here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, line 4, by striking out the words "olives, 15 cents per gallon," and inserting in lieu thereof "olives, in bottles, jars, kegs, tins, or other packages containing less than 5 gallons each, 25 cents per gallon; otherwise, 15 cents per gallon."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification?
There was no objection.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to make any extended speech. I only desire to say that in this industry to-day, under the present law, there are no excessive profits; but it is a business that can be carried on by people who live in the foothills, where they have cheap lands, and it is very desirable, from our standpoint in California, that it should be encouraged and allowed to develop, as it will under the present tariff conditions. Much lowering of the duty will destroy it.

Mr. RAINEY. May I ask the gentleman how many tons of olives are produced to an acre?

Mr. HAYES. About one and a quarter tons of olives per acre.

Mr. RAINEY. The brief filed here by Mr. L. J. Hough, of Los Angeles, Cal., shows that the average profits per ton of pickling olives is \$39.20; and if they produce a ton and a quarter to the acre—

Mr. HAYES. They are not all pickling olives. Only 25 to 30 per cent of the crop are pickling olives. The rest have to go to the oil press. The pickling olives are only the larger and finer grades, and the poorer ones, those that have any blemishes or that are smaller, have to go to the oil press, so that the figures stated by the gentleman do not represent the profit per acre, nor anything like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, lines 3 and 4, by striking out "Currants, Zante or other, 2 cents per pound" and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"Currants, Zante or other, shall be admitted free of duty."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I introduced various amendments in the discussion of the bill yesterday, but unfortunately a number of them did not meet with the approval of gentlemen on that side of the House. I have now introduced an amendment which I feel confident (?) will receive the support of every gentleman on that side of the House, and I believe when I have explained it it will also receive the support of every Member on this side of the House. As I am informed, this is a product that is not raised in this country at all. The Zante currant can be raised and is raised only in Greece, particularly in the Peloponnesus. This is shown by the statement made by United States Consul A. B. Cooke:

[From the Daily Consular and Trade Reports.]
GREEK CURRANT CULTURE AND CROP.

Greece has practically a world monopoly in the cultivation of currants. Efforts have been made to grow the currant in other countries, but thus far without appreciable success. The Greek currant belongs to the grape family, being a sort of small, seedless, and very sweet grape, growing upon a vine like the ordinary grape. Its cultivation is confined to the Peloponnesus and the lower Ionian Isles and constitutes the chief agricultural industry of those sections.

This duty does not to any degree protect any American industry. It is a tariff that is levied, as I suppose, solely for revenue. I note from the tables that are furnished by the committee that last year some 33,000,000 pounds of Zante currants were imported into this country at a value of \$1,500,000, the average price per pound being about 4.7 cents. The duty under this proposed law is 2 cents per pound. It is estimated by those who have prepared this table that the price of these currants will continue to rise; that the price next year will be 5 cents per pound; and the proposed duty is therefore about 40 per cent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the bald proposition: These Zante currants are not luxuries. They are necessities for the food of the common people. I am speaking for the great host of pie eaters and plum-pudding eaters and for 400,000 workmen throughout the United States, to whom these currants are a valuable, nutritious, and wholesome article of food. You can not make a good mince pie or a good plum pudding without Zante currants, and in the face of the declaration of gentlemen on that side that they are going to cheapen the poor man's food this bill proposes, ruthlessly and without the slightest excuse, to levy a tax upon the buns and mince pies and plum puddings of this country of \$661,000 per year.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman's amendment should give a little better opportunity for that side of the House to get close to the pie counter, does he think there would be any trouble in having it adopted? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. I think there would be no difficulty at all. If gentlemen on that side could be assured that they and their constituents could get up close to the pie counter at once, they

would all vote for this amendment; but I think they are going to vote for it anyhow. They will have to vote for it, because it is in line with the declaration that has been made here 50 times during this debate, that the purpose of this legislation is to cheapen the poor man's food. And I invite attention to the fact that the Zante currants are used not simply in plum puddings and mince pies. They are used in the poor man's bread and the poor man's cake. There are thousands of laborers in this country whose only approach to luxury is a few currants in their bread; and yet this Democratic majority, made up of this host of the friends (?) of the common people, pledged to see to it that the common people shall have free bread and free meat, are proposing here to say that they will levy on the food of the poor man a tax of \$661,000 per year. I want my friends on this side of the House to understand that this duty of 2 cents per pound can not possibly be of any advantage to any American industry, since we have tried to raise Zante currants in this country and failed ignominiously. An attempt was made to raise these currants in California, but it was found that the nature of the vine changed in that climate so that the seedless Zante currants could not be produced.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If I thought these currants were the same they used to make pies of for the harvest hands in Kansas, I would be against the amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAYES. The same kind.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then I am against them.

Mr. WILLIS. I think these are not the same thing. These are the kind they undertook to raise in California and they were not the real thing. This is an amendment in the interest of the people. It reduces the price of food according to the Democratic doctrine; it takes the tax from the poor man's bread and the housewives' mince pies and plum puddings; it does not deprive any American laborer of employment or injure any American industry; and it ought to be adopted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I want a minute.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield the gentleman a minute.

Mr. PAYNE. I will wait until the gentleman from Alabama gets through.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised that my good friend from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] should attempt to make a joke of the food of the poor people. He is always interesting and always says some good things, but I did not expect that he would treat the question of giving the poor people of this country free bread and free meat as a joke.

Of course, the committee has endeavored to reduce the taxes on the food products of the American people. As to how far that will be effective in reducing the price no man can prophesy at this time. In regard to some food products, such as sugar, I do not question for a moment that, if this bill becomes a law, there will be a very great reduction in the price. As to the other food products, the probabilities are that it may be infinitesimal.

But here is the difference between currants that are raised only abroad and sugar that is a competitive product. These currants of course are highly competitive. They all, or practically all, come from abroad, and every cent of tax that falls on them goes into the Treasury of the United States to support the Government of the people. But when you come to the tax on sugar—if I recollect right, I saw the gentleman from Ohio the other day walk between the tellers voting against making this reduction on the people's sugar; he is trying to take a revenue tax off of currants, every dollar of which goes into the Treasury of the United States to support the Government of the people, for, as I stated, he walked between the tellers and voted for a tax on sugar that levies \$115,000,000 burden on the consuming masses of the American people when only \$50,000,000 of it goes into the Treasury of the United States to support the Government, and the other \$65,000,000 goes into the pockets of the special interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the position the gentleman from Ohio takes in levying these taxes.

Now, you would imagine from what the gentleman from Ohio said, that we had resurrected this tax from nowhere and put it as a burden on these people. There has been a tax on these Zante currants almost from the beginning. Under the Wilson bill there was a tax of 1½ cents a pound, and the ad valorem equivalent at that time equaled 89 per cent. Under the Dingley bill there was a tax of 2 cents per pound, and the ad valorem equivalent equaled 79 per cent. When the Payne bill became a law 2 cents was retained on the Zante currants, with an ad valorem equivalent of 56 per cent. In 1912 the ad

valorem equivalent dropped to 42 per cent, and this bill still retains the same 2 cents tax on Zante currants. It will produce a revenue of over \$600,000 for the Government and, as I say to the gentleman from Ohio, every dollar of that tax goes to the Government and the special interests get none.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIS. Under the gentleman's theory, would he be in favor of a tax on tea and coffee? I am opposed to such a tax.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that there is a broad prejudice against taxing tea and coffee.

Mr. WILLIS. And currants.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But there is more justice in taxing tea and coffee, every dollar of which tax would go into the Federal Treasury, than there is in taxing sugar in the interest of special interests whose hands have never been too clean in the city of Washington. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I can not say all I want to say in that time. I am surprised at the gentleman from Ohio. He has not delved into the question as he usually does. These Zante currants are nothing more than raisins, and not very good raisins at that. They take the place of raisins.

The 2 cents a pound is a protective duty on them. Of course, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has copied our duty in this bill on Zante currants, as he has copied a good many other things in the present tariff law, and he would have done a good deal better if he had copied more. It is a protection on raisins. He need not have put any duty on raisins. If he had not it would not be proper to put it on Zante currants, but if it is proper to put it on raisins, it is proper to put it on Zante currants, purely as a matter of protection, although this is a food product. Currants are a food substitute for raisins in pies and cakes and things of that kind. I have eaten them both. I commend the gentleman from Alabama for keeping this duty on in order that we may produce raisins here, and with the competition make them cheaper in the markets, as they already are and have been for a number of years. The duty is all right and I shall vote against the amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

225. Lemons, limes, oranges, grapefruit, shaddocks, and pomelos in packages of a capacity of 1½ cubic feet or less, 18 cents per package; in packages of capacity exceeding 1½ cubic feet and not exceeding 2½ cubic feet, 35 cents per package; in packages exceeding 2½ and not exceeding 5 cubic feet, 70 cents per package; in packages exceeding 5 cubic feet or in bulk, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, in line 7, strike out all of paragraph 225 and substitute the following:
"Lemons, 1½ cents per pound; oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, and pomelos, 1 cent per pound."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I would like two or three minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. I desire to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, each gentleman to be recognized for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close in 15 minutes and that the recognition be for 3 minutes to each gentleman. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in good faith, to replace the duties where they now are and to remedy an injustice that is being done an industry that has already suffered through the ravages of the frost. I also offer it to call the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means to several items in this proposed paragraph. You have changed from the pound basis to the box basis, and I suppose the reason for this, Mr. Chairman, is to simplify the method of handling the imports by the customhouse by eliminating the necessity of refunds for decay. But the present plan will increase the cost to the Government, because the decay will have to be determined by counting each rotten fruit, rather than eliminating and weighing the decayed fruit as a whole. It has been

held by the Board of Appraisers that there should be no allowance for decay where the duty has been levied on the capacity of the packages rather than the contents. This was Treasury decision 32108, but this decision was recently reversed by the United States Court of Customs Appeals, Treasury decision 32570, which holds that decayed fruit is subject to rebates whether the duty is levied on contents or capacity basis. So that this present plan will increase the cost to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I take it that it was the intention of this committee to fix the duty on citrus fruits at one-half cent per pound, and the committee has done this in connection with the fruit in bulk and in packages exceeding 5 cubic feet. On all other packages it has fixed a duty considerably below one-half of 1 cent per pound by an apparent error in fixing the maximum size of the packages. It provides that in packages of capacity exceeding 1½ cubic feet and not exceeding 2½ cubic feet there shall be a duty of 35 cents per package. A cubic foot of lemons weighs, on the average, 36½ pounds, and the rate of 35 cents established is 10 cents below what the committee should have fixed on this package. The importer at present uses a package of 2 cubic feet, but with this maximum of 2½ cubic feet he will immediately enlarge the package and thus take advantage of the provision in this paragraph and save for himself the duty of 10 cents on each such package, thereby escaping the payment of duty on 18 pounds of fruit on each package.

There has been much talk on this floor about the eastern consumer paying the cost of transportation on lemons from California. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the present duty was never intended to equalize the freight rate. It equalizes the difference in the labor and materials entering into a box of American and foreign lemons and nothing more. The foreigners add to the producing cost a complicated series of brokers' and speculators' profits and the growers' profits as well, and compare that with our cost of production; but no tariff duty should ever attempt to protect a group of foreign profits, because the foreign industry can simplify its method whenever business necessities require.

What the Democratic Party denies to American industry it should as scrupulously deny to a foreign industry.

This Congress is asked to reduce the revenues of the Government a million and a quarter dollars annually and to turn that sum over to the small coterie of importers who control the supplies that enter the American ports. It is a stake worth playing for, and is done under the subtle guise of reducing the cost of living. I would not have the assurance to make these remarks if the history of the retail lemon business in Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, and St. John, where foreign lemons, duty free, are used exclusively, did not prove that the retailer there charges the consumer the identical price, or even more, than the consumer pays in the United States.

The low duty on citrus fruits established in this bill violates every principle of tariff making. It makes a rate lower than a competitive rate, it takes no account of the difference in the cost of production, and it reduces the revenue that the Government has collected more than a million and a quarter dollars annually. It will turn the lemon supplies of the eastern consumer into the hands of a few importers, and in the absence of a healthy domestic competition the eastern consumer, like the consumer in Canada, will pay the price of a monopolistic control of the lemon supply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment after this amendment has been disposed of.

Mr. HAYES. That is what I desire to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. This does not exhaust debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This merely disposes of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 12 minutes of debate remaining. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out paragraph 225, page 56, and insert in lieu thereof: "Lemons, 1 cent per pound; oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, and pomelos, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound."

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, the lemon growers of California believe that they are entitled to a duty of

1½ cents per pound on lemons, and that it will be for the best interests of the American people to have a duty of 1½ cents per pound on lemons. However, this Congress has determined on a reduction.

I came to this Congress and to the previous one believing that many schedules should be reduced, but I can not stand here now, and I have not been willing at any time to stand here, and vote for a reduction in other schedules and not be willing to make a similar reduction in schedules affecting my own district and State. Therefore I offer this amendment in good faith.

Mr. Chairman, nobody to-day really knows what reductions should be made, unless it is upon the wool schedule and the cotton schedule, which have had the benefit of a tariff-board report. I would be perfectly willing, and I think the various industries in California would be quite willing, to take any reduction recommended after deliberation upon a report from an expert, nonpartisan tariff commission. I would vote for whatever the result of that investigation proved would be best for the American people. [Applause.] I believe that 1 cent per pound will help the lemon industry far more than the one-half cent per pound allowed in this bill.

Our lemon growers believe that a reduction to one-half cent per pound will practically ruin the lemon industry. Lemon groves have increased in California near 150 per cent in the last 15 years. In 1903 California furnished about 25 per cent of the lemons consumed in the United States. To-day it supplies something like 60 per cent of the lemons used in the United States.

Los Angeles County alone, which I have the honor in part to represent, has enough land not now planted to fruit trees which is adapted to and available for the raising of lemons to supply the 40 per cent now imported. In the balance of the State 80,000 acres are also fitted and available therefor.

California would like to supply the whole of the United States with lemons. It believes it can do so at prices that will average less than if supplied from abroad.

All I ask is a fair protection for this or any other California industry. It is all that I have ever asked at any time. I am ready to reduce any schedule that should be reduced, even our own. I do not ask for California industries a ratio of protection beyond that which I am willing to vote to industries elsewhere. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HAYES. I ask for information, will that cut me out?

The CHAIRMAN. It will not.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the frank admission from my friend from California that the lemon industry in California has been receiving more protection than it really needed. I know of no industry in the country that has so completely demonstrated at the present time its ability to get along absolutely without tariff protection as the lemon industry of California. Out there 6,500 lemon growers have formed a combination, but in some mysterious way they escape the operation of the antitrust laws. There are a few lemon growers who are not in the association, but not many. These 6,500 lemon growers have organized themselves into 115 primary associations, and those 115 primary or original associations have organized themselves into 17 associations, and these 17 associations have perfected the Lemon Trust of the country, which is known as the California Fruit Growers' Association, and there is nothing like it anywhere in the world. Why, they have a box rate on lemons from San Francisco to New York of 84 cents per box, and they can not land lemons in New York from Sicily for less than that amount; and after the Sicilian lemons get here they pay the tariff before they get on the market. The California Fruit Growers' Association have the right to divert a car of lemons whenever they want to do it, and on account of the perfect organization they have formed, if lemon growers in different sections of California start two carloads of lemons for the same point somewhere in the Middle West or in the East, before those lemons reached that point this splendidly organized association always finds it out and they divert one of those cars of lemons, so there never is and never can be in any territory reached by California lemons the slightest competition between lemons grown in California, and, at present, on account of the perfect organization they have, California lemons are being sold cheaper in New York City than they are being sold in Denver.

They ship lemons from California to Canada and pay the tariff charged by Canada, and then compete there—and compete successfully—with lemons from Sicily. The lemons grown in Sicily and in California are really two different propositions.

The California lemons are larger. They are a better looking fruit. The Sicilian lemons are much smaller, but they contain more acidity. There is only one place on this continent where there is any competition in lemons at the present time, and that is in New York City and adjacent sections, and perhaps other large eastern cities. It is only along the Atlantic seaboard that competition is possible between the California lemon and the Sicilian lemon. We have given them the rate they ought to have in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, in line 7, page 56, by inserting after the word "lemon" the words "1½ cents per pound."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is something like Josh Billings's goose. He would be better off if he did not know so many things that are not true. [Laughter.] Most of what the gentleman has stated in regard to marketing the California lemons is not true.

Mr. RAINEY. It is all based upon the testimony we took in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HAYES. The gentleman has misinterpreted it entirely.

Mr. RAINEY. No; I have not.

Mr. HAYES. This lemon growers' association of which he speaks has no authority to fix the price of lemons. They handle only 75 per cent of the lemons grown in California, and a large proportion of this 75 per cent is sold at public auction in this country in open competition with the world. That is the truth. And if they bring less in New York than they do in Denver it is because in New York they have to encounter more competition from the Italian or the Sicilian lemon than they do in Denver. That is all. That is what makes the price. There is no trust. It is an association of lemon growers, formed for the sole purpose of marketing their product to the best possible advantage. They often do divert, if there is liable to be a great dumping of a surplus in one market, a car of lemons that may be consigned to that place, to a place where there will be no surplus. And I commend that sort of thing to all the agriculturists of the country. We would be in a very different situation agriculturally to-day if the growers of agricultural products would follow the example of the lemon growers of California.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is an infant industry in this country in the true sense of those words. Fifteen years ago lemon growing was not known in this country as a large commercial proposition, and to-day we do not grow more than one-half of the product that is consumed in this country. But we have land that is adapted to growing sufficient lemons to supply all of this country and the whole of the Western Hemisphere.

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

Mr. HAYES. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Do you not understand that the purpose is for the Democratic Party to give the American voters a free lemon?

Mr. HAYES. As I understand it, the purpose of this provision is to get the Italian vote on the Atlantic seaboard. That is the purpose, and that is all the purpose, there is no doubt. It will not bring a cheaper lemon to the consumer, and nobody knows it better than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. AUSTIN. The Italian board of trade in New York City requested this?

Mr. HAYES. They sent agents here to appear before the committee and demanded it.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAYES. I can not yield.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is along the same lines as nearly all of the provisions that affect the agricultural schedule. They are intended to catch the voters. That is what they are for, and there is no scientific or business reason why most of them should be incorporated into our tariff laws.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] has made an appeal to the Members of this House for lower priced lemons for the people of this country.

The gentleman has stated how many men were engaged in the raising of lemons in California. If he had been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1908 he would have heard an abundance of evidence to the effect that 1 cent per

pound was not sufficient protection to protect the lemon orchards of California. He would have heard that lemon orchards were fast being grafted to oranges, it not being profitable to raise lemons. Thousands of trees have been grafted, thus discontinuing to that extent the raising of lemons in California. The gentleman ought to have stated to the Members of this House that Italy and Sicily now supply the whole world, outside of the United States, with lemons, and that from one-half to two-thirds of all the lemons consumed in the United States come from Sicily and Italy.

The gentlemen who appeared before the committee in January favoring a lower rate of duty on lemons denounced the lemon growers of California for the employment of alien labor, foreign labor—Japanese, Chinese, Mexicans, Hindus, and all that sort of people—and assailed those engaged in the sugar industry of California for employing foreigners, stating that they had no other farm labor.

I want to read a statement from a paper published at Yonkers, N. Y.—the Yonkers Statesman—on April 16, 1913. There is a strike on in the establishment of the Federal Sugar Refining Co., where the very men who testified before our committee and criticized California for employing foreigners figure. Here is what one of them says, going on to tell about the strike in the refinery of the Federal Sugar Refining Co., and about protection to be given nonunion labor. I read:

REFINERY OPERATING TO-DAY.

The Federal Sugar Refinery is operating to-day with a force of about 150 men. They are refining the raw sugar that was on hand in the factory when the strike started. Unless this were done the cane sugar would spoil. It is the plan to close down completely when this work is finished, unless there are enough nonunion men to run the plant.

The men working are all nonunion men. A few of them are new employees, who have come in since the strike started. Others were employed as machinists, oilers, helpers, cleaners, and in various other capacities.

Following yesterday's clash between the police and the strikers at the entrance to the refinery, the company has supplemented the guard of policemen with between 60 and 70 special officers, whom it is employing.

Mr. Spreckels said this morning that protection would be afforded to the men at work, even if the Regular Army has to be called out.

"We rely on the city authorities for protection," he said, "and they seem to have the situation well in hand. If the police and special officers are not sufficient to protect the plant and the men who want to work, we have the sheriff of the county to fall back on, and next the militia and the Regular Army. Being citizens of this country, we have this right to protection. I doubt if 10 of the foreigners in the union at the refinery are citizens of this country, and if they riot or incite to riot I think steps can be taken to have them deported."

You will notice this:

Mr. Spreckels said this morning that protection would be afforded to the men at work, even if the Regular Army has to be called out.

Then he adds:

Being citizens of this country, we have the right to protection. I doubt if 10 of the foreigners in the union at the refinery are citizens of this country, and if they riot or incite a riot I think steps can be taken to have them deported.

He says not 10 of the foreigners of that union employed at the refinery are American citizens—employed by Mr. Spreckels and Mr. Lowry, upon whose testimony largely you have made up the sugar free-list bill and imposed a lower rate of duty on lemons, criticizing the Californians for employing foreigners. Now comes the truth of it right in his own factory, where men are now on a strike, not 10 of whom are citizens of the United States. Oh, that is a grand appeal. That is a grand man's statement to listen to in the fixing of rates of duty. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

226. Orange peel or lemon peel, preserved, candied, or dried, 1 cent per pound; coconut meat or copra, desiccated, shredded, cut, or similarly prepared, and citron or citron peel, preserved, candied, or dried, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, at this moment the mail of Members on both sides of the Chamber is heavy with letters from men who are making suggestions as to amendments to this bill, and in actual practice every Member when so written makes invariably the same reply at this stage of the measure. The Member writes his constituents and says that the bill is now closed against possible amendment.

This omnibus tariff bill is closed against possible amendment. This bill has been closed to amendment since it left the Ways and Means Committee. It was not changed much in the Democratic caucus. It was closed there, and it has not been materially changed at all here. It is closed here.

The scene we see here is to us quite different from what it must appear to the people out over the country. The people of the United States believe that here is raging a closely fought battle over the tariff. There is a battle here, but it is a sham battle. Every amendment which is offered from any place, save one place here, is promptly voted down. If an amendment comes from the little table in front, where sits the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], no matter what it is, no matter how trivial or how grave it may threaten to be in its results, it is always voted up. If it comes from any other place, it is voted down. If this debate accomplishes anything at all, it is to outline the policy or demonstrate the lack of policy on the part of the party in power.

Through the whole debate it has become more and more apparent that those in charge of the bill have levied inconsistently a duty with an idea of protection here and with an idea of revenue there. The debate has also revealed, I think, to every one—probably not to the partisan eye, but in reality—that the bill is full of inconsistencies; that in some instances those who have made up the bill have put a duty upon the raw material and left the finished product free, and in other cases they have put a duty on the finished product and left the raw material free. We saw one notable instance in the case of ferromanganese, a product which is absolutely controlled by the Steel Trust, which is part of the raw material entering into a finished product. We saw steel made free and a duty put upon the trust-controlled ferromanganese.

If the debate has served any purpose at all, then, under this five-minute rule, it has been in developing anew the fact that in the framing and presentation of an omnibus tariff bill men can not know what they are doing, and do not know what they are doing.

At the conclusion of this bill there will come an opportunity for the submission of a motion to recommit. In all likelihood I will be precluded from offering that motion to recommit, unless there shall be a special rule allowing two motions to recommit. For that reason and believing as I do that Congress will never successfully revise the tariff justly in the United States unless the revision is schedule by schedule, preceded by data adduced by a scientific nonpartisan tariff commission, I propose, if I am precluded from the motion to recommit, to offer as an amendment to the administrative features of this bill a proposition for the creation of a tariff commission. My proposal is for a real tariff commission, not a sham-efficient or make-believe one, a proposition which will permit a body to exercise power and authority to investigate with thoroughness all factors involved, that it may reach out and get the facts, a power that the late tariff board did not have, a power that I do not think other measures offered give to proposed commissions; and I will now, with the permission of the House, include in my remarks this provision for a tariff commission, which I will offer later as an amendment, so that it may be printed in the RECORD and that all the Members may have a view of it.

It is as follows:

"SECTION V. (a) That there is hereby created a body to be known as the tariff commission, which shall consist of five commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person shall be eligible to serve as a member of said commission while holding any other public office of either honor or profit, either by election or appointment, or who is a Senator or Representative elect of the United States. Not more than three of said commissioners shall be members of the same political party. The commissioners first appointed under this act shall continue in office for the terms of 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 years, respectively, and from the first day of July, A. D. 1913, the term of each to be designated by the President, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 10 years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. Any commissioner may, after due hearing, be removed by the President upon proof of ineligibility or of any violation of any provision of this act, or for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. No vacancy in the commission shall impair the right of the remaining commissioners to exercise all the powers of the commission. Said commissioners shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. Each commissioner shall receive a salary of \$7,500 per year. The President shall designate a member of the commission to be chairman thereof during the term for which he is appointed. The commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum, and such other employees as it may find necessary to the proper performance of its duties and shall fix the salary or compensation of each. Three commissioners shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business as a commission.

"(b) That the principal office of the commission shall be in the city of Washington, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall furnish the commission with suitable offices and equipment thereof and with all necessary supplies. The commission shall, in addition, have full authority as a body by one or more of its members or through its employees, when so authorized by the commission, to conduct investigations at any other place or places, either in the United States or foreign countries, as the commission may determine. Said commission shall promulgate rules and regulations for the safekeeping of all papers, correspondence, tabulations, reports, explanations, and other information gathered by it. All of the expenses of the commission, including all necessary expenses for transportation incurred by the commissioners or by their employees under their orders, in making any investigation in any place other than in the city of Washington, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman of the commission.

"(c) That the commission shall have authority and power, and it is hereby directed to ascertain and tabulate for purposes of comparison the difference in the cost of producing articles of the same or similar quality and kind in this country and in actually or potentially competing foreign countries. The commission shall ascertain and tabulate for purposes of comparison where such tabulation is practicable in connection with the several articles covered by its reports in the United States, and in such foreign countries the wages, hours of service, and efficiency of labor employed and the standards of living of such laborers. The commission shall likewise ascertain the cost and selling prices of raw material, the cost of labor, the fixed charges, the depreciation upon the true value of the capital invested, and all other items entering into and determining the true cost and selling price of the finished product. The commission shall ascertain the market conditions and the prices at which protected products of the United States are sold in foreign countries, as compared with the prices of such products sold in the United States. The commission shall investigate the effect of transportation rates upon the markets and prices of dutiable products, and so far as pertinent to the tariffs fixed upon articles on the dutiable list the control of such markets and absence or presence of free competition in the same, and shall, pursuant to the purposes of this act in so far as practicable, investigate all questions and conditions relating to the agricultural, manufacturing, mining, commercial, and labor interests with reference to the tariff schedules and classifications of the United States and of foreign countries, and shall investigate the capitalization, industrial organization and efficiency, and the general competitive position in this country and abroad of industries seeking protection from Congress. The commission shall likewise investigate in general and in regard to particular articles the revenue-producing power of the tariff and its relation to the resources of government, and shall investigate the effect of tariffs both of the United States and of foreign countries on prices, on the operations of middle men, on the wages paid for labor, and on the purchasing power of the consumer. The commission shall also make investigation of any particular subject whenever directed by either House of Congress or the President of the United States. The commission shall have the power to call upon any of the existing departments or bureaus of the Government for information on file in such departments or bureaus which it may require in connection with the work which it is authorized to do by this act, and it shall be the duty of every such department or bureau of the Government to furnish such information on request from the commission. It shall be the duty of said commission to hold hearings from time to time at such places as it may designate to determine industrial, commercial, and labor conditions in relation to costs of production and effects and operations of the tariff schedules and classifications in force in the United States and in foreign countries. Such hearings shall be public, except as otherwise herein provided. The commission shall, whenever practicable, give at least 10 days' public notice of any and all such hearings, and at any such hearing any person may appear before said commission, subject to such reasonable limitation upon the amount of and duplication of testimony and arguments as may be provided by the rules of said commission, and be heard or may be represented by attorney and may file any written statement or documentary evidence bearing upon any matter which the commission may have under investigation. The commission may from time to time make or amend such general rules or orders as may be requisite for the orderly regulation of proceedings before it, including form of notices and the service thereof. Every vote and official act of the commission and of each member thereof shall be entered of record. Any of the members of the commission or its secretary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations and to sign notices.

"(d) That to assist the President in securing information as to the effect of tariff rates, restrictions, exactions, or any regulations imposed at any time by the United States or any foreign country upon the importation into or sale in the United States or any foreign country of the products affected, and as to any export bounty paid or export duty imposed or prohibition made by any country upon the exportation of any article to the United States which discriminates against the United States or the products thereof, and to assist the President in the application of the maximum and minimum tariffs and other administrative provisions of the customs laws and in obtaining information concerning the economic results of said laws, the commission shall from time to time make report as the President shall direct, and upon direction by the President shall draft a plan for scientific classification of schedules in aid of administration of the provisions of the customs laws.

"(e) That for the purposes of this act in the case of articles on the dutiable list, and such other articles as the commission may decide or may be directed to investigate, the said commission is authorized to require of any person, firm, copartnership, corporation, or association engaged in the production, importation, manufacture, or distribution of any such article or articles the production of all books, papers, contracts, agreements, invoices, inventories, bills, and documents of any such person, firm, copartnership, corporation, or association and make every inquiry necessary to a determination of the value of such property and necessary to accomplish the purposes for which said commission is created. In aid of its powers herein granted to secure information the commission shall have the power, whenever necessary for the purposes of its investigations, to prescribe and enforce uniform systems of accounting for protected industries, for manufacturers, and producers of commodities protected by import duties. The commission is authorized to require by notice the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers, contracts, agreements, inventories, invoices, bills, and documents relating to any matters pertaining to such investigation. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing, and witnesses shall receive the same fees as are paid in the Federal courts.

"(f) That the district courts of the United States, upon the application of the commission alleging a failure to comply with any order of the commission with relation to the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence, shall have jurisdiction to issue the necessary process or writs for the enforcement of the orders of the commission, and in case of disobedience to a subpoena the commission or a member thereof may invoke the aid of any one of the district courts of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents within the jurisdiction of such court within which an investigation or inquiry by the commission is being carried on. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person or corporation subject to the provisions of this act, any of the district courts of the United States having jurisdiction as herein provided may issue an order requiring such person or corporation to appear before the commission and produce books, documents, and other papers if so ordered and give evidence concerning the matter under investigation by the commission, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. The commission may also order testimony to be taken by deposition in any investigation and at any stage of such investigation. Such deposition may be taken before any person authorized so to do by the commission and who has power to administer oaths. Any person may be compelled to appear and depose and produce documentary evidence in the same manner as witnesses may be compelled to appear and testify and produce documentary evidence before the commission as hereinbefore provided. Such testimony shall be reduced to writing. No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, papers, documents, or other things before the commission or in obedience to the subpoena of the commission whether such subpoena be signed or issued by one or more of the commissioners or the secretary of the commission on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to criminate him or to subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no natural person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he may testify under oath or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, before said commission in obedience to a subpoena issued by it: *Provided*, That no person so testifying shall be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(g) In any investigation conducted by the commission as herein provided, the testimony of any witness in regard to secret processes or trade secrets not contrary to public policy shall not be reduced to writing, nor shall any documents of like character be copied into the records of investigations or otherwise made a part thereof, and for the purpose of obtaining such testimony or of examining such documents, and for such purposes alone, the commission shall have the power to hold secret sessions and take evidence thereat. All other testimony shall be reduced to writing and, with all other documentary evidence received, incorporated in the records of the commission for the guidance of the commission and for the use of the President and Congress as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That no evidence or information secured for the confidential use of the commission shall be made public in such a manner as to be available for the use of any business competitor or rival of the firm, copartnership, corporation, or association from whom or concerning whom such evidence or information was obtained; *And provided further*, That in case in any investigation authorized by this act the commission shall obtain evidence or information for its confidential use, the commission shall not be required to divulge the names of persons furnishing such evidence or information.

"(h) The commission shall make annual reports to Congress of its investigations and conclusions and such special reports as the President or either House of Congress may direct. The annual reports shall be published and ready for distribution on the first Monday of December of each year. Upon demand of either the President or either House of Congress the commission shall make a report of all testimony and information upon which its reports are based."

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, I was a little bit amused to hear the remarks of my colleague from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] on this particular point. This morning I picked up the Kansas City Star, which is a progressive paper of 300,000 circulation, circulating over four or five States in the central western country, circulating largely in the State of Kansas and in the district of my friend [Mr. MURDOCK], and a very strong supporter of that gentleman. All of us out in Kansas like Vic personally. He has good red corpuscles in his blood and good red hair on his head, and he is a good fellow; but it does not come with very good grace of him to make the remarks he has just made.

I want to read this editorial from the Kansas City Star, which has supported him on almost every proposition he has made. It reads thus:

THE PROGRESSIVES' CHANCE.

The Wilson administration is offering the country the only effective tariff revision in the interest of the whole people that it has had in 50 years.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

It would be a tremendous pity if the Progressives in Congress should go on record in opposition to this measure.

Undoubtedly, the bill is not perfect. There are some evident inequities in it. But these are of minor importance in comparison with the big achievements in behalf of the consumer, who hitherto has been ignored in tariff legislation.

The removal of the sugar duties and the heavy reductions in clothing, in building material, in steel, in chemicals—in fact, all along the line—show the extent to which the administration has freed itself from the powerful interests that hitherto have controlled. For the first time since the war the general welfare has been considered.

True, the revising has been done with an ax rather than with finer tools. But the—

Mr. MURDOCK. "The excrescences" is what I make that out to be.

Mr. HELVERING. This paper was folded just at that place.

But the excrescences that have grown up needed the ax. The finer trimming can be done later under the supervision of a tariff commission.

To insist that the relief now offered be withheld pending the investigations of a commission would play directly into the hands of the standpatters, who always are for anything that would cause delay.

A commission ought to be established later to supervise the adjustments that will be required. But just now the work in hand is to establish the tariff on a new basis in the interest of the country as a whole.

The Progressives in Congress are not in a position to do anything by themselves. Their only chance is to help whichever party is acting on behalf of the people. If they become mere carpenters and critics, they will seem to the country to be playing politics, with the final purpose of getting the jobs. By supporting Wilson at this time they will prove their unselfish devotion to the common good.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly interested during the progress of this debate in listening to the universal statement which seems to have come from the other side that the industries of this country are in a state bordering almost upon paralysis. We have had depicted before us lines of men reaching to soup houses and the opening of bread wagons, and so forth, and my interest, Mr. Chairman, has been greatly aroused in the news from the financial centers

of the country, when these statements which have been so generally made have reached these centers and have been circulated among the business men of the country. And so this morning I have collected here a few clippings from some of the papers which are of distinctly nonpartisan character; and certainly any opinions which bear on their face the evidence of nonpartisanship, about which we have heard so much during the progress of the debate, should commend itself to the judgment and consideration of this House.

The Review, issued by R. G. Dun Co., April 25, stated:

NEW YORK, April 25.

Dun's Review to-morrow will say:

"Notwithstanding the recent moderate reduction in trade and industrial activity, it is significant that confidence still prevails, and in the West and South a spirit of optimism is manifest as to the future—largely based upon the fine crop outlook for both cotton and wheat—which contrasts with the more conservative feeling that exists in eastern centers.

"The work of recovery from the effects of the midwestern floods is progressing, and this gives increasing relief to business. The tariff readjustment continues to inspire caution in the trade circles more immediately affected, but the end of uncertainty is meanwhile not far to see. Weather conditions are distinctly better, and this gives an impetus to building operations but also retail trade and real estate transfers.

"Money conditions are easier, both at home and abroad, and while there is some show of activity regarding the Balkan situation, international conditions, as a whole, are much less disturbing. Pig iron is somewhat more active but at lower prices. The iron and steel mills report business as fully up to normal. Textile lines show abatement in activity. Lumber is more active. Trade in anthracite coal is larger. Reports from the leading western and northwestern cities are very cheerful in tone, and the advent of more settled weather has resulted in larger retail activity."

An Associated Press dispatch says:

NEW YORK, April 26.

The past week has seen shrinkage in steel specifications. Some good business has been placed, however. Three thousand additional freight cars for the Grand Trunk and 1,000 steel underframe cars for the Seaboard were ordered. Some good bridge business is under consideration. Conditions in the steel trade, as a whole, are more normal. Premiums are disappearing. Steel men claim that when the tariff is settled a fresh impetus will be given to business.

The outlook for pig iron is better. There is more inquiry and prices are firmer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not to judge by these reports that business improvement is altogether confined to the northwest and western districts of this country, but it has even reached the city of Philadelphia, which is probably the last city in the United States that would feel the impetus of business activity. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The Franklin National Bank, of Philadelphia, in its monthly circular on business and trade conditions, says in part:

With business generally so active and money so well employed that none is available for the financing of new concerns or for stock exchange operations, there should be little room for complaint in manufacturing and mercantile lines. Prospective tariff reduction is holding back some lines, but the total volume of business is far above the average for this season. Some declines in imports and in manufactures will be apparent until the tariff bill has been disposed of. If the matter is properly handled by Congress, there need be no upsetting of business, and the effects of such tariff reductions as may be made will soon be dissipated in the increasing business which will naturally result.

Mr. Chairman, not only is this condition of business prosperity not confined to the eastern and the western part of the country, but we find it is general throughout the entire country. The Secretary of Commerce and Labor has just issued a statement in which he says:

The United States has been exporting merchandise at the rate of almost \$7,000,000 a day so far this year, as shown by figures announced by the Department of Commerce yesterday. The imports have exceeded \$5,000,000 a day. The statistics are for the first nine months of the fiscal year.

Great Britain has bought on an average \$1,750,000 worth of goods every day, and Canada and Germany each have bought about \$1,000,000 worth a day. The fourth best customer was France, whose purchases in the nine months were \$120,786,314.

The total outgoing and incoming trade of the country this year, it is estimated, will reach \$4,100,000,000. This would be an increase of 13.5 per cent over 1912.

"The figures," said Secretary Redfield, "for the entire nine months are such as to give just pride to every American. Out of total transactions of \$3,300,000,000, there is a balance in our favor of a little over \$500,000,000."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish these gentlemen on the other side would come out of the cave of Adullam in which they have been lingering for the past week, and see that the clouds of prosperity are all touched with a golden lining, and that the business people of the country have nothing to fear; that they are only impatient that you gentleman will limit the material that you are getting out for home consumption, which appears in the RECORD, and give the business interests of the country a chance to recuperate.

I read from the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 2, an organ entirely devoted to the interests of protection, that our distinguished friend on the other side, the gentleman from Phila-

delphia [Mr. MOORE] has had himself interviewed in this paper. It says:

OPPOSITION TO END.

To-night there were indications that Republican leaders would not undertake to delay the passage of the bill much longer. Representative MOORE, of Pennsylvania, who has been active in offering minority amendments, voiced this view. He said the Republicans would not attempt to filibuster, and that they had been "hammering away at the Underwood bill for four days without making a single dent in it."

The fact that many who claim their business is affected are asking the Republicans to hasten matters in order that they may "readjust their affairs" is said to be partly responsible for the minority attitude.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

So it seems to me my friends on the other side are between the devil and the deep sea. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it comes pretty near being between the devil and the deep sea to be between prosperity and the Democratic legislation. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] announced that he proposed, if opportunity presented itself, to offer an amendment providing for a tariff commission. I take it that the amendment that he has prepared is in substance the bill introduced by various gentlemen on this side of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and myself, and recommended by the Republican caucus. We welcome eleventh-hour converts to a tariff commission. [Applause on the Republican side.]

When in the last session of Congress the Republicans offered a motion to recommit the wool bill, directing the Committee on Ways and Means to bring in a reported bill in accordance with the Tariff Board report when made, the gentleman from Kansas voted against a bill to be founded on the Tariff Board report. When in the last Congress the Republicans offered a motion to recommit the metal-schedule bill to await the report of the Tariff Board, the gentleman from Kansas voted against the motion to recommit to await the Tariff Board report. At the same Congress the gentleman at the first session voted to pass the wool bill notwithstanding there had been no Tariff Board report. He voted to pass the sugar-schedule bill, although there had been no Tariff Board report. He voted to pass the so-called free-list bill without waiting for a Tariff Board report. At the second session of the Congress he voted to pass the wool bill without waiting for a Tariff Board report, and he voted to pass the metal bill without waiting for a Tariff Board report. He did not vote on the motion to recommit on the cotton schedule, or on the passage of the bill, probably because he was not here. He voted to pass these bills over the veto of the President, although the President vetoed the bills upon the ground that before bills were passed the tariff commission or the Tariff Board should ascertain the facts and lay them before the Congress. On no occasion when votes have been taken in the House has the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] stood for a tariff board report or a tariff commission report until he has been commissioned by Col. Roosevelt to say that we ought to have a tariff commission. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

228. Almonds, not shelled, 3 cents per pound; clear almonds, shelled, 4 cents per pound; apricot and peach kernels, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 56, line 22, strike out the word "clear."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the Democratic side of the House to the fact that this is a committee amendment offered from their side. I do it for the reason that occasionally during consideration of this bill under the five-minute rule it has not always been understood upon the Democratic side that an amendment has been offered by their side. When the chemical schedule was under consideration I remember that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] offered an amendment. A number of gentlemen upon that side of the aisle voted "no." I stepped across the aisle and suggested they were committing treason by voting against their committee. "Why," they said, "we thought that amendment was being offered from the Republican side." [Laughter.] So I simply rise to say that, of course, this amendment must receive the vote of every one of the gentlemen upon that side of the aisle because it is offered by the Democrats, although the same amendment, identical in form, might be offered by the Republicans, and every one of them would vote against it. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of this amendment I might further add to what the gentleman has just

stated that it ought to receive all the votes of the Republican side, but it probably will not receive any. The word "clear" was in the Payne bill, and we are striking it out because we are attempting to correct all of these absurdities in the Payne bill. No one has ever been able to determine, so far as the Treasury Department is concerned, what the word "clear" was put there for. Sometimes they have interpreted it to mean that the almonds must be free from dirt or something of that kind. If that is not it, they do not know what it is. All the experts on the tariff have been unable to determine why the word "clear" was put there in this particular clause. We are striking it out at the recommendation of the Treasury officials and because we find it ought not to be there. I suppose all the gentlemen on the Republican side will vote against it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we have some sense. We vote for good amendments.

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it was necessary for the gentleman who has just spoken to explain a very important amendment that was offered by him, because it would go through without that explanation. Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely impossible to frame a tariff bill or to frame any measure of any character unless there is some system connected with it. There is absolutely no system connected with the preparation of the tariff bill that this House has before it. They talk about experts, but surely no experts in all the world can lay before a Ways and Means Committee in three weeks all of the information about all of the products of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.] When it took the Government of Germany five years, with 200 experts, to frame a tariff bill, surely it ought to take our Democratic brethren at least two months to do the same thing. I heartily concur in what has been said by the Progressive leader and by the Republican leader with reference to a tariff commission. I heartily favor that; but we are to have no chance for that, because a secret Democratic caucus has decreed against it. I say that this bill that is offered to the American people is a hodgepodge of inconsistencies, just the same as was the Wilson-Gorman bill, because it was framed in the same way.

And the Wilson-Gorman bill, passed by a Democratic Congress, is the law that the only Democratic President that we have had for 40 years pronounced to be a perfidy and a disgrace.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. I have not the time; no, sir. Mr. Chairman, the trouble in the Democratic Party is that they have to make an issue out of something. They say that the people have demanded a reduction of rates, but the people of this country never have demanded and never will demand that American industries be shut down and American laboring men thrown out of employment all for the sake of this so-called free competition and free trade. The American people believe in Americans first and foreigners afterwards, and when they have a chance to express their opinion upon this bill, that is now being pushed through this House by order of a Democratic President and the Democratic floor leader, the gentlemen on the other side will find out that the people believe, as they have always believed, in the protection of American industries. Mr. Chairman, the great trouble, especially in the southern section of this country, is that they are still fighting the issues of 40 or 50 years ago.

SEVERAL MEMBERS (on the Democratic side). Oh, no.

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. You gentlemen from the South know full well that it is to the best interest of the great Southland, and I speak as a Southerner, that they have protection of American industries in the South. You know that if you would cast aside the feeling you have that you should vote the way your grandfathers voted you would come up here solidly and vote for protection for southern products. [Applause on the Republican side.] Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe that after this is over and this bill has been passed and the dire results thereof have followed that when you get a chance to vote next time, gentlemen on the other side, if you ever do again, you will vote for protection to American industries, American labor, and American homes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on this paragraph and all pending amendments in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to close debate on this paragraph and all pending amendments in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from California is very much interested in almonds.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has not the gentleman an amendment pending?

Mr. HAYES. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all pending amendments close in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have just listened to the talk of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moss], who, I understand, is evidently a very new and a very fresh Member of this House. [Laughter and applause.] He talks about protection to American labor. He comes from the State of West Virginia, I understand, which is a coal-mining State, and under Republican policies they have protected American workmen to such an extent that West Virginia is now filled with foreigners, competing against the American workmen in the coal mines, and there has been a strike in the West Virginia coal mines for the last 12 months. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican policy now is, and has always been, to compel the American workman to pay the very highest protection prices for everything that he consumes, while the people who compete against him are brought from the slums of Europe into a free-trade market. Mr. Chairman, under Republican rule there were more strikes under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt than there ever had been in the history of this country until President Taft took charge of the administration, and the strikes were so frequent that absolutely the Bureau of Labor could not keep an account of how many there were. [Laughter.] And it is impossible at this time to get from the Department of Labor the number of strikes that took place under the administration of Mr. Taft. Mr. Chairman, the other day I heard the hairless wonder from Michigan [laughter]—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Who is he?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. FORDNEY [laughter]—tell about the bank accounts that the working people of this country had. You go to the hearings of the people in this town in Massachusetts, Lawrence, who were down here last year, and you saw them, and they testified before that committee that they did not have meat to eat over once a week. You saw a few days ago—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I always yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is the Democratic Party opposed to the employment of children in our industries?

Mr. THOMAS. I am opposed to the employment of all children under 16 years of age.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is it not true that the most flagrant violation of the rights of children in this country has been in those States in which the Democratic Party has been in absolute control for 50 years?

[Cries of "No" on the Democratic side.]

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman name the States?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. South Carolina and Georgia—

Mr. BARTLETT. That is not true about Georgia.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Alabama. Call the roll of States in which the Democratic Party has been longest in power and you will include them all.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. THOMAS. Wait a minute. Sit down. [Laughter.] The conditions in Georgia and Alabama may be bad, but the working people down there have meat to eat more than once a week, which they do not have in Lawrence, Mass. And in Michigan—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. And they do not have to pay for their drinking water. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. [Laughter.] I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. RAINEY. I will have to object.

Mr. MANN. An agreement was made a few moments ago to close debate in 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] has used 5 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] is to have 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. HAYES. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question, then, is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 56, line 22, by striking out the figure "3" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "4"; also by striking out, in line 23, same page, the figure "4" and inserting the figure "5."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, this bill reduces the tariff upon almonds, shelled and unshelled, 1 cent a pound. My amendment would maintain the present rate. Now, almonds are a luxury. I think the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle will admit that. They are not a necessity. There were imported last year 17,000,000 pounds of almonds, both shelled and unshelled, or thereabouts. So that it is apparent that the present tariff is a competitive tariff, and I should hope sufficiently competitive to satisfy the gentlemen who are the sponsors for this bill. I might point out further, Mr. Chairman, that the extra cent a pound would come in very handy, perhaps, if my amendment should prevail, in assisting the Government in discharging its obligations. And so, upon a Democratic basis, I do not see how our friends upon the other side can fail to vote for this amendment. The present rates are competitive. The article is a luxury, and the increase of 1 cent per pound will increase the revenue on imported almonds \$170,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

229. Filberts and walnuts of all kinds, not shelled, 2 cents per pound; shelled, 4 cents per pound.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 57, line 1, by striking out the figure "2" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "3"; and also by striking out the figure "4," line 2, same page, and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "5."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, like the former amendment, the purpose of this one is to restore the tariff on walnuts and filberts, shelled and unshelled, to the rates in the present law. The conditions are exactly similar as stated by me in regard to almonds. Last year the importations of walnuts and filberts were something like 34,000,000 pounds. The people of California are producing perhaps half of the walnuts that are consumed in this country. We have facilities for producing all, and in time to come—and in the near future if the present rates can be continued and the present conditions maintained—we shall be able to produce all the walnuts that are consumed in this country. But now the present tariff is competitive. As I say, 34,000,000 pounds were imported last year. Walnuts are not a necessity; they are a luxury, and the increased revenue that would come in on 34,000,000 pounds of walnuts and filberts would be no inconsiderable amount. On last year's importations it would amount to \$340,000.

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HAYES. I will.

Mr. SHARP. How many States are there in which you can produce these walnuts?

Mr. HAYES. I know of no State in this country except California.

Mr. SHARP. But do you think it would be just for the large mass of the American people living east of the Mississippi River, and especially living far east of the Mississippi River, to be compelled to pay the freight on the walnuts shipped from California, when they can be got at somewhat of a reduction very much more easily from abroad?

Mr. HAYES. Why, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's suggestion would destroy all of this schedule and every other schedule where there is any competition.

Mr. SHARP. I will ask the gentleman another question, if I may. Is it not true that immediately after the rate on lemons was raised in the Payne-Aldrich bill the railroads commenced to raise the freight on that product?

Mr. HAYES. It is not true, Mr. Chairman; but it is true that the railroads undertook to get 15 of the 50 cents that was added to the tariff on lemons. It is also true that the lemon growers resisted that attempt, and the matter was brought before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission refused to allow the railroads to increase the rate, holding that the present rates were reasonable and sufficiently remunerative. Those are the facts.

Now, so far as walnuts are concerned, as I said, there is no place except in California that I know of where they can be raised; and just the same argument that the gentleman from Ohio has advanced will apply to everything that a tariff is

levied upon. It is no great injustice nor hardship that the people who can afford to spend their money for imported walnuts or filberts should be asked to help, to the extent of 1 cent a pound additional, to defray the running expenses of the Government of the United States. I can not think of any place where it would be better placed than upon a luxury of this kind, and I do not think my friend from Ohio can. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

230. Peanuts or ground beans, unshelled, $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 cent per pound; shelled, $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have the Clerk read that so as to have the change made on line 3 as well as line 4, so that both " $\frac{3}{4}$ of" and " $\frac{1}{2}$ of" would be stricken out, thus fixing the rate at 1 cent per pound.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, line 4, after the word "shelled," strike out " $\frac{3}{4}$ of."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment was not reported in full. As the amendment was reported, it only proposes to strike out certain figures in the bill.

Mr. MOORE. I want to strike out " $\frac{3}{4}$ of" in line 3 and " $\frac{1}{2}$ of" in line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, line 3, after the word "unshelled," strike out " $\frac{3}{4}$ of," and in line 4 strike out " $\frac{1}{2}$ of."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I presume "the wish is father to the thought" in the mind of every true Representative of the Old Dominion who happens to be on this floor. The people of Virginia, who are very largely engaged in peanut culture, are desirous of having a protection upon their industry, and from my point of view it is not only fair but entirely consistent that a protectionist coming from outside of Virginia should stand by the real, true interests of Virginia that are looking to their own progress and welfare.

I am informed that peanuts, of which we are very large consumers in my section of the country, can be brought in from Japan, over the seas, up to the Allegheny Mountains, almost to the very borderland of Virginia, as cheaply as the people of Virginia, the tillers of the soil, the horny-fisted representatives of that fine old State, can send this product of their soil out to the city of Chicago.

If this is true, the peanut raisers of Virginia suffer a very great disadvantage in competition with the cheap peanut-raising industry of Japan.

I listened a little while ago to my friend from California [Mr. STEPHENS] making his delightful preachment in defense of the lemon duty for California, and I heard him say the woolen and cotton duties might be revised—willing to cut the woolen and cotton industries, but holding to the duty on lemons.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Not now.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. What the gentleman says is not in accordance with what I said at all.

Mr. MOORE. I want to make my statement. If the gentleman does not agree to it, he can take it up in his own time. I am simply calling attention to this inconsistency. It was the kind of philosophy that defeated the Republican Party in the last campaign.

But I want to return to Virginia peanuts and to say I know that I voice the hearts, the minds, the disposition, the inclination, the hope, and the expectation of all true Virginians when I ask for an increase in the duty on peanuts from three-quarters of a cent a pound to 1 cent a pound. The Virginia peanut ought to be protected. [Applause.] It suffers from a competition that is unfair, and if the Virginia peanut is not protected against its cheap Japanese competitor, now menacing it from across the Pacific, the Virginia peanut raiser may have to go out of business. If he will not speak on this floor, I am going to do it for him, even though it offends some of my own peanut consumers in the city of Philadelphia who pay 5 cents a bag, which seems somewhat exorbitant, since they have reduced the quantity that goes into the bag.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MOORE. Will you speak for Virginia?

Mr. GOULDEN. You will find out when I ask my question. Why does the gentleman speak for a higher duty on peanuts, that he says are of such great use and benefit to his own people? Why does he defend an interest of the people of Virginia instead of caring for his own people? I never knew the gentleman to do that before.

Mr. MOORE. Why, I have seen the gentleman on a ferry-boat, on his way from New York to Philadelphia, and on the railroad train, eating peanuts all the way, and I know he is a friend of the peanut.

Mr. GOULDEN. Certainly; but that was because they were cheap and good. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if I caught aright the remarks of the bewhiskered gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], he stated that this debate would be closed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] and by myself, in which I would say nothing. Now, I do not like to give advice to Republicans, but you know about this season of the year the dogwood blossoms are in bloom, and that is when we shear sheep, and I would advise the gentleman from Illinois to get shaved. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] talks about Members of this House taking up time. I presume I have taken up about as little time as almost any Member of this Congress who has been here as long as I have, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has filled volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with mixed metaphors and insipid nothingness. [Laughter.] I do not know what he has cost this Government, and it would take an expert to make the calculation, but I presume he has cost it \$10,000,000 since he has been rattling around over on that side of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NORTON. Is this a continuation of that moonshine debate of last night? [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. What did he say? He said nothing. He may have attempted to say something, but did not do it.

Mr. LANGLEY. If my colleague, who evidently did not understand the gentleman's question, will permit, I will state that so far as my colleague and I are concerned the moonshine incident is closed. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. What did the gentleman from Kentucky say? My colleague from Kentucky seems to have moonshine on the brain.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, if that is so, it is the only place where any of it has been deposited. Of course it is on my mind, because it has been mentioned a good many times lately.

Mr. THOMAS. And he seems to be replenishing the supply.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman does not need any replenishing.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal from these Republicans here about the secret caucus of the Democrats, because, as we had a right to do, we acted in the interest of political unity. Why did they object to a secret caucus? Because they think we might do something like they would have done if they had had the opportunity. I have heard here the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], the gentleman who sports the sunset locks. [Laughter.] I have heard a great deal from him about this secret caucus. He had a caucus of 13 members—that was enough to condemn it, 13 members—and two days before that caucus met it was stated in the papers in this city that this alleged so-called Progressive Party, which is nothing but a patent medicine advertising scheme [great laughter], would meet and elect Mr. MURDOCK Speaker. Now, I wonder how they knew that two days beforehand if there had not been some secret meeting or secret caucus between Mr. MURDOCK and these other 12 members of this alleged Progressive Party in secret caucus somewhere? [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

231. Nuts of all kinds, shelled or unshelled, not specially provided for in this section, 1 cent per pound; but no allowance shall be made for dirt or other impurities in nuts of any kind, shelled or unshelled.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentlemen of the committee if they have any amendments to offer to this paragraph. I am informed not. The gentleman from Illinois, on a preceding paragraph, moved to strike out the word "clear" with reference to almonds, and said it was a blunder. Evidently he did not know that clear almonds was in the law, and had been for

a good many years. In 1909 a question arose about dirt in nuts, and we went to work before the bill was prepared and had a Treasury expert to aid us in that way. That expert suggested an addition to this paragraph that was not in the previous law, "but no allowance shall be made for dirt or impurities in nuts of any kind, shelled or unshelled." That was the amendment we put in the law, and these gentlemen do not see fit to change it, and it is well they do not for the customs court held under it the construction that the gentleman claims would be the law if you strike out the word "clear." It was a microscopic mind that went before the general appraisers and before the customs court to try to show that the additional language which we put in for a safeguard had anything to do with the rate of duties on almonds. The customs court held that shelled almonds, if they did have some dirt in them, was subject to the higher rate of duty under the law.

Every paragraph that we find as we proceed in this bill generally shows the wisdom of the committee and of the House that passed the present tariff law. There are some things in it that we have criticized that are open to criticism. They have adopted even the new language that we put in this paragraph, and they have adopted language of ours right through the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

233. Extract of meat, not specially provided for in this section, 15 cents per pound; fluid extract of meat, 7 cents per pound, but the dutiable weight of the extract of meat and of the fluid extract of meat shall not include the weight of the packages in which the same is imported.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to a paragraph that has been passed. It is an amendment in regard to fresh fish.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We passed the fish paragraph some time ago, and I can not consent to go back.

The Clerk read as follows:

234. Poultry, live, 1 cent per pound; dead, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 57, line 16, after the word "live," strike out "one" and insert "three," and after the word "dead" strike out "two" and insert "five."

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, my genial friend and colleague from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] seems to have the impression that moonshine is the chief product of the district I have the honor to represent. I do not know whether the wish is father to the thought or not, but I beg to assure my associates here that it is not the chief product by any means of that district or of our State.

Mr. BUTLER. What is moonshine?

Mr. LANGLEY. I refer the gentleman to my colleague. He probably knows. There are many important industries in the tenth Kentucky district, and among them is the chicken industry. We raise, consume, and sell a good many chickens in that district, not only hens, but spring chickens and roosters, and all classes of fowls, and, as I said yesterday, we have a flourishing egg industry also.

I feel that this provision in the Underwood bill reducing the tariff so radically on chickens dead and living would be an injustice to my district because, if you Democrats are going to reduce the price of chickens and eggs, you will seriously cripple that important industry. For that reason I have offered this amendment to restore the rates provided by the existing law.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, at a late hour last night I attempted to get the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], with regard to the effect which this bill would have upon the consumers of the country, but I was unable to elicit any information from him at all. He appeared very weary, but this morning he seems refreshed, looks intelligent, and several times has shown indication of giving the House some information. I will now ask him how much of a reduction will the ultimate consumer receive in the way of lower prices on poultry, if this provision shall be enacted into law?

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Iowa gets through I will reply to him in my own time.

Mr. GOOD. Can the gentleman tell me how many cents per pound of reduction this proposed duty will effect? This statement which I have in my hand contains 13 items in which the gentleman says the Payne law increased the price from 100 to 200 per cent on meat products. On eight of those meat products the Payne law reduced the duty 25 per cent. If a reduction in the Payne law of 25 per cent on meat products, according to the gentleman's theory, is followed by an increase from 100 to 200 per cent, how much of a reduction now will we have on poultry with this little reduction in the price?

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly yield to the gentleman from Philadelphia.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman from Iowa think seriously for a moment that it was the real purpose of the Democratic Party in the last campaign, during which orators penetrated the gentleman's district, to reduce the cost of living? Did they not only want to tell the people about it?

Mr. GOOD. This circular that was circulated in the cities, but very carefully concealed from the farmers, did promise a great reduction, and it promised, as far as farm produce was concerned, that we would return to the prices of 1896. I will ask the gentleman if he believes that we should return to the prices of farm products in 1896? [After a pause.] I am speaking to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I just told the gentleman that when he gets through I will answer him in my own time.

Mr. GOOD. But is the gentleman willing to return to the prices that prevailed for farm produce in 1896, in the interest of the American consumer?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to get the attitude of the gentleman from Iowa. Does the gentleman indorse—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield for an answer to my question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Does the gentleman indorse the Payne tariff law? [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. I yield for an answer to my question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would like the people in Iowa to understand the gentleman's attitude toward the Payne law.

Mr. GOOD. I stand for the duties that are levied in the Payne tariff law as against those levied in this bill ten times over.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Does the gentleman indorse the Payne tariff law?

Mr. GOOD. There are things in the Payne tariff law that ought to be changed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What are they?

Mr. GOOD. A great many schedules ought to be changed, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has offered amendments greatly reducing the duties of the Payne law in the cotton schedule and in the woolen schedule. Some of the duties in the agricultural schedules should be reduced, but we should not attempt this great slaughter of this industry of agriculture, the greatest industry in all the world. You said in this circular that you would return to the prices of 1896. Is the gentleman in favor now of enacting a law that will bring into effect the prices that prevailed for farm produce in 1896?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; because those conditions were brought about by a previous Republican administration.

Mr. GOOD. Why did you permit the great Democratic Party to circulate that infamous statement? That statement is not based on a single fact, and yet it is a political document upon which Members in cities on the gentleman's side of the House obtained seats in this Chamber.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, for a day or two I have submitted in silence to the observations of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that I do not know how much we will be able to reduce the cost of living in this country, but I do know that during the period of the real supremacy of the Republican Party in this country, extending from 1896 down to the present time, they have done nothing in that direction. I know that during all of that period of time the cost of living in this country has been getting higher and higher until all kinds of meat are practically banished now from the tables of the poor; and I know that the gentleman from Iowa, who sits here in this House representing a great district in that State, does not render to the Democratic side the slightest assistance in bringing down the cost of the market basket. On the other hand, on every occasion in this House when an item came up for consideration looking toward lowering tariff taxes, looking toward fewer hungry children in the cities of this country, he has been found voting against it.

Tell me that the farmers of his district, the courageous descendants of the brave men who in the old days came down the long forest avenues in oxcarts, came down our rivers in flatboats, and came across to the State of Iowa—

Mr. GOOD rose.

Mr. RAINEY. I can not yield now. Tell me that they do not feel strong enough, as strong as their ancestors, to do the things that are right. Tell me they are not courageous enough to be in favor of giving the hungry men, the hungry women, and the hungry children of our great cities a cheaper breakfast table, a cheaper market basket? Do the men who live there in his district propose to keep up the tariff walls around their products in order that they can get higher prices and listen to the cry of hunger that comes from our cities—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. RAINEY. I can not yield.

Mr. GOOD. Just a question.

Mr. RAINEY. No; I will not yield, I have not the time. Does the gentleman represent constituents that are so cowardly that they brush aside such cries as that; will they approve the position taken by their Representative here? I will undertake to say that throughout this broad land from the east to the west, from the north down through the magnolia section of our country to the southern gulf, you can not find many men who will argue as the gentleman does in favor of keeping up the price of bread at the expense of—what? At the expense of the developing muscles, sinews, brains of the coming generation; at the expense of the hunger and suffering of our people who live in the towns and in our great cities. No; we are doing what we can to relieve these conditions. The gentleman from Iowa is doing what he can to keep from relieving such conditions as these. Why, I can not answer the questions of the gentleman from Iowa, the silly questions, the tiresome questions he propounds to me upon this floor. They belong to the same category as the old inquiry, "How old is Ann?" which everybody has been discussing so long. Why, the gentleman comes into this House this morning with a tired expression upon his face. All night long he dreamed about a circular that was at one time—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

235. Chicory root, raw, dried, or undried, but unground, 1 cent per pound; chicory root, burnt or roasted, ground or granulated, or in rolls, or otherwise prepared, and not specially provided for in this section, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable said about just how much the producers would lose by reason of this bill. I want to read something authoritative from a Democratic standpoint. I read from a pamphlet, on page 5—I will announce the document later—as follows:

Estimated value of consumption and estimated saving to consumers which have resulted from the enactment of the free-list bill—

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman is not talking to the question of chicory roots, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. SLOAN. I will endeavor so to do. Chicory roots, and so forth, are food products and come under the same rule as any other food products, and my statements will conform to that rule. The pamphlet says:

Fresh and preserved meats, estimated consumption, \$615,000,000; estimated saving, \$66,759,000.

Sixty-six million dollars lost to the farmers of the West, who produce more than their sections consume.

Flour and grist, cereals and bread, estimated consumption, \$665,000,000; estimated saving, \$75,677,000.

Or a total loss, largely to the Northwest, of \$142,336,000, as given out here.

Mr. DONOVAN. A point of order.

Mr. SLOAN (reading)—

These figures indicate that the value of the articles included in the free-list bill consumed in this country during a year amount to \$2,760,000,000, assuming that the tariff is effective in increasing prices to the extent of one-half of the rate of duty.

Who is the author? I read from this pamphlet. It is headed "Underwood's marvelous record as a majority leader" in the National House of Representatives, and gives a review of his work, and then in front is this splendid picture of a splendid man [applause], who appears suave, urbane, and strong, with a form of steel incased in an armor of velvet, the repository of the consciences of every Member on that side of the House, as he stated the other night when saying the individuality of the Members on that side of the House is surrendered and left to the "wisdom and cohesive strength of a great party," of which he is the all-powerful leader. And beneath that picture is this printed inscription:

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, Democracy's best asset.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

And I wondered why the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] in charge of this schedule, with thousands of these documents within his reach, did not answer the question and say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] how much he believed the change would be.

Oh, no; we are discussing the agricultural schedule now, and you do not want to make an estimate now lest the farmers would hear it and demand that their Representatives forsake their caucus and stand up for the interests of the districts which send them here. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee within the last hour said that it was difficult to make any reasonable estimate of how much a reduction in price it would be—probably quite infinitesimal on many of these things. I say this so that the producers of this country will know precisely what the philosophy of this bill is, namely, to cut from the prices of their products half the stated rate of revenue. This is the doctrine the author of this bill announced in the East and South when he was running for the presidential nomination. In this day of fulfillment he does not want to look the farmers in the face and say "My bill will cut down the prices of your meats and cereals, practically all you raise, about 12 per cent." That would make a loss of several millions to the farmers and stockmen of my district.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close all debate on this paragraph.

The motion 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:

Strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"236. Unsweetened chocolate and cocoa, prepared or manufactured, not specially provided for in this section, 8 per cent ad valorem. Sweetened chocolate and cocoa, prepared or manufactured, not specially provided for in this section, valued at 15 cents per pound or less, 2 cents per pound; valued at more than 15 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem. The weight and the value of the immediate coverings, other than the outer packing case or other covering, shall be included in the dutiable weight and the value of the merchandise."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what that change affects?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; this change affects the sweetened chocolate and cocoa. A large amount of sweet chocolate and cocoa comes in here which is really a confection, and it comes wrapped in tin-foil paper and embossed paper and goes on the market as a confection. The only change we make here by this amendment is to leave the unsweetened variety at the rate we have fixed in this bill and give the sweetened variety the confectionery rate.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the higher rate that you give them?

Mr. RAINEY. The higher rate is that if it is valued at 15 cents per pound or less, 2 cents per pound; valued at more than 15 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is the prepared chocolate which comes in, namely, Swiss chocolate and other kinds?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; if it is sweetened. If it is manufactured and sweetened we give it this higher rate.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. In the original bill, H. R. 10, coconuts were on the dutiable list?

Mr. RAINEY. They have now been placed on the free list.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question? I have a telegram here about sweetened chocolate. You say you increase by this amendment now proposed the duty on sweetened chocolate?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORDNEY. To what rate?

Mr. RAINEY. To the confectionery rate in our bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose this increase is made because of the mistake of putting the high rate on copra, from which cocoa is manufactured?

Mr. RAINEY. This change is made in order to make the bill harmonious.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; that is an answer to my question in the affirmative, to make the bill harmonious.

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; to balance the bill and make it harmonious.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I have taken a little time to examine the 40 or 50 paragraphs, enumerating something like 60 different articles produced by the farmer, and I notice that the reduction is anywhere from 20 per cent to 100 per cent. In some cases all the duty is taken off and the articles are placed on the free list.

Now, I think that this schedule exemplifies better than any other schedule that I have noticed the theory upon which this bill was written, the theory that was announced by the distinguished leader of the majority on the opening of the debate, and uttered and reiterated often by other Members on the other side of the House, namely, that the purpose of this bill is not to protect anything, but that it is for the purpose of raising revenue and for the benefit of the consumer and not for the producer.

I take it that there is not any doubt on the part of the majority or the minority that the purpose of this bill is looking theoretically to the consumer instead of to the producer, and I think that that is distinctly a wrong principle of legislation. It is not because I happen to be on this side of the House, but because I think it is necessary for you to look to the interests of the man who produces the article to be consumed before it is possible to have any consumption; in other words, that you can not hope to consume anything until you have produced it.

Now, this schedule applies surely to the producer as no other schedule does, for the farmer in this country is the producer. He tills the soil. He produces the food to feed the race. He produces the clothing to clothe the race. He furnishes the necessaries of life to keep up the race. The American farmer produces in a single year, according to the figures of the Secretary of Agriculture, in his report, food products to the value of nearly \$9,000,000,000 worth.

This is the fruit of the producer under our scientific methods of production to-day, and I am going to ask the gentlemen on that side of the House what is the meaning of all the expenditure of money on the increase of production on the farm, where you make 1 acre produce double what it once produced, or quadruple what it once produced? What was the purpose of the expenditure of money for garden and field, for laboratory and experiment station, if it was not for the purpose of discovering better methods of production? And I am asking you what is the purpose of legislation if it is not to increase the ability of production? Whenever you look simply to the consumer, without regard to the producer, you are playing the city against the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And what do you do, and why do you do it? Is it possible that there are more votes in the city than in the country? I do not want to charge that, but, notwithstanding, there seems to be some truth in that suspicion.

You say you will reduce the cost of living. Gentlemen, I want to say that you do not reduce the price of living by reducing the protection accorded to the farmer. You reduce the price to the farmer of the article he sells; but are you sure that the consumer who ultimately consumes will get the product any cheaper than before? [Applause on the Republican side.]

You took the tariff off of hides and promised cheap shoes, but shoes have gone up in price. You now take the tariff off of sugar. Sugar will take wings as soon as the price is under the control of an importer. You take the tariff off of wool for the sake of cheap clothing. Watch the process of price reduction. You take the tariff off of flour in order to cheapen the price and give free bread. You thereby feed the flour mills of Canada at the frightful expense of our own mills, to the great advantage of foreign mills, which, when they have accomplished their purpose, can put up the price of flour as in the case of sugar.

There is one almost certain way this bill will reduce the price of foodstuffs. When the effect of this elaborate and skillfully planned assault upon the industries of the country, where existence seems to be an offense, oft expressed by various Members on the other side of this Chamber, when the inevitable crippling of these industries shall displace thousands of laborers or greatly reduce their wages by either an actual cut or reduction of time, thus reducing the greatest factor of consumption in this country, then prices will come down—not because of more production, but because of the destruction of the ability to consume. Here is the viciousness of this proposed legislation. The advocates of this bill openly assail every man who resents the assault upon the business of the country with the charge that he favors the special interests as against the people. This tone has dominated this debate from the very opening day. When we plead for the maintenance of the integrity of business, that our capital may employ labor and thus continue the prosperity now so general, we are met with the open charge that we plead the cause of special interests, while they stand for the consumer—the mass of the people. This is mere claptrap.

Who is the consumer? What does he want? His greatest desire is to be secure in his ability to secure what he needs. This ability is found in a system that concerns itself with the common interests of both the producer and the consumer, not a policy that blindly stifles production in the belief that by so doing it will assist consumption. This Nation will denounce in no uncertain tones any legislation directed against the farmer, the chief producer of the country.

I am bombarded with telegrams and letters of protest against this treatment of the farmer, not only from farmers, but from chambers of commerce, business clubs, and officers of commercial associations. I wish to append a telegram from the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, April 30, 1913.

Hon. S. D. FESS,
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.

Also, a telegram from business men in Springfield, one of the best cities in the country, and in as prosperous an agricultural region as is found in the United States:

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, May 1, 1913.

Hon. S. D. FESS,
Care House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your tariff speech to Congress. Every word is absolutely true regarding Ohio, also the whole country. The Underwood tariff bill is a great injury to farmers. Unless this bill is amended making the duty on foreign flour and wheat products equal the American farmers will lose millions of dollars, and eventually be forced out of growing wheat.

E. H. KELLY.
E. O. BOWMAN.
JNO W. BURKE.

Here is a letter from one of the leading millers of the State. They all tell the same story:

OSBORNE, OHIO, April 28, 1913.

Hon. S. D. FESS, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand that the Underwood tariff bill will be taken up on the 29th instant, and I hope you will not only vote against the admission of foreign mills' flour duty free, but will use your influence among your fellow Representatives to get them to vote against the bill. I believe when the farmers in the great wheat-growing States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, and the Dakotas realize the apparent protection of 10 cents per bushel upon foreign wheat and the admission of foreign mills' flour duty free affects the earnings of his farm there is sure to be an outcry that will make itself unmistakably heard in Washington.

The truth is, under the present provision of the Underwood bill there will be no tax upon foreign-ground wheat. Foreign farmers working themselves or employing labor at a mere pittance will reap the greatest benefit, for it allows foreign-ground wheat to enter the United States duty free, provided the products are made of a foreign product in a foreign mill. It is easily understood what the result will be. It means an enormous increase in the number and grinding capacity of flour mills in Canada, Argentina, Australia, and other wheat-growing countries, and especially Great Britain, whose flour mills are located upon the docks of her ports, drawing wheat from all over the world. These mills, for example, buy wheat in Buenos Aires, freight it by water to Liverpool or other ports, grind it into flour, ship the flour to New York or some other American seaport market, and sell it at less than 40 cents per barrel lower than the American mill located at New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore could manufacture the same grade of flour from the same wheat or wheat grown in the United States.

The Canadian millers likewise could flood the United States market fully as much as Great Britain by selling below the price the United States miller sells in competition. When it is realized that the average net profit of the flour mills of the United States will hardly exceed 5 cents per barrel on their annual production, the impossibility of competing with the foreign mills under the conditions which this act provides may be clearly realized.

I believe you fully understand the hardship this bill would cause the American farmer and the American miller if it became a law, and I am satisfied that you will do everything in your power, not only by your vote but influence as well, to defeat the bill. Thanking you in advance for anything you may do in the matter, I remain,

Very truly yours,

TRANCHANT & FINNELL,
Per M. L. FINNELL.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will pardon me, does he want to offer an amendment or just debate?

Mr. CALDER. I want to strike out the last word.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman to wait until the Clerk has read the paragraph.

Mr. CALDER. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

237. Cocoa butter or cocoa butterine, refined deodorized coconut oil, and all substitutes for cocoa butter, $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CALDER. Following the line of the argument of the gentleman [Mr. FESS] who has just taken his seat, I am very much interested in the discussion of this agricultural schedule and its effect upon the consumer.

I spoke a little bit yesterday of the effect upon the consumer of the reduction of duty on lumber, and I hope very much that these reductions on farm products will affect the price to people in the great city of New York, which is the market place for all agricultural products in our part of the country. And if these reductions do really make the breakfast table and the market basket cheaper, this committee and this House in passing this bill will have accomplished something.

My mind goes back to an incident that occurred last summer. The Democratic governor of the State of New York, Gov. Dix, appointed a commission to investigate transportation and market conditions in the State of New York, and particularly the high cost of living, and I have read a copy of the report of that commission. One particular incident in it impressed me very much. It told of a garden truck farmer on Long Island who sent 25 bushels of string beans to the market. This report says that at the end of 10 days he received for the 25 bushels of string beans 76 cents, out of which he had to pay for picking and trucking to the railroad depot. At that same period string beans were selling in the city of New York to the poor people, who could not afford to buy them except by the quart, for 10 cents a quart. For the same string beans that the farmer got 3 cents a bushel the consumer paid \$3.20 a bushel. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the reduction of the duty on string beans in this bill from 45 cents a bushel to 25 cents a bushel will in some way give the poor farmer more than the 3 cents a bushel which he received for the string beans he sold last summer, and will in some way reduce the price to the consumer in the city of New York from 10 cents a quart, I am sure our people will be duly grateful. For the life of me, I can not understand how the reduction in duty will affect the matter at all.

Everybody here knows, and I am sure the sensible people throughout the country knows, that all of this talk to-day about the reduction in the price to the consumer is pure buncombe on the part of the Democratic majority on this floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to occupy five minutes; but, in view of what has been repeatedly said here about the increase in prices in recent years, I think that certain gentlemen ought to be reminded of the fact that the increase in the cost of living is not confined to the United States of America. This increase is world-wide. It has been very pronounced in England, though not quite so great as in this country. It has been very pronounced also in Germany and in all other countries. Proof of this is found in the consular reports of the State Department issued regularly to Members of the House. In March last I received, as did each Member of the House, one of these consular reports in which appeared a copy of a Japanese report on "Advance in Japanese Prices," sent by Vice Consul Walter Gasset, of Kobe, Japan, from which I will read the following:

ADVANCE IN JAPANESE PRICES.

The table of statistics following, which is similar to one published in Osaka every month, shows the gain or loss in price in January, 1913, of 46 of the principal commodities as compared with January, 1912.

The price of these articles in 1902 is taken as 100, from which the rise or fall is computed. As the average price in January, 1913, was 140, it will be seen that prices generally of the principal commodities in Japan have increased 40 per cent in 11 years.

Compared with December, 1912, 13 commodities showed an advance, 20 a decline, and 20 remained unchanged during the month; but in comparison with a year before the general advance in prices is remarkable.

| | January, 1912. | January, 1913. |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| COMMODITIES ADVANCING. | | |
| Rice, uncleaned..... | 173 | 215 |
| Eggs..... | 108 | 110 |
| Wheat..... | 154 | 181 |
| Sugar..... | 190 | 192 |
| Small red beans..... | 142 | 203 |
| Firewood..... | 125 | 140 |
| Sake..... | 121 | 127 |
| Japanese paper..... | 107 | 110 |
| Seaweed..... | 173 | 210 |
| Copper..... | 116 | 138 |
| Charcoal..... | 130 | 150 |
| Rice, cleaned..... | 162 | 189 |
| Petroleum..... | 131 | 150 |
| Oats..... | 154 | 250 |
| Porcelain..... | 101 | 105 |
| Barley..... | 242 | 262 |
| French nails..... | 117 | 119 |
| Soy..... | 144 | 152 |
| Galvanized iron sheets..... | 98 | 101 |
| Chemicals and drugs..... | 124 | 148 |
| Raw cotton..... | 119 | 149 |
| Japanese medicines..... | 55 | 60 |
| Cotton yarn..... | 141 | 151 |
| Vegetable wax..... | 134 | 144 |
| Dyed yarn..... | 144 | 147 |
| Fish manure..... | 150 | 155 |
| Sheet glass..... | 72 | 78 |
| Antimony..... | 110 | 113 |
| Towels..... | 162 | 112 |
| COMMODITIES DECLINING OR REMAINING UNCHANGED. | | |
| Tea..... | 140 | 125 |
| Coal..... | 107 | 107 |
| Rapeseed oil..... | 154 | 126 |
| Matting (for tatami)..... | 121 | 119 |
| Timber..... | 169 | 169 |
| Imported iron..... | 103 | 100 |
| White cotton cloth..... | 130 | 125 |
| Gassed yarn..... | 140 | 139 |
| Raw silk..... | 116 | 116 |
| Habutai..... | 114 | 114 |
| Silk crape..... | 117 | 117 |
| Beans..... | 149 | 149 |
| Dried mushrooms..... | 123 | 108 |
| Katsubushi..... | 121 | 98 |
| European paper..... | 101 | 101 |
| Mousseime..... | 138 | 132 |
| Hemp..... | 160 | 157 |

Is the tariff law of the United States responsible for this most remarkable increase in the cost of living in Japan? Is it responsible for the increase in the cost of living in free-trade England?

Gentlemen should remember that two things may exist at the same time and yet one not be the cause of the other.

When we Members of the House were at school and studied logic, each one of us often had pointed out to him the very common fallacy, "Post hoc, ergo propter hoc"—after this, therefore on account of this.

That argument is one of the most foolish sorts of attempted reasoning. Two things may exist together, or one after the other, and neither be the cause of the other.

It is not the tariff in the United States which has caused the marked increase in the cost of living in free-trade England and elsewhere all around the world.

Mr. Chairman, this great question of the increased cost of living is of the most pressing importance to our people. Without delay there ought to be appointed the greatest commission possible of appointment in the United States, a commission representative of every political faith and creed and of the highest ability, attainments, and character, to investigate and report the facts relating to this world-wide phenomenon of such tremendous importance to struggling humanity. The Congress of the United States and the other national legislatures need these facts to enable them wisely to solve one of the very greatest of legislative and economic problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

238. Dandelion root, and acorns prepared, and articles used as coffee, or as substitutes for coffee not specially provided for in this section, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was interested in the remarks about the high cost of living which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] indulged in. I have no doubt in the world that the consul in Japan who made the report from which he read is a Republican consul.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. McCOY. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. What he reported was the official report published every month by the Japanese themselves in Osaka.

Mr. McCOY. I would reply to that in the words of the old adage, "Figures do not lie, but liars figure." I do not know how he made up the figures. I will say that if the gentleman from Wisconsin will take the consular reports which we received from our consul in London in 1910 he will ascertain that the consul there reports that the prices of the necessities of life in many instances had gone down in the 10 years prior to 1910, and that only on a few articles which we designate as the necessities of life had prices gone up. If he will conduct his investigation a little further he will find that in these countries that have the highest protective tariffs prices have gone up the most in the last 10 years, and I recommend that he look up the statistics furnished from these countries by our consuls.

The gentleman from Ohio said "Hides were put on the free list," and then he was interrupted. I happen to have some constituents interested in the duty on hides, for they manufacture patent and enamel leather. One of these manufacturers told me the other day that if we had not placed hides on the free list there was a time when, because hides had increased in price for well-known reasons, they would have had to go out of business. It is another one of those post hoc ergo propter hoc arguments to say that because hides were placed on the free list therefore the prices of boots and shoes have advanced. Leather advanced in price because of the scarcity of hides, and the prices of boots and shoes accordingly.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOY. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Did you not promise that if hides went on the free list we would have cheaper boots and shoes?

Mr. McCOY. I was not here at the time, and so I made no promises. I am telling you what the manufacturer who is interested in hides said—that they would have been obliged to go out of business if hides had not been put on the free list, for the price of hides would have been higher with the duty and too high to permit them to do business.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Do I understand the gentleman to state that this man said that if hides had not been put on the free list they would have been much higher in the United States than they were after they were put on?

Mr. McCOY. I said that they would have been much higher if not placed on the free list, because with the duty the price would have been increased by the amount of the duty.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. That was my question. I asked if the statement of the gentleman was if hides had not been on the free list they would have been much higher in the United States.

Mr. McCOY. Yes; that is what he did say and what I say. Another manufacturer of the city of Newark, N. J., was in my office the other day, and I was glad to hear him make a certain statement. He has enjoyed the benefits of a high protective tariff for years, and has reached the place where he does not have to bother about his income. He said that recently manufacturers of Newark had come to him and tried to get him interested in the Underwood bill and were astonished because he would not get excited over it. They wanted to know why he would not write letters to the Congressmen who represent Newark. He said, "I know that there is something wrong with the present tariff, and I hope that the Democrats have found the remedy in this bill. For my part, I propose to give them a chance to try it." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close on this paragraph in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate close upon this paragraph and amendments thereto in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman from New Jersey who has just taken his seat that when the Payne tariff bill was being prepared there was a gentleman whose name was Jones, president of the Shoe Manufacturing Association of New England, came before the committee, and in making his plea for free raw hides I asked him if the duty of 15 per cent ad valorem then on hides were removed what difference would it make in the cost of a pair of \$3 shoes, such as he was then talking about. Gentlemen will remember that hides which were protected at that time with a 15 per cent ad valorem duty were heavy hides, 60 pounds or over in weight. The gentleman, after figuring for a few moments, replied that it would lessen the cost of such a pair of shoes from 1½ to 2½ cents a pair. I then said to him, "My friend, if raw hides are placed on the free list—the shoes you now sell for \$3 per pair—will you sell them for \$2.97½ or \$2.98 per pair?" He said he would. I doubted the correctness of the man's statement, and told him so. He said I was entitled to my opinion; but what

happened? When that class of hides were placed on the free list the shoes then selling for \$3 wholesale went up to \$3.50 and \$4 per pair.

Mr. McCOY. Was it because the duty was taken off?

Mr. FORDNEY. Heaven only knows what caused it; but I know that the price of shoes advanced. He did not state facts when he said that if raw hides were put on the free list he would sell the shoes at 2½ cents per pair less. Neither did the gentlemen in the woolen business tell the truth those days.

They came into the city where I live to a merchant with whom I deal and stated to that merchant they were obliged to put up the price on woolen goods because of the increased duties on wool and woolens placed in the Payne law, for it is true there was not one fraction of a penny increased duty on any item in Schedule K—the woolen schedule—in the Payne law. On the other hand, there were slight reductions made.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. These higher prices of shoes—did they not come under a lower duty on shoes in the Payne law?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; absolutely right the reverse to what the shoe manufacturer said he would do. He said he would lower his price if we gave him free raw hides, and he did not do so.

Mr. HARDY. Under a lower duty on shoes?

Mr. FORDNEY. Under a lower duty on shoes. The duty was reduced from 25 per cent to 10 and 15 per cent.

Mr. HARDY. Post hoc, ergo propter hoc—if that is on that account then the manufacturers ought to want the lowest duties possible.

Mr. FORDNEY. The manufacturer in that hearing was not honest with the committee. They took the advantage on leather goods that the South American cattle growers took upon their cattle hides. They took it for granted when the Government of the United States had placed raw hides on the free list that there was a shortage of raw hides in the world's supply of hides. They immediately took advantage of that situation, and they advanced the price of hides—not to such an extent that it was necessary to add 50 cents to \$1 to a pair of shoes that cost only \$3.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

239. Starch, made from potatoes, 1 cent per pound; all other starch, including all preparations, from whatever substance produced, fit for use as starch, ½ cent per pound.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask a question of the gentleman in charge of the bill. The tariff on starch made from potatoes is placed at 1 cent per pound, and on all other starch, including all preparations, from whatever substance produced, it is ½ cent per pound. Does that include sago, or starch used in the manufactures in competition with potato starch?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; we understand it does.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. If so, why is not the rate the same—1 cent a pound?

Mr. RAINEY. The starch that is made from potatoes is used altogether, as I understand it, in manufacturing. In the cotton mills it is made out of rotten potatoes and small potatoes.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Oh, no.

Mr. RAINEY. It is made out of potatoes not fit for food.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Made out of small and cheap potatoes, that is true; but not from rotten or worthless stock.

Mr. RAINEY. It is used in the cotton mills as sizing.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. We thought it could stand a tax.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. And sago is used the same way.

Mr. RAINEY. But sago is a food, also.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. But sago for food is free. We do not ask any tariff on that. Sago starch in the manufactures is in competition with potato starch, and it should receive the same rate when it is used for exactly the same purpose and enters into competition with it.

Mr. RAINEY. We think it is used also for other purposes.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. When it is used for the same purpose as a competitive article, ought it not to have exactly the same rate?

Mr. RAINEY. Now, we thought we made the proper cut.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I am not objecting to the reduction, but what I am objecting to is the unfair competition you are placing upon the American producer when you provide for 1 cent on potato starch and only one-half a cent on sago starch used for exactly the same purpose.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If my colleague will permit me to interrupt this debate, potato starch is a very large revenue producer, and it was on account of the revenue that we were unable to put the rate any lower, whereas—

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. If the gentleman wants revenue, why does not he place the 1 cent on sago? There is none produced in this country.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Because that would be a prohibitive duty on the starch made from sago. At present the present rate is prohibitive, even at our reduction to the equivalent—

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Is not tapioca and sago free for use for food products?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Admitting that used for food product should be free, why not put on the same tariff when used for the same purpose in manufacture and containing the same constituent material?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. For the simple reason that the same tariff in one case produces revenue and in the other is prohibitive.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I think the gentleman is mistaken, for this reason: Wherever there is a rate of any sort that makes a distinction between the sago that is used in the arts and for food, the rate for manufacturing use is essentially the same as that which is used for the potato starch that is used for manufacturing purposes. If this sago starch contains about the same constituent material for use in the manufacture and if potato starch has a certain value per pound and will bear a cent per pound tariff and yet yield a revenue, sago starch ought to do the same thing, because it has essentially the same value.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him again. At a cent a pound we now get \$200,000 revenue on potato starch, whereas at a half a cent we only expect to get \$5,000 out of all other starches.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. You would get more than that if you made it a cent a pound. That is what I am objecting to as being the unfair competition which you are subjecting our potato raisers to and our starch makers.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It does not represent a cent a pound, only \$6,000 revenue; we have not cut it enough, I am afraid.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. You reduce the tariff on potato starch 33 per cent and starch makers do not object to it, so far as I am informed, but they do object to an unfair discrimination in favor of the starch makers of other countries, and especially of the Tropics, as against ours produced in the small factories in the smaller towns scattered throughout the potato-raising regions of the country.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to impart some information on the high cost of living in England to my valued friend from New Jersey, Mr. McCoy, who represents, I believe, the East Orange district, a Member for whom I have the very highest respect and the kindest of feeling. We have served on the same committee for four years, and I always listen with interest to his speeches upon the floor of this House and, with others, I regret he does not often address the House. I am sure I voice the sentiment of all of my colleagues in the hope he will continue in Congress in spite of any post-office appointments that may be made in his district. Now, he has questioned what a Republican American consul in Japan stated in reference to the high cost of living in that country, and has himself quoted some official as saying that living is cheaper in England than in America. I wish to furnish the gentleman from New Jersey and this House and the country extracts from a letter published in the midst of our campaign last year by the Chicago Daily American, written from Paris, France, on October 8, and signed by William Randolph Hearst, who has a string of Democratic papers reaching from ocean to ocean, and who gave loyal and valuable support to President Wilson and rendered a splendid service to Democracy when he championed the cause of our Speaker for the presidential nomination. Now, listen to Mr. Hearst, high Democratic authority, on the cost of living in England in 1912, the tariff, and the condition of the wage earners in that country:

Obviously, if the American protective tariff is responsible for the high cost of living which at present prevails all over the world, then undoubtedly our voters owe to their own country and to other friendly nations the humanitarian duty of relieving the oppressive burden of the high cost of living in America and elsewhere by promptly reducing the American protective tariff.

Scientific reduction of the tariff consists rather in judiciously and discriminatingly modifying the tariff in a way carefully calculated to benefit all the people of the United States, be they employers or laborers, producers or consumers. To secure and insure such scientific

modification of the American tariff I beg most respectfully to suggest to Gov. Wilson the following course:

1. The abandonment of all old stock free-trade arguments based upon fallacies and upon exploded theories and upon promises which have been proven to be false by the practical and unprofitable experience of free-trade nations like England.

2. The recognition of the principle of protection of American industries and the wise and just application of that principle to those industries which require and deserve protection.

3. The modification of the protective tariff on the one hand by reciprocity, which will open the markets of foreign nations to our products in return for the opening of our markets to their products, and on the other hand, by preferential duties which will reduce the tariff on goods imported into the United States in American ships.

It is useless to talk of a protective tariff properly applied being mainly responsible for the increased cost of living. It is worse than useless. It is senseless.

The cost of living in England, a free-trade country, is quite as great as the cost of living in the United States, a protective country. Indeed, to make an even more convincing comparison, the cost of living in England, a free-trade country, is notably greater than the cost of living in Germany, a protective country.

If, therefore, free trade or radical tariff reduction can reduce the cost of living, why is not the cost of living in free-trade England largely lower than the cost of living in protected United States, or, at least, as low as in protected Germany?

As a matter of fact, even the most radical tariff reduction does not materially reduce the universally increasing cost of living, but it does materially reduce the wherewithal to meet the increasing cost of living.

Radical tariff reduction does force manufacturers out of business and men out of employment, and by throwing a superabundance of labor upon the market does reduce the price of labor, which is wages.

In England the wages paid in most lines of labor are so low as absolutely to shock the American sense of justice and of regard for the general welfare. In every industry that I have had occasion to investigate I have found wages to be 40 to 50 per cent lower in England than in America.

At the time of the recent railway strike in Great Britain I investigated the wages of the engineers and trainmen. I found that the highest salaries paid any railway engineers in Great Britain were less than \$15 a week, and that these so-called high wages were paid to only a dozen men who were the star engineers on fast trains meeting the Atlantic liners.

The average engineer received less than \$9.50 a week; firemen averaged less than \$6 a week; and the average guard, who corresponds to our conductor, received \$6.30 a week.

There would be a revolution in America, and a justifiable one, if such wages as these were paid to our competent railway employees. Yet with such wages workmen in free-trade England are expected to meet a cost of living as high as or higher than ours.

No wonder there are industrial disturbances in England and strikes and riots and men shot down by the soldiery. No wonder there is political and economic discontent and an emigration so great that the steamship lines can not carry all of those who desire to leave England.

The false statement that living in England is cheaper than in America has been made so often that it is believed by those who have not taken the trouble to learn the facts. Living is not cheaper in England than in America. If anything, it is dearer. Food is much dearer in England than in America. Luxuries like fruit and many vegetables are entirely beyond the reach of the average individual.

Let all of us Democrats abandon worn-out and worthless free-trade arguments and frankly admit that a certain amount of judicious protection is a beneficial thing for our country and our people. Then let us seek to apply protection discriminately to develop and maintain valuable industries which require protection and which through the just and proper conduct of their business dealings with the public deserve protection.

Let us realize that the tariff (even an unfair tariff) is not the cause of special privilege, but merely a symptom of special privilege—a useful institution partly corrupted by special privilege.

Let us then modify the tariff and purify the tariff, together with all the acts and operations of government, to meet the requirements of the times, but let us modify the tariff in a way which will benefit our own Nation at least as much as it will benefit competing nations.

In conclusion, I will give some prices from the London Times of September 10, 1912:

WHAT IT COSTS TO LIVE ABROAD.

The London Times of September 10, 1912, gives the following as the London wholesale prices for the commodities named on the day before:

| | Cents. |
|------------------------|--------|
| Lard, per pound..... | 16.25 |
| Bacon, per pound..... | 19.00 |
| Butter, per pound..... | 38.00 |
| Ham, per pound..... | 20.00 |

These are wholesale prices. Retail prices are from 10 to 20 per cent higher, and still higher if there is free delivery. Those who think that the cost of living is lower in Great Britain than in the United States should try it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota make a motion?

Mr. MILLER. I wish, if I can get recognition, to amend the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only way the gentleman can get recognition.

Mr. MILLER. I have tried to do it two or three times now, in order to offer a bona fide amendment. I move to amend paragraph 239, page 58, by striking out the words "1 cent," after the word "potatoes," and insert in lieu thereof "1½ cents," and the further amendment to strike out from line 9, page 58, "½ cent," and insert in lieu thereof "1 cent."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, line 7, after the word "potatoes," strike out "1 cent" and insert "1½ cents"; line 9, same page, strike out "½ cent" and insert "1 cent."

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in the application of the jackscrew to the farmer's portion of the tariff bill they squeezed it down so hard that some of the items had the juice squeezed out of them without any rhyme or reason, and this is one of those items. The gentleman has stated, if I understand his position correctly, that they reduced the duty on sago starch, which is the substitute for potato starch, from 1 cent to ½ cent for revenue purposes, and in spite of that I find from the table which his committee has prepared and furnished us for our information and guidance in order that we may vote and act intelligently upon this great bill—those on this side not having had the marvelous opportunity to attend the Democratic caucus, when full illumination was spread upon the various paragraphs—in that table I find it is expected, having reduced the duty from 1 cent to ½ cent, there will be an absolute deficit over the year which has just preceded.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I think he either misunderstood what I said or is misquoting me, because my argument was directed to explaining the discrepancy between the tax on potato starch and other kinds of starch.

Mr. MILLER. As I understood the gentleman's position, I think it is as he stated. And if by having a 1-cent duty on this they derive \$7,000 revenue, and if having ½ cent they derive only \$5,000 revenue, wherein lies the argument for reducing the tax?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Minnesota was arguing in favor of putting this at the same rate.

Mr. MILLER. Precisely.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In order to do that we would have had to reduce the rate on potato starch ½ cent, and give up \$100,000 worth of revenue, or else raise the duty on sago starch to 1 cent and make it prohibitive.

Mr. MILLER. I do not propose to reduce either of them.

Now, it is easy to assume that the starch manufacturers of the United States are prosperous and easy-going. As a matter of fact, nearly all the potato-starch manufactories in the West—those being the only ones with which I have had anything to do and about which I have any information—are owned very largely by the farmers and the potato growers, and they act simply as a regulator of the produce from the farm. They use in making starch, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] indicated, good potatoes, but too small to be merchantable. When the price of potatoes goes up, why naturally the starch factories close down. Now, if it is proposed by putting potatoes on the free list that the price of potatoes to the farmers is to be so much reduced that they are to become very cheap, then you do not need any duty on starch made from potatoes, because potatoes will be so cheap that the starch factories will all run at full time. But if it is not expected that that great reduction to the farmers is going to occur, then you do need some duty on potato starch. As a matter of fact, the starch factories are not particularly prosperous, but have to eke out a rather precarious existence. And as my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] so clearly pointed out, there is neither logic, economy, money, rhyme, nor reason in putting 50 per cent of the duty on sago starch that is put upon potato starch when both are to be used for identically the same purpose. If we place the duty on sago starch as called for in my amendment, the duty will be the same as in the present law, the duty will be equalized with that on potato starch, and more revenue will be derived for Uncle Sam. I do not say reduce the duty on potato starch. Leave it up that there may be derived the revenue desired by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON]; but I do say raise the duty on sago starch, thus treating potato starch made by our farmers fairly and bringing in more revenue for our Government. Mr. Chairman, the situation is positively pathetic. There is no question about the merits of the amendment to increase the duty on sago starch. The arguments of those in charge of the bill establish its merits, and yet it will not be adopted. The merits of a proposition receive no consideration here. The Democratic majority have decided there shall be no amendments adopted, so no amendments will there be, and injury after injury will be perpetrated upon the people and industries of America. Such legislative obstinacy presents one of the most remarkable spectacles ever witnessed in the history of our country.

But, returning to potato starch, the rates in the bill will injure that industry and result in serious harm to the American farmer. Potato starch is a by-product of potato raising, and if the potato-starch factories be closed the American farmer will lose a market for an important part of his produce. Not content with placing potatoes on the free list, it is proposed by this rate further to strike at the welfare of the farmer. A sad day, indeed, for the agricultural interests of our Nation.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out what seems to me to be a want of intellectual consistency in the positions so frequently taken by the gentlemen on the other side. Almost hundreds of times they have argued to us that a reduction of the duty has been or will be followed by a higher price in the product concerned. Just a little while ago we had an argument from the gentleman from Michigan to the effect that when hides were put on the free list they, on that account, went up in price, and that when the duty on shoes was reduced or cut in half, shoes, on that account, went up sensibly in price. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is constantly making the same argument.

Now, we do not believe that they believe that argument, for every time you try them they oppose all reductions in behalf of the interests that want higher prices. Now, despite the argument, post hoc propter hoc, made by the gentleman from Michigan, if he would be honest with himself he would say that whatever cause produced the rise of price on hides or shoes, it certainly could not have been produced by the reduction of the duty. The truth is that no candid man makes the argument, post hoc propter hoc, except as a suggestion, a persuasive suggestion, and unless he can show the connection between the two he never insists upon its cogency or power.

The men who talk about the low prices that prevailed in 1896 being a result of the enactment of the Wilson bill, and who talk about the panic of 1893 being the result of the Wilson bill, have been simply making this post hoc propter hoc argument: That because one thing followed another it was caused by it. They have never been honest in making that argument with themselves or with the country, because they know that the low prices of 1893 were not connected with the bill that was enacted in 1894, and that the low prices that followed were not caused by it, but were only continued under it.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I regret I can not yield to the gentleman. I have not the time.

Now, I want to say that the man who wants to connect cause with effect will, when it comes to the low prices of 1893 and 1894, discover that those low prices existed before 1893 all over the country under a Republican régime, and he will try to discover the cause. He will find that wool, cotton, and every other agricultural product had gone down and had been going down for years. Corn had been burned in Kansas before the Wilson bill was framed; but it is convenient—and it may be without intentional deception—that they omit those facts when they talk about the low prices that prevailed in 1896. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They know that in 1897 and in 1898, after the passage of the Dingley law, cotton was still selling at 4 and 5 cents in my country, and wool was still down. They know that bankruptcy and failure had existed before 1893, and even before the election of 1892, and even during 1890 and 1891, all over this country. They know further that by the retirement of bank notes from 1882 to 1892, amounting to over \$300,000,000, our currency had been greatly contracted, while the volume of our business and of our production had increased. The intellectually honest man will find some connection between falling prices and a decreasing currency with increasing volume of business. They know also that after the election of 1896 the Republicans took warning and very largely stopped the further retirement of bank notes, and authorized the establishment of small banks, which added many millions to our bank notes, and that this, with large discoveries and production of gold, greatly increased the volume of our money, and that was followed by rising prices. And an honest man may find some connection of cause and effect between these two facts.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HARDY. I regret I can not yield to the gentleman in five minutes.

When you discuss the low prices of 1893 and 1894 you should couple with your statement the fact that low prices existed also before 1892 and the fact that for some years there had been falling prices, a greater and greater disparity between the value

of gold and the value of farm and other products. You should give the people those facts, and then you will not go before the country under false pretenses, and you will not charge that anybody expects or has expected to go back to the prices of 1896 with the volume of money as it is now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the pending paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that debate on the pending paragraph close in five minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I presume that it will be impossible on either side of the House to claim perfect intellectual honesty in regard to this discussion. I desire, however, in reply to what has just been suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], charging that the Republicans are guilty of intellectual dishonesty in claiming that the low prices that existed in 1893 and subsequently were due to the tariff, to say that that is not altogether a myth by any means.

I admit that much that the gentleman has said with regard to the conditions that existed prior to 1893 is true, and I have never heard any Republican claim that the low prices that existed at that time were entirely due to the operation of the tariff. But if that were true, you would have a substantial argument in favor of the bill that you now propose, because your oft-reiterated statement is that this bill will bring low prices because it reduces the tariff rates.

Intellectual honesty compels you to say to the people that you are expecting to give lower rates on food products because you are lowering the tariff rates. Some of us have been attempting to show that that was not always true. Some of us have been attempting to show that that did not inevitably follow. I want to call the attention of gentlemen to this significant fact: It is said by the distinguished chairman of the committee having this bill in charge that they must fulfill their promise to the people to give them free bread, which I presume in his judgment means cheap bread. There is only one country in the world that I know of that gives the people free bread, and that is Great Britain. Yet the price of bread in the city of Berlin is 10 per cent cheaper to-day than it is in London, the price in Paris is 14 per cent cheaper than it is in London, and the price in Vienna is 25 per cent cheaper for bread to its people than in London, where they have free trade in bread and free wheat and free corn. And all those cities, with their lower prices to their own people, are in highly protected countries.

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

Mr. TOWNER. I can not yield. I have the same difficulty that the gentleman had.

I want to say, further, that the greatest progress that has been made, both in the raising of prices of wages to their people and in the lowering of prices of food products to them, in comparison with free-trade England, has been made in Germany, and Germany has the highest protection on her farm products of any country in the world.

The result has been that after she more than doubled her tariff on agricultural products in 1906, the stimulus which was given to agricultural production in Germany resulted in a reduction of the prices of foodstuffs to the German consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

240. Spices: Cassia buds, cassia, and cassia vera; cinnamon and cinnamon chips; ginger root, unground and not preserved or candied; nutmegs; pepper, black or white; capsicum or red pepper, or cayenne pepper; and clove stems, 1 cent per pound; cloves, 2 cents per pound; pimento, $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 cent per pound; sage, $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound; mace, 8 cents per pound; mustard, ground or prepared, in bottles or otherwise, 6 cents per pound; all other spices not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, line 18, after the word "section," insert the words "including all herbs or herb leaves in glass or other small packages for culinary use."

The amendment was agreed to.

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto in five minutes.

Mr. COOPER. I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask that debate close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, when I arose a moment ago I did not expect to be shot from behind by my colleague from Texas, but I see that such is the case. In regard to intellectual honesty, the gentleman who sat down a little while ago said that he never contended that the tariff bill of 1893 was the cause of low prices in that day. I want to say that a great many protective Democrats have made that statement. I have heard that statement made on the stump by Republicans and Democrats who were leaning toward protection. I do not charge my friend from Texas with a conscious want of intellectual integrity and I may be guilty of an unconscious want of it. It is born with all gentlemen to try to be intellectually honest, but we are not on all occasions. The gentleman from Texas says you are not honest when you say that you do not expect to reduce the price of the producer, while you do to the consumer. If the tariff alone is to be considered, no man intellectually honest with himself has ever said that. We do say we expect to reduce prices very much to the consumer without hurting the producer if by means of tearing down the tariff wall we can prevent the stilted prices being put upon the people by the trusts behind the tariff wall. Where you have no trust, no combination, if you have free, open competition, the producer gets less and the consumer will get the product for less. If you have not open competition, the producers may get little or nothing, and yet the consumers be held up by the trusts. Tear down the tariff wall and you may get competition. Build it up and keep it up and you do not get competition, for inside the tariff wall combination takes the profits from the producer and the consumer alike. The great capitalists store away the profits and pile them into millions and millions of dollars. They build floating palaces on the sea, they build castles in Scotland under the benefit of high protection, while they hold an iron hand of the trusts both on the producer and the consumer alike.

I know that under so-called protection wool sold in Boston substantially for what it sold for in Liverpool year after year and month after month, not because protection might not have enabled them to get a higher price, but because the woolen manufacturing trust held them down. And we know that if there is a world-wide hide trust and a cattle trust, free hides would not have benefited the people and free shoes might not. Combination is becoming world-wide, and the representatives of the people have got to get busy and throttle and break up the trusts. We have not ended our service to the people when we pass a low tariff. That will help us against domestic trusts, but not much against the world-wide trusts. We have got to be like the watchman on the watch tower, every day and every hour faithful, and see that these designing combinations who crave great profits do not maneuver so as to crush the people. These combinations have cut out free trade in everything but labor, but they have had and continue to have free trade in labor, and Puritan old New England is fast being peopled with a foreign population, and all over the land free trade in labor and high prices in trust products prevail. I say, let us start where we may and break down the tariff wall and stop the stilted prices. Let the people get natural and fair and reasonable prices for their products, and let there be no stilted prices for the farmer or the manufacturer. The farmer can live. For 100 years he has been groaning under the burdens of a high tariff, and when we seek to reduce it the hypocritical cry is twofold—save the farmer and save the laboring man! In God's name, when did they ever before care for either the farmer or the laboring man? They care not now and they never cared, but if they can use the farmer as a cat's-paw to pull their chestnuts out of the fire, if they can use the laboring man and his fear that his wages will be reduced as a club in fighting us and preventing us from cutting off some of their profits, they are up and about it. Morning, noon, and night they inject the farmer and the laboring man into this debate. That is the mask behind which they hide their true and hideous face of greed. What we want is simple justice to all, with special privileges to none. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, to comment a little on this paragraph. This is one of the striking cases—only one of many—where the promise made by the Democratic Party not to injure any business is made most apparent and prominent, not in the observance but in the breach. I have a great many letters from people who say that they voted the Democratic ticket upon the strength of

that promise, thinking the party would keep its promise, and now, when they get into power, pointing out the different ways in which they have not done it.

This paragraph on spices in the present law puts all unground, raw spices, so to speak, on the free list, and imposes a specific duty on those spices when prepared for the table, ground and put up in packages. It protects the manufacturer in this country not unduly, because of the ground manufactured spices. We import about \$10,000,000 worth annually free of duty, a fair chance for a competitive duty which we hear so much about on that side of the proposition. What does this committee do? They go along here and transfer from the free list absolutely all raw, unground, unprepared spices and put on a specific duty per pound, equal to the duty per pound on those spices ground. There is not anyone within the sound of my voice so insane or so ignorant as to believe that that does not shut up the spice mills of this country. They place the same duty on the imported spices, unground, per pound, that is put upon the manufactured spices per pound. How are they going to grind a pound of it in this country when you consider the labor difference between this country and the countries abroad? We are not grinding the spices to sell abroad. We are not exporting them. We are simply grinding them for our own use. Have they kept their promise? I ask gentlemen on the other side of this House whether they have kept their promise in this respect? You got into power partly on that promise. I have received letters by the hundred from people, stating that they voted for you, because you said you would not injure any business; that you were going to help labor; and they are just hoping for the time to come when they can get at you once more, because of your broken promises. Of course, these things please me. If you are going to do this thing, the worse job you do the better I will like it [laughter], because the sooner the people of this country will get relief. Most of them are bound to get it in the neck, as the boys say. I do not believe in any legislation that is class legislation, especially as against the laboring class and the farmer class. I do not believe in it at all. I want to get around to the point where we can protect them, where we can make good the promise you made not to injure any business in this country. Why do you not keep your promise?

Your President is getting anxious about it. I notice by his talks over in New Jersey that he says you have to keep your pledges. He knows, because he was elected, not by the Democratic Party, but by the division in our party, and by a good many Republican votes, expecting him to keep his pledges, and he is anxious to keep them. But you have been up against it when you went to get some appointments that were dear to your hearts, and he told you plainly how he got there and illustrated how you got there. Why do you not keep your word to the American people put in your platform and proclaimed on every stump? Why do you not do it as you have agreed to do it? Why these broken promises? Why did you encourage these hopes and now break them the first time you have an opportunity by the very first act that you seek to put on the statute books?

Mr. COOPER. I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, line 14, after the word "cloves," strike out the words "2 cents per pound" and in lieu thereof insert the words "free of duty."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, cloves are now on the free list. Last year we imported nearly six and a half millions of pounds, a large proportion of which was used in the manufacture of vanilla. Vanillin is a flavoring extract used extensively in the preparation of various foods consumed by the people of the United States. It used to be made exclusively from vanilla beans, all of which, of course, are imported; they are not grown in this country. Under the existing tariff law vanilla beans are on the free list, but the pending bill proposes to put them on the dutiable list at 30 cents a pound.

The vanillin made from cloves is, I understand, practically identical with that derived from vanilla beans and is equally harmless as an edible. But in this connection a most suggestive fact was brought to light last Tuesday during the debate on the chemical schedule, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] said that vanillin, which got its name from the vanilla bean, is now being made also from certain coal-tar derivatives. I remember that Dr. Wiley, the former distinguished Chief of the Pure Food Bureau, was bitterly hostile to all attempts to compel the people of this country to eat more and more of articles made from coal-tar derivatives.

Now, these coal-tar derivatives come from Germany. That country has a practical monopoly of their manufacture, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. METZ] made very clear during

the debate on Tuesday. He told us that he had to buy these derivatives from manufacturers in Germany or they would shut out his business over here, and that he could not get them except upon the terms fixed by the German trust or syndicate. And yet by the pending bill the rate on vanillin, the finished product, has been reduced 10 per cent to the direct advantage of the German manufacturer and of the importer to this country, while on cloves, now on the free list, the rate has been made 2 cents a pound, and on vanilla beans, now on the free list, the rate is made 30 cents a pound. In other words, vanilla beans and cloves, the raw materials of the American manufacturer of vanillin, are taken off the free list and a high tariff put upon them, while the tariff on vanillin, the finished product of the German manufacturer made from coal-tar derivatives, is lowered 10 per cent.

Through the courtesy of my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], I was this morning handed a letter addressed to him from a firm in Maywood, N. J., from which I will now read some very interesting information as to what such a tariff will do:

The production of vanillin in this country from coal-tar derivatives has been so frowned upon by the Bureau of Chemistry, under Dr. Wiley, that we have stuck to the vegetable supply of raw material, namely, cloves. We could not manufacture from the coal-tar derivative if we so desired, because this material, manufactured in Germany, is so controlled by a trust or syndicate that to ruin the American manufacturer they would at any time withhold supplies. This, therefore, would prevent the organization of a plant for the manufacture of vanillin from this raw material in the United States. We are compelled to use cloves, and to reduce the duty on vanillin from 20 cents to 10 cents per ounce and then add 2 cents per pound to cloves, the equivalent of 20 per cent on our raw material, you can readily understand, spells "ruin."

We call your attention to the paragraph toward the bottom of the first column, page 619, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in which Mr. METZ says: "All these products are bought from the German syndicate. * * * They are controlled abroad by syndicates, and all the syndicate has got to do is simply refuse to sell the American manufacturer and he is out of business." "Products," to which he refers are coal-tar derivatives such as would be necessary in the manufacture of vanillin from this source in the United States. Even if the foreigner would let this product come to the United States, which he will not, they would still be subject to a duty bearing from 15 to 25 per cent; so that, no matter which way the unfortunate American manufacturer turns, he is crowded out by a tariff on raw material, unintentionally levied for the protection of the German manufacturer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Can I have one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been closed by order of the committee. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

241. Vinegar, 4 cents per proof gallon. The standard proof for vinegar shall be taken to be that strength which requires 35 grains of bicarbonate of potash to neutralize 1 ounce troy of vinegar.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment in the form of a new paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to limit debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests the amendment be reported. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 22, page 58, after the word "vinegar," the following as a new paragraph:

"241½. Until such time as the opinion of a nonpartisan tariff commission has reported upon the agricultural schedule the rates of duty on all articles in this schedule shall be the same as the rates provided for in the act of August 5, 1909."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is subject to a point of order probably, but I have no objection to its being voted upon. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph be limited to 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Reserving the right to object, is that paragraph 241?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is a new paragraph; I did not intend it for that. I will ask to close debate and let the gentlemen speak on the next.

Mr. GARDNER. I hope the gentleman will allow some time on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts—241½.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman wish to speak to the amendment?

Mr. GARDNER. No; but my colleague does.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not intend to cut the gentleman's colleague out. I ask unanimous consent that on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts debate may be limited to five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto shall close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is recognized.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, perhaps more than half of the district in western Massachusetts I have the honor to represent consists of those interested in agricultural pursuits. I may add the other half are interested in the welfare of their brother farmer. I have sat here patiently listening to the discussion of these sections of this schedule without offering any amendment as we came to them from time to time. It seemed to me that the entire schedule was so contrary to the interests of the farmer, not alone in Massachusetts but throughout this broad land of ours, that we ought not to differentiate between one section or one paragraph in favor of another in offering amendments. I have refrained from speaking for another reason also, because I have realized that the Democratic steam roller, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] as chief engineer, has been so carefully and so thoroughly oiled and managed that amendments offered by us on this side of the aisle are treated the way the steam roller crushes the material under its tremendous weight.

But I do wish, Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the farmers of my home section, to protest against the adoption of this schedule until such time as a nonpartisan tariff board can act upon it. They, like other farmers throughout the country, are honest, honorable, hard-working citizens. No class of our citizens labor harder, in my opinion, and obtain less in return than the tillers of the soil. Nothing should be done to lessen their market prices. So I am glad to enter this protest against a change in the protection now afforded them. These protests have come from individuals, agricultural societies, and granges, of which I am proud to be rated as a humble member.

If the cost to the individual consumer is high on produce, as we have heard so many Democratic Members say here on this floor, the reason can not be because the farmer himself is receiving more than is a fair return for the hard toil and labor that he puts into preparing that produce for the market. It is right and fair that this protection should be afforded them. Therefore, as I say, I have kept entirely still during the discussion of this schedule, but I have been thoroughly aroused at the methods you are using in trying to jam down the throats of the American farmer this iniquitous schedule. Give them a fair show, a fair price for their produce, and a fair return for the sweat of their brow. That is all we ask in behalf of our farmer. We ask fair treatment to him by your party. Let this protest of my own constituents go out to-day, as well as the protest on the part of the rest of the farmers in whose behalf others have spoken at the close of this paragraph, and let us be able to tell them that so far as the Republican votes are concerned, we want justice done them through a nonpartisan tariff commission. That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, why I offer this amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. LOBECK. I would like five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been closed by the action of the committee. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on that.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE H—SPIRITS, WINES, AND OTHER BEVERAGES.

242. Brandy and other spirits manufactured or distilled from grain or other materials, and not specially provided for in this section, \$2.50 per proof gallon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph be limited to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph be limited to 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TOWNER. As I understood it, the arrangement as to 15 minutes granted to the gentleman from Nebraska and others was that they were to be recognized on paragraph No. 241.

The CHAIRMAN. Two hundred and forty-two.

Mr. TOWNER. That was the last one read, but, as I understood it, time was to be granted for them to speak on the former paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. There was nothing of that kind stated in the request of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LOBECK. He asked for 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Paragraph 241 was read and passed, and then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] offered an amendment to insert a new paragraph, and upon that debate was limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. LOBECK. I understood it was 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It was limited to five minutes. And then a vote was had on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the Clerk proceeded to read the bill in regular order. Paragraph 242 was read, and the gentleman from Alabama asked unanimous consent that debate on that paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 15 minutes, and it was so ordered. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK] is recognized.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be agreeable to the gentlemen who want to speak to modify that arrangement and make the speeches three minutes long instead of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] modifies that, and suggests that the recognitions during the 15 minutes be for 3 minutes each. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak upon this amendment which has just been read. My understanding was that I should have time to speak on the section just previously read.

My object in rising now is to say that I have heard a good deal said in the discussion of this tariff measure about the panic of 1893-1896. I had a good deal of experience in it, personal experience, and in my judgment the tariff was not one of the chief causes of that panic. One of the causes was the fact that the farmers west of the Missouri River who had been buying merchandise from the East could not purchase on account of crop failures caused by drought. Supplies were sent into the district represented by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] and other neighboring districts in Nebraska and Kansas by the people of the East and the people of Iowa and Illinois to help the homesteaders and pioneer settlers of Nebraska and Kansas.

When these Republican gentlemen discuss 1893 to 1896 they forget 1873-1879. In the district represented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] they had equally hard times from Cedar Rapids west. In every town along the Northwestern Railroad they were having auction sales at that time, for I remember personally about it. In the district represented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] they had the same degree of hard times, and the same was also true in northwestern Iowa.

We had a high tariff in those days. We were living under a Republican tariff. A Republican newspaper, a copy of which I have in my hand, dated in 1877, namely, the Chicago Inter Ocean, does not ascribe those hard times to the tariff. It ascribes the hard times to the money conditions of that time. The failure of Baring Bros., of London, in about 1890, a world-wide failure, was one of the principal causes of the hard times in this country in the nineties.

In Brother MILLER'S State, in Minneapolis, about every man was broke who had been speculating in city real estate. It was the same in St. Paul. It was the same in Sioux City, in Mr. SCOTT'S district, and the same in Kansas City and in Omaha. It was overspeculation everywhere and the monetary condition that caused the panic of 1893, not the Wilson tariff.

In my time I have seen hogs and cattle and farm products sold at as low prices under a high tariff as under a low tariff, and I have seen the Chicago live-stock market closed for two weeks to the western farmer and stock shipper under the high-tariff times that prevailed in 1873. I was a shipper at the time, and I know from personal experience.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to commend the majority members of the committee for their action on this schedule.

This is one of the schedules in which we made a great increase four years ago, putting the rates up higher than they had

ever been before, and it has often been cited as a typical part of our program in revising the tariff upward. I always plead guilty to that charge on this schedule on wines and liquors, and have never had any apologies to make for it, either. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, this committee, after considering it, I do not know how long—they say they have been working on this bill for two years, and of course I accept what they say about that—come in here with the schedule exactly as we passed it four years ago, except that they have lowered the duty a little bit on mineral water. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I have contended repeatedly that if the gentlemen would give to the study of these questions the rest of their natural lives, and should pay attention to and avail themselves of such educational facilities as come to them by way of experience, they would eventually get a good deal better tariff bill than has been shown in any attempt they have made at it thus far. This present schedule is an evidence of the advance that they are making.

I hate to have to call these things to the attention of the House even occasionally as they go along. I leave out a large part of the items on which they have done the same things that we did. Of course I am glad of their indorsement, and yet I do not care so much about that, because the facts have come out now about the tariff revision of 1909, and they are so emblazoned in the reports of the Treasury Department during the four years that have passed since the enactment of the present tariff law that the majority on the Committee on Ways and Means no longer ignore them, but indeed print them in their handbook.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. I want to ask the gentleman from New York if it is true, as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], in opening this debate, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was against his own bill, and that they forced these items into the Payne bill in opposition to the wishes of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PAYNE. I can explain that so that the gentleman from Illinois can understand it. We adopted the same rule that the majority members of this committee have adopted, and that the majority members of every Ways and Means Committee adopt. The majority members of the committee always go through the bill, discuss it, agree on the rates of duty by a majority vote, and when they have finally agreed upon it they all support the bill in its entirety. That is what we did. The bill was not exactly as I would have liked to have it. No man ever joined in a report on a tariff bill that was just as he wanted it. Why, you know this bill is not in accordance with the views of the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of your committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD], not by a long shot, and before you get through with it, it will be more out of the way.

Mr. GARDNER. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] whether he was in favor of free cattle or not, in his committee?

Mr. RAINEY. I was in favor of free cattle in my committee.

Mr. GARDNER. But you are backing up your committee's report?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I trust I have answered that question to the full satisfaction of my friend from Illinois, and that he understands now that I did disagree with some portions of that tariff law, and I disagree with them yet; but I simply acceded to the will of the majority, just as the gentleman has done and just as other gentlemen on that committee have done.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, during my absence from the House my genial colleague, the gentleman from the tenth district of Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], delivered a dissertation upon the subject of chickens; and he stated that in his district they raised some chickens and sold a good many chickens. He got his wires crossed. He should have stated that they sold some chickens and raised a good many chickens, because if it was not for the chicken industry in the tenth district there would not be any Republicans there at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a good deal of talk from the Republicans of this House about this tariff bill, and they have introduced a good many amendments. Their opposition to the bill and their amendments to it remind me of an anecdote. There was an old negro woman, who went from down in South Carolina up into Mr. MANN's district in Chicago and got a position as a cook in the house of one of Chicago's newly rich. Well, they did not have very much to eat, but they had a great deal of style, and they had it in courses; and in the course of a week this negro woman announced that she was going to resign her position. They wanted to know why she was going to quit. She said: "Well, dar's too much shufflin' ob de dishes for de

fewness of de vittles." [Laughter.] That is the way it is with our Republican friends. There is too much shufflin' of amendments for the fewness of the substance of those amendments. [Laughter.]

If I am mistaken, I am willing to be corrected; but I understood the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] a little while ago to animadvert against President Wilson for going to the State of New Jersey and raising his voice in favor of pure elections.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is limited by order of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I will continue on the next paragraph.

[Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that my distinguished colleague from Nebraska can summon no better argument for this tariff bill than the slander of his own fair State, and especially my district. I desire to say as to my district receiving any comfort or aid from the East in 1894, 1895, or 1896 it is absolutely incorrect. We took care of ourselves then and we are endeavoring to take care of ourselves now, and are asking neither favor nor charity from the East and South. Only plain justice. If anything came to the gates of Omaha, I do not know it. Unfortunately, our crops for two of these years were not good. My friend has not his historical facts on straight. We were not under a Republican tariff law, but were under a Democratic tariff law. The Wilson bill was passed August 27, 1894, and until July 24, 1897, when the Dingley law was enacted, was in effect.

Mr. LOBECK. Did not we have a drought in that time?

Mr. SLOAN. We had no drought in 1896. On the contrary, we had the greatest bumper crop in Nebraska that we had had for 25 years. [Applause.]

Mr. LOBECK. You were defending homesteaders from being foreclosed on mortgages.

Mr. SLOAN. God knows I was. We could get little for our crops, and there was no money to pay mortgage or interest. In 1896 we had a bumper crop of corn. We sold wheat from 25 to 40 cents a bushel under that Wilson tariff law. The report of the Ways and Means Committee on this bill quotes wheat at 35 cents per bushel for 1896. We sold the corn of that bumper crop of 1896, when we could get a market, for 8 to 10 cents a bushel, and also used it for fuel. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

243. Each and every gauge or wine gallon of measurement shall be counted as at least 1 proof gallon; and the standard for determining the proof of brandy and other spirits or liquors of any kind imported shall be the same as that which is defined in the laws relating to internal revenue: *Provided*, That it shall be lawful for the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to authorize the ascertainment of the proof of wines, cordials, or other liquors, by distillation or otherwise, in cases where it is impracticable to ascertain such proof by the means prescribed by existing law or regulations: *And provided further*, That any brandy or other spirituous or distilled liquors imported in any sized cask, bottle, jug, or other packages, or of from any country, dependency, or province under whose laws similar sized casks, bottles, jugs, or other packages of distilled spirits, wine, or other beverage put up or filled in the United States are denied entrance into such country, dependency, or province, shall be forfeited to the United States; and any brandy or other spirituous or distilled liquor imported in a cask of less capacity than 10 gallons from any country shall be forfeited to the United States.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this remark, that every protectionist is a free trader in everything that he does not sell.

Mr. FORDNEY. That is not true, my friend; and you can not apply it to me. The gentleman is mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make it so plain that I will not have to yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. Do not apply that to me.

Mr. DIES. What is the first thing that protection wants? Free labor. You have always stood for an open gate for the cheap labor of Europe to come to compete in your mills and factories with the labor in this country. That was given to you. You had that, and in the progress and growth of time you wanted more free trade. You wanted free trade in raw materials with which you work.

Some, like my friend FORDNEY, were smart enough to know that if they got free trade in labor and free trade in raw materials, the dynamic forces of society would be so great against them that they would be given free trade in everything that they sold. But protection, in its selfishness, not satisfied to demand an open gate for labor, not satisfied to say that a man

who works with his hands in a protective mill shall work in competition with the labor market of the world, has gone a step further now and has said that a man who is engaged in a protected industry shall have free trade in labor, and free trade in the materials with which he works—make every laborer stand and deliver in a free-trade market, and make every producer stand and sell his goods or raw material in a free-trade market, and yet give to you the sacred right to sell that which you make in the protective market.

It is the doom of protection in this country. It ought to be so. You open the gates of labor and let every Italian and every Russian and every laborer from Europe come to compete with the labor of the man who labors here. Then you say to the farmer, "Produce that which you have and sell it in a free-trade market." Do not you know that your laborer, Mr. FORNEY—do not you know that the laborer and the farmer who produces and sells in a free-trade market will have sense enough to demand that he be allowed to buy in a free-trade market? That is, you say to the farmer in America, "You have got to sell in a free-trade market, and you are not as good as a farmer in Argentina or Australia. There they can sell and buy in a free-trade market, but you have got to sell in a free-trade market and buy in a protected market." That is the mistake that you protectionists are making. Your first mistake was free labor. That was bad enough. Now you demand not only to buy your labor in your free market and sell your goods in a protected market, but you demand of a farmer that he sell his wool and his cotton and his raw material in a free-trade market and then sell him back the same wool and the same manufactured stuff in a high protected market. In other words, thank God, the extreme selfishness of protection is overleaping its own bounds.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman—

Mr. DIES. With great pleasure, to my friend from Philadelphia.

Mr. MOORE. Does it not make any difference to the gentleman that the labor that comes into the United States from foreign countries lifts itself to the American standard of wages when it arrives here?

Mr. DIES. Oh, well, if you bring in labor that is cheaper than ours you will bring down the price of our labor, just as if you bring in clothing in competition with the mills of Pennsylvania that will bring down the price of clothing. You are unwilling to bring down the price of your manufactured stuff in competition with cheap labor, but you are willing to bring down labor itself.

Mr. MOORE. Do we not exalt that labor? Instead of breaking it down, do not we build it up?

Mr. DIES. You exalt foreign labor, but you debase domestic labor.

Mr. MOORE. When it gets here we do raise it to the American standard.

Mr. DIES. He thinks a man who labors with his hands is none too good to have foreign competition, but he believes that a man who manufactures with his capital ought not to have the competition. It is all a difference of the standpoint from which you look.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. With pleasure.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman was saying that New England had always been for free labor.

Mr. DIES. I will say that the Republican Party—

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; it always has. It was founded on that cause.

Mr. FARR. Good!

Mr. DIES. The Republican Party must have stood for free labor, else we would not have had it for 50 years. The Republican Party is standing to-day for free raw material. Why? Because the protectionist is selfishness personified. You want to buy in a free market, and you are selfish enough to demand to sell in a protected market.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, unlike my eloquent friend from Texas, I do not care to discuss this paragraph from a political viewpoint. [Laughter.] There is a moral to be drawn not only from the paragraph but from the schedule we are discussing when we compare it with the schedules we have passed. The hue and cry of the Democratic Party and the bone of their contention against the Republican Party is that the Republican

Party stands for the imposition of a tariff upon goods that are imported from foreign countries. It has been heralded from one end of the land to the other that that tariff is "a tax" upon the people. Allen G. Thurman called it a tax upon "everything one wears from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet." But when we analyze this awful "tax" which is now being "imposed" upon the people in a new form by the Democratic Party we find that under the Payne law, which has been so much derided in the course of this discussion, that the entire tariff collections during the year 1912, if apportioned among the 90,000,000 people of the country, would have amounted to \$3.15 each. In other words, any gentleman who finds fault with the protective system, that builds up industry and pays wages, can save his portion of the "tax" for a whole year by abstaining from one trip to the theater or by cutting out one-half a box of good cigars or one square dinner for himself and one-half the price of a dinner for himself and friend. This would wipe out the awful burden the Payne law imposed upon him. But I want by contrast to show that, while there is fierce denunciation of the tariff system, which at the worst imposes only \$3.15 "tax" per annum upon everybody in the country, there is no word of protest from anyone on the other side of the House, particularly from anyone coming from the State of Kentucky, against the tax that is now being imposed by the schedule which we have under consideration. It will be seen by reference to the figures in the Democratic handbook that the collections at the ports of the United States last year amounted to substantially \$311,000,000. This "burden" was so distributed amongst the people of the country that it was imperceptible; but here is a schedule advanced and supported without change by our friends on the other side, without one word of comment, that imposes a direct tax on the people of the United States amounting to \$321,000,000 a year, or approximately \$3.50 a head, for liquors and tobacco. Why not charge that up to a tariff system?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

244. On all compounds or preparations of which distilled spirits are a component part of chief value there shall be levied a duty not less than that imposed upon distilled spirits.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I shall leave, Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen from Texas to settle the little difficulty among themselves. I want to refer very briefly to a statement that was made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], however, in his last address, and let me say, parenthetically, during my brief service in this House I have learned to greatly admire the gentleman from Texas. I think there is no more able advocate of this bill upon the floor of this House than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], and with characteristic frankness he says to the House now that they do not now intend to be guilty of the intellectual dishonesty of claiming that to reduce the price to the ultimate consumer will not reduce the price also of the producer; but he says, if it is necessary, in order to prevent the exorbitant high prices that are charged the consumer by reason of the trusts, that we should invite this foreign competition, and it is upon that proposition that I desire to say a word. Mr. Chairman, there has never been any distinction made in this country, in so far as trust control has been effected, between those who were protected and those who were not protected. The trusts upon nonprotected articles have been just as effective in controlling and raising prices as those upon protected articles. Nor is it necessary in order to control the trusts that you should open our markets to the nations of the world. Our friends are very fond of calling this a tariff wall. For the sake of argument let us so consider it, just a moment, and in this great trade war in which the producers of these United States are called upon to defend themselves behind their tariff wall I judge that if behind the breastworks there shall be a conflict in which one of those behind the breastworks shall assault another it is not necessary to tear down the wall or our defenses to the enemy and allow them to come in to punish those who are guilty of a misdemeanor behind that wall.

I think we can take care of and punish these malefactors themselves, and I will join with those gentlemen, and I think every man on this side of the House will aid, in preventing trust combinations from raising prices to the consumer of protected products or any products. I think it will be more to our credit and a higher statesmanship to look after those methods of control that are not extraneous, but within our borders and by our own laws control unlawful combinations, instead of tearing down our industries and inviting outside help to control this our domestic trouble. Let us make our laws so that these

combinations which raise the price of farm products, or any other production, shall be prohibited by our laws here, whether it shall be a protected article or whether one that is not protected. The fault of the Democratic argument lies first in the fact that to remove the tariff will not aid in our settlement of the trust proposition, and, second, that we can make effective our trust control within our own territorial limits, among our own people, by our own laws, without destroying our protective rates in this country.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate close in five minutes.

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

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to address the committee for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Can not the gentleman take the next paragraph?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and a good many other gentlemen on that side do not understand what the tariff tax means here in the United States. If they do understand, they have not given the House to understand that they do understand. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, speaking of raising \$300,000,000 in revenue annually, considers that that is the only amount paid by the American people by reason of tariff taxes. I want to say to the gentleman that by reason of this Payne-Aldrich tariff law, the most obnoxious and oppressive tariff bill ever written, the American people are now paying annually twenty-seven hundred million dollars. This Government has entered upon a policy under the reign of the Republican Party of taxing the American people twenty-four hundred million dollars in order to get \$300,000,000 in revenue taxes. Your trusts have sprung up under this protective tariff system. A certain article has 50 cents tax on it, and ceases to come into our country and the Government does not derive one copper on that article. The consumer continues to pay the 50 cents. Where does that 50 cents go?

It goes into the pocket of the trust magnate of the United States. He continues to reap his reward and the consumer continues to bear the burden of a 50-cent tax, although the article ceases to come to our country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said, "Why do you not be honest and keep your promise to the people? I want to protect the laboring man; I want to protect the farmer." What a strange note that was coming from him. Why, he is the author of this Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, and what he did with the laboring man in that bill and what he did to the farmer in that bill was a plenty. [Laughter.] And when I heard him say to-day, "I want to protect the laboring man and the farmer," I thought of the signs in front of two stores in London. Two fellows were engaged in selling fish, one's establishment just above the other's. The man on the upper floor hung out his sign, "Fresh fish to-day." The fellow just under him hung up his sign immediately below it, "Not so-fresh as ours." And it went on until finally the fish dealer above hung out this sign, "We sell eels to the King," and the man just below him hung out this sign, "God save the King!" [Laughter and applause.]

So, my friends, if what you are doing for the laboring man and the farmer in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law is protection, God save the farmer and the laboring man. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

245. Cordials, liqueurs, arrack, absinthe, kirschwasser, ratafia, and other spirituous beverages or bitters of all kinds, containing spirits, and not specially provided for in this section, \$2.60 per proof gallon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized.

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

246. No lower rate or amount of duty shall be levied, collected, and paid on brandy, spirits, and other spirituous beverages than that fixed by law for the description of first proof; but it shall be increased in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of first proof, and all imitations of brandy or spirits or wines imported by any names whatever shall be subject to the highest rate of duty provided for the genuine articles respectively intended to be represented, and in no case less than \$1.75 per gallon.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the little explanation that I have to make must be made in courses. [Laughter.] A little while ago I made the statement that I understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to inadvertently against Mr. Wilson, the Democratic President, because he had seen fit to go to New Jersey and make a speech in favor of jury reform. If I am mistaken in what I understood the gentleman to state I would like to be corrected.

Now, there is no man in this House for whom I have a higher regard than that which I entertain for the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. All men must concede that he is a very able man. All men must concede that he is an honest man. And yet, Mr. Chairman, with all that, he is merely a Bourbon standpat Republican, who never forgets anything and never learns anything on the tariff question. [Laughter.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course.

Mr. GARDNER. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentleman he is talking about is not present.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I did not know that.

Mr. GARDNER. I thought so.

Mr. THOMAS. But if he were present it would not make any difference. [Laughter.] And if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] desires he can substitute himself in place of the gentleman from New York. [Laughter.]

Now, I will say that the President of the United States is nothing more than an American citizen, and as an American citizen he has the right to go to New Jersey or to New York or to Massachusetts or to any other place and raise his voice in favor of purity in elections, and if there are any places on the face of God's earth that need something of this character, they are certainly New Jersey, New York, and Massachusetts, if newspaper reports be true. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

So far as I am individually concerned, I want to say that Mr. Wilson is a Democratic President. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I voted for him. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] I was for CHAMP CLARK for the nomination [applause], but Mr. Wilson is my President, and as a Democrat you are going always to find me upholding the hands of Woodrow Wilson. I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if there are gentlemen on this side who have amendments which they desire to offer to this schedule? There seems to be none.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. VAUGHAN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. VAUGHAN. Mr. Chairman, being only a freshman here, it had not been my intention to make any remarks during the consideration of this bill. However, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] made statements in his speech which have caused me to address the committee. He said, if I understood him correctly, that they upon that side, the Republicans, are as much opposed as we on this side, the Democrats, to the great trusts and monopolies that control the prices of products in this country, and that they are willing to help toward the enactment and enforcement of a law that will prohibit any organization from controlling the price of such products. In other words, they are willing to be "trust busters."

Mr. Chairman, if it is wrong for people to organize to control the prices of products to the ultimate consumer, or to obtain a monopoly of trade in any product, why in the name of common sense is it not wrong for this Government to lend its aid toward the promotion of any such organization? Why is it not wrong for this Government to enable manufacturers of products of any kind to obtain a monopoly of trade in such products? Why is it not wrong for the Government purposely to so frame the law as to protect anyone against competition? But leaving out the question of right and wrong, if trusts and conspiracies against trade are contrary to sound public policy, why is it not against sound public policy for the Government itself to restrain

trade for the special benefit of those seeking it, that they may obtain higher prices from American consumers of their products?

You on that side pretend to be against trusts and conspiracies in restraint of trade, and yet the very essence of your protection doctrine is that the Government should enter into conspiracies in restraint of trade with the favored classes in this country to enable them to monopolize the home market and obtain higher prices from consumers who have to sell what they produce in the open market against the competition of the world. The cotton raisers, the corn raisers, the producers of other agricultural products—the farmers—have to sell their products against the competition of the world. It is beyond the power of this Government to levy any kind of a tariff upon foreign imports that would protect them against competition, because they have no competition, and whenever you have levied a tariff against the importation of anything from abroad which they produce here, you have done it with the intention of fooling them into the belief that they were being protected when you knew they were not, that they might more tamely submit to your protective system, which has caused them to pay so much higher prices for the things they have to buy.

If trusts and conspiracies in restraint of trade are wrong, then why in the name of common sense is not a protective tariff, the very purpose of which is to restrain trade—why is it not wrong?

Some one behind me says, "He's a free trader." Perhaps so. Yes, Mr. Chairman, if being opposed to any kind of a law that lays tribute upon the masses for the benefit of any class or any mass, if being opposed to tariff for protection upon anything, makes me a free trader, I am, then, a free trader. And I need no better argument in favor of my kind of free trade than the fact that even the Republicans are forced to recognize that trusts and conspiracies in restraint of trade are wrong.

Whenever this Government, by any kind of a law, lends its aid to anyone to obtain higher prices for his goods from his neighbor than his neighbor would have to pay but for such law, it robs the one for the benefit of the other, and it is none the less robbery because done under the sanction of law.

It has been said time and time again during the discussion on this bill that it will ruin the "industries" of the country. What industry will be injured by the passage of this bill? Yes; it may injure some. Every industry that is enabled by the provisions of the Payne-Aldrich bill, under which we are now living, to run its hands into the pockets of the people—of the ultimate consumers—and flech from them higher prices for its products through favoritism of the Government will be forced to take its hands out of the pockets of the people.

I stand for the man who asks no favors of this Government except such as it owes to everyone under the flag. I stand for the great body of the people who only ask that the hand of privilege be taken out of their pockets, and in so far as any industry may be injured by being made to take its hands out of the pockets of the people, it ought to be injured, and this bill will injure it to that extent, and to that extent only.

Those who under the protective system are now enjoying the privilege of putting their hands up to their elbows in the pockets of the consumers, and taking as much as they want, will of course howl about being injured, but the great body of the American people will be benefited by this bill, because it lightens the burden of government upon the great consuming masses and puts it on the shoulders of those upon whom it should rest, and it is as free from protection; it is as low a reduction of tariff taxation as the country can stand at this time without such a shock to the business of the country as should be avoided. Of course it would be bad policy to change absolutely and at once from the system of high protection. It has prevailed too many years; under it the great toiling masses of the country have received such a small share of the wealth they have produced and the favorites of protection have grown so much richer. Of course it would be bad policy to eliminate protection at once. It would be a revolution and revolutions always cause shock and disturbance. But, Mr. Chairman, this bill is a long stride in the right direction. It looks toward ultimate reciprocal free-trade relations with all the nations of the world. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say here that I do not have the fears which my colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES] seems to entertain—that this bill is too long a step to take at one time. If I understood him correctly, he is against protection, but he would eliminate it more gradually. Mr. Chairman, I believe the people have waked up. I believe they are ready for this bill, and whether they are ready for it or not, in my judgment, it is the best tariff law that has been written since before the War between the States. It should commend itself to the American people—to their honesty, to their fairness—and I believe it will. It has the un-

qualified approval of the President, who received the popular approval last fall, whose position, I believe, the people of the United States understood when they elected him, and who, I believe, is in close and sympathetic touch with the people of the United States, understands their will, and will make their will the law when he approves this bill.

The people of the United States have realized that under the Republican protective-tariff system the money to run this Government is collected from the people, not according to their ability to pay, not according to their wealth, but according to what they eat and wear and consume. They have realized that under this system those who toil for their daily bread and are barely able to support their large families pay as much toward the support of the Federal Government as others who own millions. They realize that the protective system lays a heavier burden upon the poor than they are able to bear and a lighter upon the rich than they should be made to bear. They have realized also that under this protective tariff, while the Government gets millions as taxes the favored few, for whose benefit it is levied, get hundreds of millions. They have realized that they pay taxes every time they buy goods, and that when they buy goods that have been imported, or made out of imported goods, they pay taxes to the Government, and that when they buy goods that have been made in this country they pay tribute to the trusts that have grown up under the protective system.

The Republicans used to tell them that those whom they wanted to protect were "infants," and needed protection. The people know how hard it is to pull a full-grown yearling away from his mammy, and now they realize that they should have weaned the calves long ago. It is to be hoped that this bill will wean them, and that the noise they make about being weaned will not be sufficient to disturb the peace of the country.

The Republicans used to tell the people that they wanted to protect labor, to enable those enjoying protection to get higher prices for protected goods and pay their laborers higher wages. They have seen the protected "infants" import cheap foreign labor to compete with labor here and to take the places of those who join labor unions.

The Republicans tell us we should be patriotic enough to protect the "infants" in order to build up home industries, but the people have found out that the "infants" are carrying their goods across the seas, thousands of miles away, and selling them to foreigners cheaper than they do to folks here at home. They love the foreigner enough to sell to him at a lower price than they do us at home, and then they try to work up within us enough hatred or antipathy against the foreigner, whom they favor, to induce us to so frame the tariff law as to prevent the foreigner from bringing any goods over here that might come in competition with what they have to sell.

No, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen need not be alarmed. I know that those who are enjoying the special privileges of high protection; the privilege of levying tribute upon the people; the kind of special privileges that kings and queens in days gone by sometimes granted to royal favorites—yes; they are going to howl when separated to so large an extent from their privilege of collecting tribute from the people, but the people are not fools, as these Republicans think they are, and they will understand. But, whatever may be the result, be assured that we are right. It may be that the power of those who have enjoyed the benefits of protection at the expense of the masses may be strong enough to produce such a disturbance on account of being separated from their privileges as to cause such a condition, for a while, as may cause the people to think they were wrong in turning away from protection. It is to be hoped such will not be the case. But the people are not wrong in renouncing protection, and if the policy entered upon by the enactment of this bill is steadily adhered to for a sufficient time and given a fair trial, it will bring prosperity to the great masses of the people, and the burdens of Government will bear lightly on their shoulders, and no more heavily on the rich than they are easily able and should, in justice, be made to bear. The policy entered upon should and will ultimately prove successful, because it looks toward the establishment of our taxing system upon the principles of justice and "equal rights to all, and special privileges to none."

Mr. Chairman, while I am before the committee I wish to call the attention of the committee and of the country to one feature of this question which has not been mentioned in this discussion. The duties levied by this bill upon imported spirits, wines, and other beverages under Schedule H, now under discussion, are the same as those levied under the present law, the Payne-Aldrich bill, paragraphs 300 to 311 of that law corre-

sponding to paragraphs 242 to 253 of this bill. It is well that the duties are not reduced, for the country should not be flooded with cheap liquor. Liquors are luxuries, not necessities. The man who indulges in their use does not have to do so, and has no right to complain if the Government imposes a tax upon his indulgence in a beverage which, to say the least of it, never benefits him, but often results in his ruin. The consumption of such liquors, therefore, as long as their sale as beverages is permitted at all, is a very proper source from which to derive revenue. But, Mr. Chairman, surely no Democrat will contend that a tariff should be laid upon imported liquors in order that distillers or brewers may have protection against foreign competition, and thereby get a higher price for their liquors. For however much in favor of liquor some of my brethren on this side may be, surely there is no Democrat in favor of a protective tariff for the benefit of the brewers and distillers, for a tariff for protection is certainly contrary to our party faith; and though we have some sugar-protection Democrats, and perhaps some Democrats who may be in favor of protection for producers of some other things, I hope we have no liquor-protection Democrats.

The Republicans, in the Payne-Aldrich bill, raised the tariff on imported spirits from \$2.25 a gallon, where the Dingley law placed it, to \$2.60 per gallon. Since the internal-revenue tax on such liquors produced in this country is only \$1.10 per gallon, it is easy to see that the difference between the two gives protection to the American distiller to the amount of \$1.50 per gallon. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that an examination into the facts will convince the Ways and Means Committee that the American distillers reap the benefit of this differential by collecting from their customers the higher price they are able to collect on account of it. If so, they collect from the American consumers of spirits, over and above ordinary profits and over and above the amount they now pay as internal-revenue tax, which they, of course, get back when they sell, the sum of \$1.50 on each proof gallon they sell. If so, Mr. Chairman, this differential is putting about \$180,000,000 a year in the pockets of distillers through the higher price they are able to get on account of it, for of the more than 150,000,000 gallons of spirits produced in the United States each year more than 120,000,000 gallons are consumed in the United States; and I see from the report of the Ways and Means Committee which accompanies this bill, on page 189, that there were only 3,061,505 gallons imported last year.

It is easily apparent that the differential of \$1.50 per gallon practically prohibits the importation of spirits from abroad to compete with the domestic article, and enables the distiller to collect it from the trade.

I could take up the question as to how the differential between the tariff duties on beers and other similar fermented liquors and the internal-revenue tax on such liquors produced in the United States affords protection to the brewers, and that they get the higher price for their stuff which the differential makes it possible for them to get, and which I am satisfied they do get, and are gathering into their tills by the favor of the Government through this protective differential about \$400,000,000. Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into the details now. My purpose in calling attention to the matter is to express the hope that the Ways and Means Committee will report a bill that will take the protection out of Schedule H and make it operate to produce revenue. I have introduced such a bill, and it has been referred to the committee. As a Democrat I am opposed to protection, and, while I believe in taxing luxuries, I am opposed to taxing liquor drinkers for the benefit of liquor makers.

If the internal-revenue taxes on liquors is increased to equal the tariff taxes levied on imported liquors and the differential wiped out, it is safe to say that about \$500,000,000 will find its way to the Government Treasury every year which now overflows the tills of the liquor lords of America through the favoritism of this differential. Let this be done, and tariff taxation can be removed from every necessity and every comfort the people would really like to enjoy.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE I—COTTON MANUFACTURES.

255. Cotton thread and carded yarn, combed yarn, warps or warp yarn, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form, except spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons, hereinafter provided for, shall be subject to the following rates of duty: Nos. 1 to 9, inclusive, 5 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 10 to 19, inclusive, 7½ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 20 to 39, inclusive, 10 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 40 to 49, inclusive, 15 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 50 to 59, inclusive, 17½ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 60 to 99, inclusive,

20 per cent ad valorem; No. 100 and over, 25 per cent ad valorem. Cotton card laps, roping, sliver, or roving, 10 per cent ad valorem; cotton waste and flocks manufactured or otherwise advanced in value, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to the present paragraph, but it covers several paragraphs; and so, if it is adopted, which it will not be, I shall move to strike out the subsequent paragraphs to which it refers when they are reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read, in order to save time, and permit me to go ahead and debate it by unanimous consent of some sort.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, of course I should like to have the amendment read for the information of the House before the gentleman debates it; but before it is read I am perfectly willing to see if we can reach an agreement about time on this schedule. I think the cotton schedule is a schedule which, if you amend one portion, you must amend the balance. If the gentleman has a proposition to offer concerning a reasonable limitation of debate, I shall be glad to agree upon it.

Mr. MANN. Let us see if we can reach an agreement. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] covers the first three paragraphs of this schedule—255, 256, and 257. I do not know whether any gentleman on this side desires to offer an amendment to other paragraphs, with the exception of one or two.

Mr. FARR. I do.

Mr. MOORE. There will be others.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to offer an amendment to the paragraph on laces.

Mr. MANN. Can we get a memorandum of the paragraphs to which gentlemen desire to offer amendments after 257?

Mr. BUTLER. I desire to offer an amendment to paragraph 270 in regard to lace window curtains.

Mr. MOORE. I have one to the upholstery paragraph—263.

Mr. AUSTIN. And I have one to paragraphs 264 and 265.

Mr. MANN. Then, as I understand, gentlemen desire to offer amendments to paragraphs 263, 264, 265, 266, and 270 in addition to the three paragraphs covered by the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Can we not reach an agreement as to time for debate on the paragraphs covered by the Gardner amendment in the way of general debate, and then the other amendments, which would be limited?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose gentlemen who offer these amendments can not take more than 5 minutes, so that would be 25 minutes for those. I suggest that we agree on time for general debate on the schedule, and then, if gentlemen do not object, we will vote on all the amendments when we finish the schedule.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that we have, if we can, an agreement for debate of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, which might be general, and then an agreement that when the other paragraphs are read amendments may be offered and a limit of time for debate on those.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest that we agree on a limited time to discuss the schedule and divide it up between those who have cotton mills or cotton industries in their districts.

Mr. LENROOT. I think I should object to the proposition put in that form.

Mr. MANN. We can debate the particular paragraphs when we reach them when the amendments are offered, so that will not be stretched out.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not see how we can do that. If my friends thought that there was a chance of passing the amendments, that might make a difference.

Mr. MANN. When the amendment is offered to the paragraph, the Record shows that such a paragraph is read and the amendment offered, and the Member discusses it, and it shows what it is. Without that the amendment does not mean anything to one who reads the proceedings.

Mr. MOORE. May I inquire whether it is the intention of the committee to offer any amendments?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There will be a few committee amendments.

Mr. MOORE. It is not likely that the committee will accept any amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; they might offer the same proposition as the committee offered.

Mr. MOORE. In view of the experience we have had in the House, I, for one, am willing to submit the amendments without discussion. I do not want to commit anybody else. It seems to me that this is a schedule that would be affected all along the line by the change made in any one paragraph, and

on the statement of the gentleman that no amendments will be accepted by the committee, I would be willing to forego discussion.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman from Alabama be willing to agree to give us an hour or an hour and a half on the pending amendments, in the way of general debate on this side, and then five minutes on each of the five paragraphs?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would be willing to give the gentleman an hour. We have got to have some time ourselves.

Mr. MANN. I think we will do fairly well on the bill if we get through this schedule and another one to-day. It would be a great personal accommodation to me to give us an hour and a half on this proposition and then five minutes on the other paragraphs. There is a great demand for time on this proposition. I do not care how much time is used on the other side.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will agree to that in this way. The sections the gentleman is talking about are 263, 264, 265, 266, and 270.

Mr. MANN. That is all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand, the gentleman wants—

Mr. MANN. An hour and a half on the pending amendment, which will be considered in the way of general debate, and the Clerk read the other paragraphs, and we have five minutes on those.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Ten minutes' debate on each side on those paragraphs, and I control the time?

Mr. MANN. Five minutes on our side on each paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, if I do not want to use the five minutes I need not do it, but the gentleman wants an hour and a half general debate on his side. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that there may be an hour and a half general debate on each side on this schedule, and after that is concluded the debate then is to be limited to paragraphs 263, 264, 265, 266, and 270, and that on each of these paragraphs there shall be five minutes debate on each side, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois and the other half by myself.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object, but let it be understood that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has an amendment to paragraph 270 which he desires to offer.

Mr. MANN. That is included.

Mr. BUTLER. I have one also, and we can not speak in concert.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. One of the gentlemen can speak in the general debate.

Mr. BUTLER. If I am given a chance in general debate that is satisfactory.

Mr. MANN. Is it the same amendment or a different amendment?

Mr. BUTLER. It is practically the same.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to state that there are two other amendments to be offered. Mr. VARE has an amendment he would like to offer.

Mr. MANN. Every paragraph is covered, but of course only five minutes on a side are allowed on a paragraph. I am trying to get the most time that I can.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that there be three hours of general debate upon the amendment now pending, to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]; that then there shall be on paragraphs Nos. 263, 264, 265, 266, and 170, 10 minutes of general debate on each paragraph, one-half of the 10 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and one-half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and that at the conclusion of that time all debate on this schedule shall end. Is there objection?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts about which three hours of debate are to occur?

Mr. MANN. It is an amendment to the first three paragraphs of the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not yet been reported.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts proposes to offer an amendment to three paragraphs, and that the general debate is to be upon that amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The general debate would be upon the entire schedule.

Mr. MANN. At any place in the schedule.

Mr. MOORE. It is not to be limited to what the gentleman from Massachusetts proposes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no. The general debate is on the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, when the general debate closes the Clerk will read the schedule paragraph by paragraph, and when we reach the paragraphs where the debate is to be we will have the debate.

Mr. MANN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

255. Cotton thread and carded yarn, warps or warp yarn, in singles, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form, except spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons, hereinafter provided for, not colored, bleached, dyed, or advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more single yarns together, shall be subject to the following rates of duty: Nos. 1 to 9 $\frac{1}{2}$, inclusive, 5 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 10 to 19 $\frac{1}{2}$, inclusive, 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 20 to 29 $\frac{1}{2}$, inclusive, 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 30 to 49 $\frac{1}{2}$, inclusive, 20 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 50 to 59 $\frac{1}{2}$, inclusive, 22 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem; Nos. 60 to 90 $\frac{1}{2}$, inclusive, 27 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem; No. 100 and over, 32 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem. Cotton yarns, combed, twisted, dyed, colored, or advanced in manufacture beyond singles in the gray, 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon. Cotton card laps, roping, silver, or roving, 10 per cent ad valorem; cotton waste and locks, manufactured or otherwise advanced in value, 5 per cent ad valorem.

256. Spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons in any form shall be dutiable at the same rates of duty as the single yarns from which they are made.

257. Cotton cloth of plain weaves, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized, containing yarn the highest number of which does not exceed No. 10, 5 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 10 and not exceeding No. 20, 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 20 and not exceeding No. 30, 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 30 and not exceeding No. 50, 20 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 50 and not exceeding No. 60, 22 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 60 and not exceeding No. 100, 27 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 100, 32 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem. Cotton cloth of plain weaves when bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized shall be subject to a duty of 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon.

257 $\frac{1}{2}$. Cotton cloth of fancy weaves, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized, containing yarn the highest number of which does not exceed No. 10, 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 10 and not exceeding No. 20, 15 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 20 and not exceeding No. 30, 20 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 30 and not exceeding No. 50, 27 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 50 and not exceeding No. 60, 30 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 60 and not exceeding No. 100, 35 per cent ad valorem; exceeding No. 100, 40 per cent ad valorem. Cotton cloth of fancy weaves when bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized shall be subject to a duty of 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, this schedule was prepared by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] and by me. No one else is in any way committed to it. We have endeavored to draw a cotton schedule which will come within the four corners of the Tariff Board report. There is only one criticism which can justly be made in respect to its not coming within the bounds of the Tariff Board report. It is a fact that all along the line we allow an additional duty of 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to offset the process of coloring and bleaching cloths. Some gentlemen may claim that this duty is not in accordance with the Tariff Board's report. The Tariff Board report was incomplete in its figures on finishing cloths. For instance, it gave us no figures on the foreign costs of finishing cloths, such as ginghams, made by weaving various colored threads. We did not feel justified in saying that finishing mills are entitled to no protection whatever; consequently we allowed a modest 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the circumstances have a good deal changed since the report of the Tariff Board was issued, owing to a general rise in pay in the textile industry. The result of our figuring is roughly this: Take cotton cloth, which is the true measure of the whole cotton schedule—under the Payne law the average ad valorem duty for cotton cloth in 1912 was 42.75 per cent. The highest duty proposed under the Green-Gardner proposed amendment is 42 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on cotton cloth, no matter how fancy the weave, no matter how complicated the coloring.

The duties on cotton cloth in the Green-Gardner amendment run from 5 per cent on the cheapest cotton cloth to 42 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the most highly complicated weaves made from the finest of yarns, whereas the Payne law, on the average, in 1912 was higher—

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will permit a question. You have, according to that, reduced the rate upon the commoner cotton cloth below the pending bill, I understand.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; below the pending bill. I shall explain that circumstance in a minute or two. I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. GARDNER. In the first place, Mr. GREEN and I wish it to be understood that if we were drafting a law we should make the duties specific instead of ad valorem. We believe in specific rates for the cotton schedule, but we have drawn this amendment in ad valorem shape so that the House may understand what GREEN and GARDNER think are the proper ad valorem equivalents for the specific duties which they would approve. The criticism may be made that we have lowered the Underwood rates on coarse cotton cloth and raised it on fine cotton cloth, and that coarse cotton goods are made in the South, and that fine cotton goods are made in New England. That is partly true, but it was not for sectional reasons that we made the changes.

As a matter of fact, in the South to-day great quantities of fine goods are made, and in New England plenty of coarse goods are made. Still, it is true, comparatively speaking, that on the whole the Green-Gardner amendment is more favorable to New England than the schedule which the gentleman from Alabama proposes. However, I do not propose to distort this discussion into a sectional dispute.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was not the purpose of my inquiry at all.

Mr. GARDNER. I understand perfectly. Now, Mr. Chairman, the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, at the head of which is Mr. Parker, of South Carolina, presented a schedule to the Ways and Means Committee. Out of 42 rates of duty proposed in the Green-Gardner amendment I believe that only 4 are higher than the corresponding rates proposed in the Parker bill, while 4 of our rates are lower than the corresponding rates of the Underwood bill. On the whole, our schedule is substantially lower than the Parker schedule.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that personally I do not believe that cotton cloths made from yarns up to twenties need much, if any, protection; that is, provided that the cloth is a plain cloth, unbleached, not a fancy cloth or a colored cloth. In my opinion these fancy weaves, these Jacquard weaves, these high-numbered fine yarns, all need a great deal greater protection than is accorded them in the Underwood bill. I support that opinion partly by citing the importations which have actually taken place under the high duties of the Payne law and partly by the report of the Tariff Board.

I shall now address myself to what I believe to be an entirely mistaken classification in the cotton schedule of the Underwood bill. Paragraph 257 allows only 2½ per cent extra duty, no matter how complicated the finish, no matter how wonderful the pattern, no matter how many different colored threads are woven together, no matter what dyes are used. The Underwood schedule allows 2½ per cent duty to compensate for the bleaching of coarse brown cotton cloth like this which I hold in my hand. [Exhibiting.] Yet the Underwood schedule allows only the same compensation for weaving this intricate design in colors, such as the one I am showing you. [Exhibiting.]

In each case the Underwood schedule allows 2½ per cent compensation for the extra work. Could anything be more unreasonable? Consider the vast difference in the labor involved.

This morning I went into Woodward & Lothrop's store and there was introduced to Mr. Mack, the chief of the white-goods department, and Mr. Bussell, who has charge of the department in which gingham is included. I bought a number of pieces of cloth. They could not tell me the numbers of the yarns out of which these pieces of cloth were woven. However, I had the Tariff Board report with me, and I bought goods like several of the samples investigated by the Tariff Board.

Here, Mr. Chairman, is a piece of what is known as "long cloth." No. 15 of the samples of the Tariff Board report is "long cloth." Now, the Tariff Board's report gives the number of the finest yarn in that sample as 40. As you will observe, this cloth is bleached. If it were unbleached, the duty would be 17½ per cent, but inasmuch as it is bleached, the duty is 20 per cent under the Underwood bill. Here we have a piece of Persian lawn. Sample No. 19 in the Tariff Board report is Persian lawn made from yarns whose highest number is 120. Assuming that this simple white Persian lawn which I hold in my hand is of the same fineness, the duty under the proposed schedule would be 30 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. PALMER. Would I interrupt the gentleman if I asked him a question not exactly on that proposition? He may have covered it, and if so, I would not ask him to repeat it. How does the gentleman's substitute compare with the Hill bill, which was offered last year?

Mr. GARDNER. We are higher than the Hill bill on plain cloths except the coarse kinds. We are lower on the coarsest yarns and much higher on the medium and fine yarns. On fancy weaves and on Jacquards we are higher in the higher numbers and lower in the lower numbers, but on the whole we are higher than the Hill bill.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman does not claim that it does not follow the report of the Tariff Board?

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman claims exactly that. If he has time he will read a telegram in which the chairman of the Tariff Board declares that he has never consented to give his approval to the Hill bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have shown you this Persian lawn, dutiable at 30 per cent, and this long cloth, dutiable at 20 per cent. Now let me show you some singular comparisons in fancy weaves.

This single white cloth here being dutiable at 30 per cent, what do you suppose that the duty is on this other intricate weave of beautiful colors? [Indicating.] This sample here is made out of yarn No. 28 in the warp and yarn No. 20 in the filling. It is known as a Jacquard gingham. It is dutiable at only 15 per cent under the Underwood bill. Here is another Jacquard gingham [indicating], No. 32 in the warp, No. 47 in the filling, and that is dutiable at only 20 per cent under the Underwood bill. Here is another Jacquard gingham, also dutiable at 20 per cent under the Underwood bill [indicating]. Mind you that gingham, gentlemen, are made by weaving colored threads, a difficult process and a slow process as compared with weaving gray yarns into plain cloth. What are known as "prints," which used to be so popular, are made by coloring the cloth after it is woven. Machinery to make print cloths goes at a tremendous rate of speed, but no such speed is possible when a pattern is to be woven.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is a Jacquard madras. No. 70 yarn forms part of the filling; 13 waste, part of the filling; 13 dyed, part of the filling; and 42 card in the warp. There [indicating] is a very pretty, a very wonderful, and a very complicated fabric. Gentlemen, that splendid product is dutiable under the Underwood bill at a lower rate than that plain white fabric [indicating]. That plain white fabric [indicating] carries a 30 per cent duty, while the fancy weave carries only a 25 per cent duty.

Mr. COOPER. What is the value of those two, respectively?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not know the value of this fancy sample; but I can tell you the retail value of the plain sample, because I bought it this morning. I paid 18 cents a yard for it. This is a half yard of Persian lawn. The price that Woodward & Lothrop paid for it was 12 cents.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I had expected to offer an amendment to paragraph 270, but having had an uncomfortable and unsuccessful experience in my effort to secure the adoption of an amendment heretofore, I shall forego the pleasure of the bowling over which my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] will get when he offers his amendment in behalf of the lacemakers. This paragraph covers lace, window curtains, netting, pillow shams, and so forth. The duty on the articles named in this paragraph is to be reduced.

I do not wish to speak to the amendment, which, of course, will be defeated. It should be adopted because it is intended to benefit and stimulate a great industry. I do not criticize gentlemen on the other side for passing a tariff bill. This much is expected of them. President Wilson, for whom I entertain the most favorable and kindly impression, yesterday said that the country did not go Democratic last year. If it did not, I would like to know the way it did go. [Laughter.] He said it could not go Republican because of political differences in our party which led to division. His warning was in his fear of the future. I believe the country expects the gentlemen of the majority to pass a free-trade bill. The American people did not expect it last fall, but they have now concluded that the majority will pass the bill which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with the usual candor that he shows in his speech, said is a bill in which the protection idea has been forgotten by the gentlemen who framed it.

Therefore it is useless to speak to an amendment with any hope for its adoption, especially if such amendment contains a bit of protection in it. But I desire to present an humble

protest, not made by what you term the protected interests, but made by the laboring men, the operators employed in the lace mills of Chester, Pa.

It may be unfortunate for their cause, Mr. Chairman, that they addressed this remonstrance to Senator PENROSE and to me, for a cause which we should advocate would be looked upon with suspicion by a free trader. If they had addressed it to the House it might have had, perhaps, a more patient and respectful hearing. The majority here only stares at the petitioner when he holds in his hands a petition for protection. In this protest these men say that they desire Senator PENROSE and me to vote against the recommendations of the Committee on Ways and Means concerning lace and lace curtains.

Well, so far as my vote goes, not to mention that of the Senator, they will not be disappointed. The petitioners further say that the adoption of their recommendation—meaning the recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee—means an increase in foreign competition, and “also means less employment and a reduction in the pay envelope for the undersigned.” “Therefore,” they say, “we earnestly plead for your support in the retention of the present rates.”

I shall place this in the petition basket where it will pass unnoticed and unhonored—to be returned to them by the thin and thorny hand of free trade in about six months from this time.

It is only because of this short, well-pointed, and humble remonstrance that I raise my voice against what seems to me to be a positive wrong. It may not be, Mr. Chairman; when I think of all the different kinds of reformers who participated in the last campaign, I thought of some of them as the philosopher did of the tack upon the floor, most dangerous when pointing heavenward. If this bill will take from these men any part of the pay they have heretofore had, it ought not to pass. Who will deny that?

I do not believe that we are to have a condition in the United States in the business world, such as was described and promised by Democratic orators last fall in their campaign, which would correspond to glories found only in the sky. These same men were promised less expense in their living and more money in their purses. A state of joy treasured in the hearts of angels and hoped for in the breasts of men. While this debate is raging here you admit that your only expectation is to prevent an increase in the present cost of living. You further admit thereby that you do not expect to reduce it. I hope we shall not have disaster. Oh, I sincerely hope that we shall not. I do not predict it, Mr. Chairman. But I am anxiously waiting. I do not wish to see the fulfillment of Republican prophecy. It means distress. Our party can better stand defeated than to be victorious by encouraging disaster.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I believe that gentlemen, sensible men as they are, in making their air castles do not consider for one moment who are likely to occupy them. You have promised us a state of affairs which I believe that you can never supply. I do not believe that it is possible to cheapen an article of commerce without cheapening every element that goes into its production. Therefore, when you cheapen the products of the country, I believe you are bound to cheapen the labor that brings them forth. If your bill justifies your predictions, your lease upon power is indefinite. If it fails, you will retire for a generation. These lace makers did not expect you to convert our customhouses into market places where their product will be put in competition with that of the foreigner at ruinous prices. You did not tell them this last fall, although you propose to do it now.

Upon this lace schedule these petitioners desire me to say to you that the wages on Nottingham lace curtains represent from 45 to 58 per cent of the value; that is, in the manufacture of Nottingham lace curtains the workmen get from 45 to 58 per cent of the value of the product. Furthermore, in the comparison which they make—and the comparison is made by workers who come from English and Scottish mills—the difference in the rate of wages here is shown to be 61½ per cent over the union rate in Nottingham, and from 164 to 327 per cent over the rate in Scotland. It is not the lack of knowledge but the lack of time which prevents me from making the prediction of conditions which I believe you are designedly working out for these men. They now understand that you propose to increase the importation of curtains by this competitive law which is to be forced through by your forces riding unbridled at the business affairs of all the American people. What explanation will you make when election

day comes again? These people expected you to reduce duties, but did not dream that you would destroy business.

These employers desire me to say to the House that the machinery used in these mills is employed only two-thirds of the time, because the demand for the product is not sufficient for their employment a longer time. There is no sale for it. There is no use for it. It can be used for one purpose only, and that is for the manufacture of Nottingham lace curtains. When you are through, what will become of it? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, everything I have to say will be entirely technical, but I hope there are some gentlemen on this and on the other side who wish to learn something with reference to the technicalities of this schedule.

Last year and year before, if I remember right, a cotton bill was introduced by the Democratic majority of this House. The bill now before us differs from it in some very important particulars. In some respects it has been improved, and in other respects I think the action of the committee has been for the worse. The industry of manufacturing cotton is so important, creating as it does a product in excess of \$228,000,000, of which something like \$24,000,000 worth of cloth are exported, that it demands, it seems to me, the most careful attention of the House and ought to have a schedule as well framed as it can be under the information that we have before us.

When the Democratic bill was introduced last year yarn up to No. 50 bore a 10 per cent rate. That was the lowest rate that was given in the former bill. The present bill has a lower rate of 5 per cent. In that respect it is an improvement, and agrees with the rates which have been introduced by myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. The former bill also gave as its highest rate on yarn 15 per cent. The new bill gives as the highest rate only 25 per cent ad valorem and makes no allowance whatever for finishing. That is, the yarns in gray are the same as the cable laid, mercerized, gassed, or advanced in any way by additional processes.

This, in my judgment, is a serious mistake. As a matter of fact, in yarns above No. 40 about 4 per cent of our whole production is now imported, and in yarns used in this country above that number about 19 per cent is now imported. That is to say, there are about 6,700,000 pounds above No. 40 imported, and something like 35,000,000 pounds produced in this country. But this yarn so imported was admitted at a rate on lower numbers of about 24 per cent, and runs from that up to 38 per cent. They must be imported simply because they can be bought in those countries cheaper than they can be by the manufacturers produced by the parties who wish to turn them into cloth.

For that reason it would seem that the present rates which I have given are now on a competitive basis, and yet this bill would greatly reduce them, and, as I am satisfied, turn the manufacture and production of these yarns above 40 entirely over to foreign manufacturers, unless the American manufacturer reduces the wage scale.

With regard to cloth, I wish to supplement the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] at the outset in saying that 90 per cent of the cloth produced in this country, approximately 90 per cent, is in the numbers below 40 thread in making it up. So that the provisions of this schedule in reference to plain cloth are by far the most important, so far as quantity and value are concerned, of any found in the bill. It seems to me that there have been some very serious mistakes made in preparing this schedule. The report of the Tariff Board so far as plain cloths were concerned, especially those on the lower numbers, showed that practically all of them were made and sold at the mill doors in this country for as low or lower price than they were made in Europe and sold there at the mills. These plain cloths, therefore, need but little, if any, protection. In the proposed rate given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and myself we have on the lower numbers of yarn put a rate of 5 per cent, which possibly is not needed at all, but is only a nominal rate.

As graded by the bill which we have here, the protection on the coarse grades of cloth is very much higher than there is any necessity of its being, in my judgment. It can be, and I think it ought to be, reduced to the rates which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has presented, and it is possible that even those, so far as the coarse grades are concerned, that are below the twenties, might also be reduced from the figures we have given. But that is not really the most serious trouble respecting the rates and provisions of this schedule with reference to cloth. The very highest grade given

in this bill on the cloth is 27½ per cent ad valorem. This is advanced, when it is colored, stained, painted, printed, Jacquard figured, or mercerized, by 2½ per cent. The greater amount of the importations into this country are goods that are made either upon what is called dobby looms or Jacquard looms or some other kind that weave fancy cloth. This bill does not distinguish in any manner between the fancy woven cloth and the ordinary plain cloths, except that Jacquard cloths are now included and advanced 2½ per cent, whereas they were entirely overlooked in the bill which we voted upon last summer. As pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], the process of mercerizing, or the ordinary courses of finishing, according to the report of the Tariff Board, costs no more in this country than it does in Europe, so that we added only the nominal amount of 2½ per cent for it, and 2½ per cent will be added under this bill; but if a manufacturer produces one of the most expensive kinds of complicated weaves, such as have been shown by Mr. GARDNER, and some of which are simply fancy woven cloths and not Jacquard cloths, then, however complicated they may be, made by dobby loom or Jacquard loom, no matter what figures may be put in or what kind of threads, the same advance is made. It is all lumped together, all thrown together with an advance of 2½ per cent only, which will not anywhere near cover the difference in labor cost between that of this country and abroad.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have a couple of minutes more.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of demonstrating this, I will call attention to two samples mentioned by the Tariff Board. One of these is duck, in which it will be found by examination that the labor cost is less than 5 per cent. Turning then to No. 57 of the Tariff Board report, in the table of 100 samples given, is a fancy woven cloth in which the labor cost is 39.82 per cent of the whole cost of material, or what we may practically call 40 per cent of the whole cost. In other words, the labor cost in this kind of fancy woven cloth is eight times what it is in duck, and yet there is no difference made in this bill, and which we are asked to approve, except 2½ per cent. In the bill which was introduced last session by our Democratic friends a 5 per cent difference was made. This is an improvement in some respects, but it will not near cover the difference between the plain weaves and Jacquard weaves, or even some of the dobby weaves, some of which involve processes costly as the Jacquard weaves.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I assert that this schedule has not received the attention which it ought to have received. This bill is drawn upon wrong lines, and the rates are incorrect and erroneous and find no justification in the facts or the report of the Tariff Board.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have reserved for considerable amplification in the RECORD my statistical and detailed observations upon this schedule of the tariff, and I therefore desire at this time merely to offer a few general observations upon this great question. Yesterday a gentleman from my own part of the State called upon me—and I assume that my Democratic colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS], on the Ways and Means Committee, had a similar interview—he brought me samples of cloth which he manufactures in his mill, showing the product from the earliest stages right up to the final stage in which the cloth is ready to be sold across the counter.

He said: "How much do you suppose my mill gets for this beautiful piece of finished cloth?" I guessed very far from the mark. He said: "Twenty-five cents a yard." He then asked me, "How much do you suppose that retails for across the counter?" and I guessed 75 cents a yard. He said: "That retails for \$1.50 or more per yard." Now, gentlemen, I say to you that you are attacking the wrong place on this tariff proposition, in so far as it relates to these duties in the cotton schedule. You are attacking the end of the business where neither profits nor wages are unduly high, and yet you are allowing to go absolutely unscathed the middleman—the jobber, the wholesaler, the retailer—to do what they like with the price, and allow it to go skyward, to soar to the zenith, if you please, and get whatever they can from the ultimate consumer. It is the intermediaries who get the large profits, much larger than the manufacturer, and yet the former are absolutely unaffected by this tariff reduction.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I have only five minutes, and I have a good deal of ground to cover.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I wish the gentleman would indicate how we can do that.

Mr. ROGERS. I must decline to yield; I have only five minutes. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is the fashion in certain sections of the country to charge that the cotton manufacturers of New England are robbers of the consumers, but the fact is that in Lowell, for example, the average yearly dividends of our 10 or 12 cotton mills for the last eight years has been less than 4½ per cent. We in New England were much edified by a remark made on the floor of this House two years ago by a Democratic Member, then and now on the Ways and Means Committee, the Member from North Carolina—you will recall it, those of you who were here at that time—who said, "We of the South intend to make your mills in the North come down to us or else go out of business." That is the idea with which the members of the Ways and Means Committee approached this problem when they were framing this tariff and which they are now attempting to enact into law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the cotton schedule in the Wilson bill adopted by the Democratic Congress in 1894 was prepared after full and free consultation with delegations from the State of Massachusetts, comprising representatives of both the manufacturers who owned the cotton mills and of the different labor organizations representing the operatives who were employed therein. Had the remainder of the schedules of the Wilson bill been written with the same care and discretion, the Democratic Party possibly might have been retained in power in 1896.

The cotton schedule was unchanged when the Dingley law was enacted in 1897, and it was changed only to a very slight degree when it was reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Ways and Means in 1909 in the bill known as the Payne bill.

After the Payne bill reached the Senate there were some modifications made in the bill which resulted in severe condemnation being visited upon the Republican Party and the framers of the final tariff bill known as the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act. And while I believed then and believe now that many of the criticisms were unjust, I wish to call your attention to the fact that no representatives from either the manufacturers or operatives in the district which I have the honor to represent appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and asked for the changes in the bill which seemed to meet with such severe condemnation. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, during the 15 years that I have been a Member of this House no manufacturer or operative has ever approached me personally or by letter asking me to secure any changes in the cotton schedule.

Since the introduction of the Underwood bill, however, protests by telegrams and by letters have been insistent and severe in their denunciation of the cotton schedules which are contained in said bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to offer any amendments to the bill, because I realize that, owing to the fact that there is a large majority of Democrats on the other side of the House, all or most of whom are pledged to vote for the passage of the bill without amendment, it would only take up the time of the House needlessly, without accomplishing any beneficial result.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS] this morning in regard to his willingness to vote for a reduction in the tariff upon the cotton and wool industries, but he believed that there ought to be a tariff on the productions of California, and I do not forget when there was a proposition made by the Democratic majority last year to take the duty off of lemons the gentleman from California, after voting himself for all the propositions that had been submitted by the Democratic majority to reduce the tariff, rose in astonishment and almost with tears in his eyes and besought the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House to reverse their action, and reminded them that he had voted with them on every proposition they had submitted and now they ought to vote with him on the question of lemons. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Now, gentlemen, I do not know anything about the lemon industry, but I want it to enjoy the prosperity which it has long enjoyed. I do not regard the industry as so sacred that it should be entitled to especial consideration, while those who so regard it announce their willingness to join in the destructive onslaught on the cotton and woolen industries. I listened to the amendments proposed here by Mr. GARDNER, my colleague from Massa-

chusetts, and also the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] with some astonishment.

I express my astonishment, for the reason that I think, as good men as they are in many respects, they are wholly unfamiliar with the cotton industry. Some of the remarks made to me by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] as he sat behind me this afternoon, and the questions he propounded to me, convinced me that he is not acquainted with the first rudiments of the cotton industry. I do not blame him for putting in whatever amendments he pleases individually; but I want to say in regard to the cotton schedule and the report of the Tariff Commission or Tariff Board, everyone knows that the Tariff Board did not complete their investigations regarding the cotton industry in all of its details, and they plainly stated that in view of the complex nature of the industry that there was room for a wide difference of opinion in calculating and estimating the varied phases of the cotton industry; and there is no living man, no matter how capable he may be in other lines, who can take up the cotton industry in all its details without devoting very much more time than the Tariff Board were able to devote to it. It certainly would require very much more time than these two gentlemen on this side of the House have devoted to the amendments that they have presented here this afternoon to enable them to qualify as experts in proposing legislation with the view of having their conclusions enacted into law, which might seriously affect the vast number of persons employed in the industry and the large amount of capital invested therein.

I do not pretend to be a cotton expert myself, for I am not. I do not own a share of cotton-mill stock, and have not owned any since 1878. So I do not come here as a cotton expert. But I have always lived in a cotton-mill town and city, and consequently I partake somewhat of the atmosphere of this important industry. I am interested in the cotton schedule not alone from the standpoint of the manufacturers, but I am interested also in behalf of 40,000 people who are employed in the mills in the city of Fall River, where I reside, and who have families dependent upon them. They represent more than two-thirds of the population of my own city. I also speak in behalf of the cotton industry of the entire State of Massachusetts, the State that produces more cotton goods and consumes more cotton than any other State in the Union. For more than 100 years they have been making cotton goods in the city where I reside.

The industry was started upon coarse grades of goods, and some of the early pioneers in this country brought some of the first looms and spinning machinery into this country, taking the same from England and bringing it into this country in parts and assembling those parts here, and beginning the manufacture of cotton goods. And they have built up a wonderful industry, which now comprises many of the finer grades and varieties of cloth. I want to give you a little illustration of how it has been built up within the last 48 years. I call your attention to the number of cotton spindles that were in my city in 1865, as compared with the number that are there to-day. In 1865 they had 265,328; in 1866, 403,624; in 1868, 537,416; and then going on until these later years, in 1910, when there were 3,931,464 cotton spindles, and there has been no material increase there since that date. Directly surrounding the city in which I live, and the other portions of the district which I have the honor to represent, are considerably more than one-quarter of all the cotton spindles in this country, and there is not a more complicated schedule in the bill than the one pertaining to cotton.

I am deliberately and unalterably opposed to the Underwood bill, because the rates proposed are not high enough to protect American industries and American labor, and, further, because the hearings held by the Committee on Ways and Means were not considered with care, nor with any other purpose than to make the people believe they were using care, but with the result in view of providing foreign competition, which, in my view, could only result in reducing wages or throwing American laborers out of employment and destroying capital invested in the cotton industry. I am deliberately and unalterably opposed to the amendments proposed by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and my colleague from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] because they were prepared without the requisite knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say further that when the proposition was made in the form of an amendment by Mr. Hill, a former Member from Connecticut, last year, it was brought into this House very much in the same manner as the amendments of Messrs. GARDNER and GREEN are brought here to-day. Mr. Hill's bill came in as an entire surprise, as these amendments have come to my attention here to-day. I did not vote for the proposition put in by Mr. Hill, of Connecticut, last year, because, while I am willing to acknowledge that he is an

expert on the woolen industry, I do not admit that he was familiar enough with the cotton industry without devoting more time to the work, and I shall not vote for the propositions put in by my colleagues to-day. The number of yards produced in the mills in the city where I reside amount to nearly 1,200,000,000 yards of cloth per annum, and the wages amount to nearly \$300,000 per week, or nearly \$15,000,000 per annum. The whole industry of that community will be injured by the propositions which these gentlemen present here; and when the dull times come, as come they will in the cotton industry, and they are present to-day, when the dull times come and the mills do not find a market for their product, there is always sure to be a loss in wages and a reduction in the prosperity of the communities in which these industries are located, because when the mills do not find it profitable to run their plants the workmen can not draw their pay. And any such complete change in the tariff schedules as is proposed in the Underwood bill, or was proposed last year—and the present Underwood bill is more drastic than the one presented last year—should not have the consideration and approval of the membership of this House.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman say whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] in any way comports with the partial report of the Tariff Board?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I am not able to say, but the report of the Tariff Board certainly was not complete. It was not fit to be taken as a basis upon which to prepare a bill, and it was stated distinctly by both of these gentlemen who have presented these amendments that, after careful consideration, they had decided that they could not prepare a bill with any justice to the manufacturers or operatives based upon the uncompleted report of the Tariff Board without much longer deliberation.

Mr. MOORE. Then the gentleman does not consider the amendments scientifically drawn?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I do not. I consider the amendments unscientifically drawn.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is mistaken in saying that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] and I could not agree on a bill that was just. I said that the committee could not agree.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. While two men might agree upon something they do not know anything about, I am satisfied that the gentleman himself, while he is acquainted with fish and many matters affecting his own district, does not know anything about preparing a schedule relating to cotton goods.

Mr. BUTLER. We should not have any division among ourselves.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. You do not want any division, but it is necessary to exercise common sense. I do not propose to stand here and allow an industry that has been established in my city more than 100 years ago to be destroyed or injured and not register my protest against the methods pursued by the gentlemen in the preparation of these amendments.

Mr. STEENERSON. What does the gentleman want?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I want to be let alone, unless time enough can be allowed to assemble facts and present conclusions upon which legislation may be framed which will prove helpful rather than harmful to the capital invested and the vast number of men and women employed in the industry. I append herewith a letter which I received to-day from Walter H. Langshaw, of New Bedford, Mass., relating to the cotton-tariff schedule, which is worthy of careful perusal:

Letter on the cotton tariff schedule to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Walter H. Langshaw.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS., April 29, 1913.

The honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

I feel it my duty to make one more attempt to induce Congress to pass a cotton schedule that will meet the requirements of the situation without entailing serious loss to those who, in a measure or entirely, depend upon the cotton industry for a livelihood.

The proposed bill is wrong from any intelligent point of view. The reduction is too great, in some classes the rates are out of proportion, and a strictly ad valorem tariff is not suitable as a protective, competitive, or revenue tariff because of the fluctuations in cotton.

I do not believe that the apparent desire on the part of the public for revision of the tariff on a lower basis means or necessitates a vicious cut which will seriously disturb values and result in liquidation of labor and capital and serious loss to many towns and cities. Although the Democratic ticket was elected, the people have not expressed themselves as opposing the protective feature and favoring a tariff for revenue only.

The adoption of the proposed bill by the Ways and Means Committee on a basis not supported by the testimony at the hearing is to be deplored, and that such action was taken without any reason being given

for ignoring expert testimony raises doubt as to the sincerity of those who dominate the Ways and Means Committee.

As stated in my brief, 2 per cent of our population, about 2,000,000, are directly affected and should be informed why the Ways and Means Committee ignored such testimony and have it explained to them why rates are made on a given number of yarn as compared with a rate on other numbers. For instance, why is the ad valorem rate on gray yarns Nos. 20s to 39s made 10 per cent; on 40s to 49s, 15 per cent; on 50s to 59s, 17½ per cent; on 60s to 99s, 20 per cent? Assuming that cotton was a commodity in which there was a regular standard price, the different percentage rates then would give a net duty of a given number of cents per pound. As a manufacturer I know positively that the cost of manufacturing No. 99s is about double that of 59s. Therefore whatever system is used the number of cents per pound should be double on 99s what it is on 59s, and 59s should be over three times as much as that on 19s.

These comparative differences are not based on theory; they are based on facts which can be easily proven to anyone whose sense of justice is such that he has the desire to act in accordance with the facts and merits of the case. It involves no intricacies or mysteries that need confuse any intelligent man. It is not necessary to know what it costs to make similar goods in Germany, England, or France; the comparative difference can be determined from our own costs. I challenge any person to produce evidence to controvert these assertions or to give a convincing illustration that a tariff on a strictly ad valorem basis will, when figured out, show a rate in cents per pound that will remain the same on any given yarn from one year to another or that will give the same comparative differences from one yarn to another in any one year. Therefore the proposed schedule is not a protective, competitive, or revenue tariff.

On cloth in the gray I challenge any person who possesses practical knowledge of the business to produce evidence that will justify the action of the Ways and Means Committee in putting only an additional duty of only 2½ per cent over gray yarns.

On fabrics in the gray the cost is increased about half as much again over yarns. Therefore whatever system is used the duty per pound of cloth woven of a given number should be over half as much again over gray yarn in cents per pound, or its equivalent per yard. On fancy fabrics in the gray it is more than double the cost of gray yarn; in some fabrics more than three times the cost. On an average it is certainly more than double the cost. So whatever method is used the results should be that the duty should be in cents per pound or its equivalent per yard over twice as much as that of gray yarn. In support of this I will state that the pay roll of the weaving departments of the Dartmouth Manufacturing Corporation is greater than that of the spinning and all labor incidental to spinning yarn.

The working out of the proposed cotton schedule on a given number of yarn, assuming a fair cost or market value, when cotton was at its lowest price, would be 6 cents per pound. Using the same figures of cost, under cotton at the highest price in recent years the duty would be 9 cents per pound, showing a fluctuating difference in duty of 50 per cent. This is no theory; it is an actual fact, and any method that results in such a change because of the changes in the price of raw material is not a good tariff from a protective, revenue, or competitive standpoint, and is certainly bound to be a constant cause of disturbance to the industry.

Under extremely high-priced cotton there would be no revenue. Under extremely low-priced cotton there would be importations, a superabundance of revenue, and a large number of people thrown out of employment. We can not possibly progress on economic lines under such a law.

On gray plain cloth the calculated results are even worse. The duty is in cents per pound all out of proportion to yarns. That is on a calculation using the same basis of cost for conversion and for cotton, and because of a rate on a strictly ad valorem basis the proportion is changed when worked out on high-priced cotton as compared with low-priced cotton.

On fancy and figured gray cloth—which is comparatively a new industry in this country—there is practically no consideration given to the large increased cost of conversion over and above plain gray yarns and plain gray cloth. There is certainly not over 15 per cent of our products in this country that is on fancy and figured work. A large portion is made in New Bedford, and plants have been equipped to do this work, and the little consideration shown for the increased cost in adjusting the rate of duty as compared with other classes is singular considering Chairman UNDERWOOD's significant remark, when asked by a Congressman from this district to give New Bedford more consideration. He said, "New Bedford mills are rich; they can stand it." Rather a suggestive remark and unbecoming one who is such a dominating factor at this period of the Nation's affairs, even if true; but the implication would hardly stand, as there are five or six mills which were projected and completed about three years ago which have not paid or earned a dividend, and the stocks are very much below par, some of them as low as 45 per share, and no buyers.

There are the old mills which have good records whose stock has declined 20 to 40 per cent within three or four years. (See quotations attached.) Such conditions should certainly have important bearing and influence with those who are to decide what kind of a cotton schedule is to be adopted.

In face of these facts do you wonder that those interested in gray cotton fabrics, mostly fancy, in New Bedford or elsewhere, are alarmed at the possibility of such a measure becoming a law? The Dingley rate of duty was unreasonably high, but did not affect the consumer, as gray plain cloths and yarns ruled much below a price at which they could have been imported. The rate was left high evidently for the purpose of making it so as to cover the increased cost of manufacturing fancy fabrics, as there was no distinction made between plain and fancy figured work. There has been considerable growth, particularly in New Bedford, in the last few years, and this growth has resulted in domestic manufacturers underselling importers on special fabrics, hence the antagonism of the importers, who, I believe, have been given too much consideration in the making of the cotton schedule in the proposed bill.

In the act of 1897 the rate was based on so much per number. This is the correct way, but the rate should be changed about every 10 numbers. The duty on that bill of 60/s was 15 cents per pound. Assuming that 10 cents was decided upon, the tariff per pound would be reduced 33½ per cent.

On plain woven gray cloths the duty should be about 15 to 16 cents per pound; on fancy, which represents, as before stated, less than 15 per cent of our output in cloth, the duty should be about 20 to 22 cents a pound; other numbers in the same proportion. By a schedule on this basis the duty per pound would be fixed and not be disturbed by the change in the price of cotton.

In the matter of figuring the yarn on the cloth, it is simply a mathematical calculation of ends per inch and inches in width and yards per pound to determine, with due allowances for contraction, what is the average number. This method is much better than a tariff based on the finest number in the cloth, which would not always be easy to determine.

We have listened to lectures by those who are very much removed from the problem that faces those in the cotton industry, and it has been assumed that we are lacking in efficiency and courage. We have in New Bedford many English employees, and the quality and quantity produced is little, if any, below any known standard, certainly not more than would be natural, considering that we have a limited market of skilled textile operatives and that our growth has been rapid.

In some instances where the dividends have been exceptionally large we are given no credit for efficiency, but are condemned as being avaricious. In instances where the dividends are small or omitted entirely we are accused of keeping antiquated machinery, and therefore condemned and criticized because we do not buy new machinery and presumably pay 45 per cent duty into the United States Treasury, and then be called to task because we asked consideration to which conditions entitled us.

If we carry our capital much less than cost and run the risk involved in borrowing money, and then win out our dividends are too high. If we hold in reserve earnings to make ourselves strong, and later pay it out and give the stockholders an opportunity to buy a few more shares at par, we are accused of watering the stock. I am reminded of a remark which I think was made by Grover Cleveland in his first campaign, that he was "too tall when he stood up and too short when he sat down."

Two years ago Chairman UNDERWOOD wrote me asking for specific information. I asked for an opportunity to appear before those who were engaged in the work, but no opportunity was given me. It was my intention that if I was convinced of the sincerity of those who had the work in hand to have given them all the information I had at my command. This year, since the hearing, I have endeavored to arrange for a meeting with Chairman UNDERWOOD for the purpose of discussing the subject, but failed. I am now convinced that I favored a moderate reduction and was opposed to the policy of the "stand-pat" element, and that some of the information I might give could be used for political effect rather than for the introduction of economic principle in legislation.

The consideration shown one of experience and wide knowledge of the business, who favored a reduction in the tariff, is strangely in contrast with that shown to an importer who, I understand, has had the ears of a portion of the committee, and who, desiring to poach on our industrial preserves, is simply representing foreign capital.

The attempt of an importer to controvert a statement of men of experience and interest in this business, on which the welfare of many communities depends, by mention of the duties and costs of some specific cloths, even if they were correct, has no more to do with the main questions involved in this matter than has the price of Poland Spring water to do with the cost per horsepower of the water at Niagara Falls.

The Ways and Means Committee thus far has acted as the judge and jury, yet it is, in a measure, a packed jury, because the majority is comprised of those whose politics are the same as those of the party in power. The chairman, who should be the judge, really becomes the prosecuting attorney. The testimony of the defendants, the manufacturers, is thrown out, and evidence in favor of the prosecution is introduced at special interviews and the defendants given no opportunity to offer new evidence or testimony in rebuttal.

Chairman UNDERWOOD, in a speech to Congress, stated that "conditions of the consumer and manufacturer have changed since the Dingley law was enacted in 1897." While this may be introduced as an argument in favor of a revision, even on a lower basis, it is no argument in favor of the Underwood bill. He also stated that "all commodities have increased an average of 46 per cent." Note that he uses the word "average," a word he criticizes others for introducing into the tariff features, in the same speech. If a portion of this increase has grown because of high protection, in what proportion and in what industry? That is the specific thing we want to know—what industry has been benefited unduly and out of proportion to others, all things considered?

Prices of cotton, wheat, and other commodities have advanced, and common cotton has fluctuated between 6 cents and 17 cents a pound. Special cottons, American and Egyptians, have sold as low as 10 cents and as high as 35 cents for same grade and staple. Is the protective tariff to blame for this? If not, why is it not possible that the same underlying cause is responsible in many of the manufactured commodities, as in the raw materials?

He states, "There is one law of supply and demand." True, and there is no industry, business, or profession in which the law of supply and demand has been applied more effectively than in the cotton industry. The testimony supports it—the proofs can be found by those who seek them.

He further states "that there will be no immediate benefit to consumer because retailers have goods on their shelves bought under protective duties. The merchant will not buy more goods until he has sold these." This illustrates the crudeness of the theories or hypocrisy of some men who pose as leaders in reform movements.

A large number of people in New England would be pleased to have Mr. UNDERWOOD give us a practical illustration of the application of this theory by disposing of some of our shares, including new mills.

There are thousands of bales of cotton and cloth in storehouses which millmen would like to sell at cost, also some new mills. I have one, bought under "protective duties." Part of it has been stopped two years because we can not get cost for its product. I would like to find a customer at cost or even 20 per cent less. Why is Mr. UNDERWOOD so much more considerate of the retailers' welfare than for those who depend on the cotton-manufacturing industry for a living?

He states that "the tariff has been putting a premium on incompetency. We find that industries highly protected are running with equipment 60 years old." For every instance he will find in the cotton industry here, I will find a similar one in England, which is the leader in cotton textiles. Incompetency is not confined to manufacturing; it is in all trades and professions.

Who is responsible for the laws which render it easy for unskilled labor and incompetency to come here in large numbers, but makes it a penalty for any inducement to skilled labor, even though we need them to establish an industry? This condition is contrary to economics, and manufacturers didn't bring it about.

He states that no favored manufacturer has sat behind the committee doors and prepared this bill and dictated its provisions. I should put it that no manufacturer, certainly not in the textile industry,

has received any consideration. Personally, I ask for no favors; I do ask for justice and the introduction of some intelligence into a measure that is to affect 2 per cent of the population. I admit that the protective feature has been abused, but because there is a malignant growth is no reason why the patient should be killed or maimed by a bungling operation.

His reference to the raised tax on the luxuries of the rich and reduced on the necessities of the poor is in line with his reference to New Bedford mills mentioned in a previous paragraph. Expressions of this kind raise a question of the motives that govern Mr. UNDERWOOD'S action, and it would appear that the desire is to do something for political effect rather than for the permanent good of humanity. He states on cotton cloth that the people were taxed 50 per cent; they have reduced it 30 per cent. These are the kind of stump speeches that are spread over the country by one who occupies a position that makes it easy to do. We are selling some fine cotton cloths in New England to-day at a less base price than similar goods are sold in England, and considerable of our standard products are sold at over a cent per yard less than they could be imported.

The general tone of his address and a comparison of the inferences drawn from it with the actual facts indicates how essential it is that a commission should be established and the tariff taken out of politics. The business interests of this country have suffered because of the cheap political demagogues, the "ins" on one side and the "outs" on the other, playing the game for political preferment.

There is over \$28,000,000 deposited in savings banks in New Bedford. A dollar invested in a corporation is entitled to as much consideration as the dollar borrowed by the mills from the savings bank, no matter who invests in, whether it is the man of great wealth or the comparatively poor man. Most of the stockholders are people of moderate means. The city of New Bedford has increased about 60,000 in the last 20 years. Thousands of the employees in the mills have built their homes and borrowed money on mortgages. I know elderly people and widows who depend, in a measure—in fact, almost entirely—on the income of their modest investments. Therefore it is essential that, if justice is to prevail, these facts should have influence in the kind of a tariff law that is to be enacted.

The steel industry yielded hundreds of millions to those who were prominently identified with it, and, according to "The New Freedom," Mr. Carnegie sold out at about four or five times the estimated value of the property. There is no doubt but what this was due, in a measure, to excessive duty and limited competition, but nobody ever heard of anything like this in the cotton-mill business. Although there have been instances where exceptional profit has been made, it was with plenty of competition, such as is done in any business.

Because the Steel Trust magnates in the past have gathered their harvest and stored it away it is no reason why the cotton industry should be flched and demoralized.

I am on record, as stated in my brief and pamphlet recently published, as favoring for years a moderate reduction, and am opposed to the method of the stand-pat element who were the controlling factors in the Congress that passed the Payne-Aldrich bill. I am not seeking more wealth or trying to build up a monopoly; there is nothing of the kind that could be built up in this business; there are too many in it and it is too diversified. I expect and am willing to make a reasonable contribution for the common cause in the form of reduced valuations, if I can be relieved of the uncertainty and troubles due to pernicious legislation.

What is desired principally is an accurate comparative duty for different classes of gray cotton yarns and cotton cloth, which represent by far the greater portion of the industry.

First. A duty which can be based on our costs by a method that will not be subjected to violent changes because of fluctuations in the price of cotton or because of change in fashion. This is very important, because any irregularity in the proportionate duty per pound of one yarn as compared with another, or with cotton comprised of certain yarns compared with another, or with cloth as compared with yarn, or with fancy cloth as compared with plain cloth, is bound to result seriously when the fashion changes materially.

Second. I naturally desire that the rate of duty be not lower, certainly not at this period, than is justified, considering the high cost of our equipment, for which we have paid 45 per cent, or the equivalent, more than our foreign competitors, as shown by importations of machinery, and of the difference in wages, which is from 30 to 50 per cent, as can be substantiated.

If the social and industrial welfare of this country is to be given more consideration than cheap politics, it is now time to begin, and the present administration could give no better demonstration of their good faith than by passing a tariff bill which, even though it may be somewhat lower than is justified, will be at least scientific and comparatively equitable.

I believe that the fundamental cause of the apparent discontent of the masses, which is not limited to this country alone, is due to a feeling on the part of those who labor long and diligently all of their lives that they do not receive a return in proportion to the share of the world's work which they perform, and I certainly believe they do not receive their proper share. I do not believe that it is due to avariciousness, selfishness, or tyranny on the part of men engaged in any manufacturing business. It is due to the inherent selfishness of the human being as expressed in all walks of life, and consolidated capital, under the name of corporation, has been a target for all those who wish to pose as friends of labor, particularly a portion of our politicians and professional agitators, who reap a harvest through the gullibility of the laboring man.

The cost of living is high here, more so than some time ago. So it is in other countries with a high tariff and with a low tariff, therefore, the tariff now in force, inadequate as it may be, is not entirely, if in a degree, responsible for the increased cost of living. Undoubtedly the cost of living is higher here than in other countries, but the margin between wages earned and cost of living is certainly better than that which exists in other countries. If this were not so immigration would cease. I know for a fact that many who, for homesickness or other reasons, return to the land of their birth, are glad to get back here again. I know of a few who are unable to do so because they could not save the money to pay their passage. Therefore it would seem as though there must be some other cause for the increased cost of living, particularly in this country.

Personally I believe it is due to the tremendous increase in numbers of parasites, and people who live by their wits and those who labor and perform a kind of work which would be unnecessary if economic laws applied in all avenues of life. Political bosses, ward heelers, professional ambulance chasers, and blackmailers—men who use their cleverness to win a case and defend a man they know to be guilty and defeat the ends of justice and increase the cost of administering it; the

large number that are engaged in competing for trade; unnecessary solicitors, the cost of and the energy used in providing the consumer with an inferior article, which, if properly applied along creative or inventive lines, would provide the consumer with a superior article. Until legislation devotes more time to these features, the margin between the cost of living and compensation received for labor will not be increased.

New Freedom has a chapter entitled "Let there be light." I would like some light to explain why the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee ignored the testimony of men who, unquestionably, were not identified with the radical "stand-pat" element, and why they made certain rates on one class as compared with another. New Freedom also refers to a "Government by trusteeships" and the "Political boss," and, in accordance with the sentiment expressed, will you not, my dear Senator and Congressman, consider this question carefully and be patriotic and support that which you believe worthy according to the merits of the case?

Writers and speakers, particularly those affiliated in politics, are disposed to devote too much attention to "rich malefactors," particularly those identified with corporations. For 25 years I labored in the ranks with the workers. My letter is not because of a desire that action should be taken to enable me to retain what wealth I have accumulated or to add to it. I am satisfied with what I have and could be perfectly happy with much less, and, no matter how the tariff is adjusted, I shall have enough. My plea is principally on behalf of those who I know are not in as fortunate circumstances.

Yours, very truly,

WALTER H. LANGSHAW,
New Bedford, Mass.

(President and manager Dartmouth Manufacturing Co. and Bristol Manufacturing Co.)

LANCASHIRE'S VIEW OF PROPOSED CUT IN COTTON-GOODS TARIFF.

Sir Charles Macara, president of the Federation of Master Cotton Spinners' Associations of Lancashire, discussing industrial conditions in the American cotton industry and the new Underwood tariff bill, said:

"All their concerns have cost them a tremendous amount more to capitalize than ours have. They are left with this big handicap. At present, despite their tremendous tariffs, we have retained the finer end of the trade, and there is every likelihood that in this branch of the industry the tariff reductions will benefit us, because it is very difficult for them to secure the skilled workers that we have at our disposal. Their workers are of mixed nationalities and constantly migrating, and they can not compete with Lancashire in fine fabrics. The reduced tariff will increase this end of our trade, but it will not give us any greater opportunity on the lower and middle class goods, which Lancashire has not had recently."

The following table shows the high prices reached by local mill shares during the year 1909, their selling prices in September, 1912, and their present prices:

| | High, 1909. | September, 1912. | Present value. |
|--|-------------|------------------|----------------|
| Acushnet Mill..... | 300 | 150 | 135 |
| Beacon Manufacturing Co..... | 102½ | 102½ | 102½ |
| Beacon Manufacturing Co., preferred..... | 111 | 112½ | 112½ |
| Booth Manufacturing Co., common..... | | 70 | 50 |
| Booth Manufacturing Co., preferred..... | | 85 | 75 |
| Bristol Manufacturing Co..... | 150 | 100 | 75 |
| Butler Mill..... | 175 | 132 | 122 |
| City Manufacturing Co..... | 253 | 110 | 100 |
| Dartmouth Manufacturing Co..... | 300 | 245 | 225 |
| Dartmouth Manufacturing Co., preferred..... | 106 | 104 | 103 |
| Gosnold Mills, preferred..... | 113½ | 95 | 90 |
| Grinnell Manufacturing Co..... | 250 | 180 | 160 |
| Holmes Manufacturing Co..... | 102 | 99 | 100 |
| Holmes Manufacturing Co., preferred..... | 103 | 115 | 102½ |
| Hathaway Manufacturing Co..... | 200 | 200 | 175 |
| Kilburn Mill..... | 195 | 127½ | 120 |
| Manomet Mills..... | 138 | 122 | 117½ |
| Nashawena Mills..... | 107 | 75 | 58 |
| Neld Manufacturing Co..... | | 95 | 95 |
| N. B. Cotton Mills Corporation..... | | 125 | 125 |
| N. B. Cotton Mills Corporation, preferred..... | 101 | 100 | 99 |
| Nonquitt Spinning Co..... | 132 | 94 | 92 |
| Page Manufacturing Co..... | 130 | 90 | 87½ |
| Pierce Manufacturing Co..... | | 390 | 325 |
| Pierce Bros. (Ltd.)..... | | 100 | 100 |
| Potomska Mills..... | 137½ | 120 | 116 |
| Quissett Mills, common..... | | 85 | 90 |
| Quissett Mills, preferred..... | | 100 | 98 |
| Sharp Manufacturing Co., common..... | | 90 | 82½ |
| Sharp Manufacturing Co., preferred..... | | 102½ | 105 |
| Soule Mill..... | 175 | 97½ | 90 |
| Taber Mill..... | 127 | 105 | 102½ |
| Wamsutta Mills..... | 142½ | 125 | 116 |
| Whitman Mills..... | 225 | 160 | 131 |

I also append a portion of the testimony given by Mr. Simeon B. Chase, treasurer of the King Philip Mills, Fall River, Mass., in the hearing held before the Committee on Ways and Means on Schedule I, and the colloquy which occurred between himself and members of the committee. I print this extract from the hearings referred to, because I was refused an opportunity to make a statement regarding the same before the House because of the lack of time allowed for its presentation:

Mr. HILL. Would it not necessarily compel a very severe reduction in wages when it would become impossible for the industry to meet the foreign competition on any other basis?

Mr. CHASE. I think that would necessarily be a result under those conditions.

Mr. HILL. In view of the fact that the Tariff Board states that many of the products of the cotton industry are now sold for less than the English product by a considerable percentage in a number of cases, would not that intensify the difficulty in passing that point and then securing revenue after that? In other words, is it possible, in your judgment as president of the Cotton Manufacturers' Association of

this country, for any committee to fix a tariff rate which will establish a certain amount of competition and stop there, without imperiling the whole industry?

Mr. CHASE. I do not think so.

Mr. HILL. You do not think it possible?

Mr. CHASE. I do not think so. Nobody knows where that point is, either.

Mr. HILL. That is it exactly. I fully agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN. You recognize the fact we are going to get revenue from this tariff? We have to have a reasonable competitive rate somewhere and there is no reason why you should not stand your proportion of that reasonable competitive rate, as well as the other fellow.

Mr. CHASE. I expect to.

The CHAIRMAN. And all we are trying to do is to bring about a parity. The present tariff bill is written like a mountain range with some high peaks and low valleys. Some fellows are standing the competition coming through the low valleys, and others are having the advantage of the high peaks. We are trying to equalize you, and I am sure you will agree with me that if we can succeed in doing that, you ought to stand your share, as well as the other fellow.

Mr. CHASE. I think this, Mr. Chairman, in all candor, that even from your own point of view, you are not going to accomplish what you think you are as far as the American consumer is concerned. You may get some revenue for the Government.

We have heard a good deal about the high price of cotton and gentlemen have said a good deal about large dividends that have been paid by certain corporations in years gone by. I sold a lot of goods to a retailer. This is a matter of record and can be proved. There were about forty or fifty thousand yards. I put them up in pieces and shipped them to his store. The expense on a yard from my mill to his store was practically nothing; there was no use to consider it as anything. My price for those goods was 8½ cents. He refused to buy them at that price. At any rate, he came back with a bid of 8¼ cents.

I could, at 8½ cents, get possibly a little over a cent a yard profit, but I sold the goods. The man hurried me a good deal for delivery. I went to the city where the merchant did business a short time afterwards, and went into the store and wandered around until I came to the counter and recognized the goods that I had made. I asked the clerk how much it was, and I found it was then selling for 25 cents a yard.

The CHAIRMAN. I recognize, of course, the great difference between the wholesale price and the retail price, but this committee can not adjust that. We do hope to relieve the consumer in some places, but if we are wrong about that and you are right, and we do not succeed in doing that, if we equalize these duties so that they are reasonably competitive all along the line, at least we will give more revenue to the Government; and the other people, through the Government, will get some benefit from this tax, which they do not get when it is a prohibitive tax. You recognize that?

Mr. CHASE. I recognize the revenue feature.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think you will agree that we ought to make the effort.

Mr. CHASE. But when it comes to the consumer, I do not believe you are going to do anything.

The CHAIRMAN. But at any rate, we will give the people the benefit of getting some portion of the tax that is left. But I do not think you will disagree that that is a commendable purpose, if we do it in moderation.

Mr. CHASE. If you will be careful, I have nothing to say. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is there any class of cotton goods with the manufacture of which you are familiar that the statement made in the circular quoted by Mr. Palmer would be a true statement?

Mr. CHASE. I think there are cotton goods made in this country where the tariff would not make a particle of difference; that is, you would hardly know the difference whether there is a tariff or not. The amount of labor employed would be so little, with goods made as they are now, with automatic machinery, that it would cut hardly any figure.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does it apply to any goods you manufacture yourself?

Mr. CHASE. No; it does not apply to anything made in our town, either, so far as I know.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Or made in Fall River?

Mr. CHASE. No.

Mr. FORDNEY. You stated a minute ago you sold a certain grade of goods to a certain merchant for 8½ cents per yard, and later on those goods were being retailed at 25 cents a yard.

Mr. CHASE. That is true.

Mr. FORDNEY. In reference to reducing the cost of the article to the consumer, I can give an illustration in another way which would be just as fair, as to reducing the duty on manufactured articles which we produce.

In the State of Michigan to-day, in which State I have the honor to live, a bushel of potatoes can be purchased for 40 cents. The other morning when leaving for Washington I stepped into a dining car, and paid 15 cents for one baked potato. [Laughter.]

The duty on a bushel of potatoes is 25 cents, and in order to reduce the value or the cost of that baked potato to the consumer that duty of 25 cents on a bushel of potatoes must be distributed. [Laughter.] That is a fair illustration, is it not?

Mr. CHASE. As far as the consumer is concerned, it is. I have not any more question about it than I stand here that, as far as concerns the duties on cotton goods or the general duties on articles of consumption that are levied in the customhouse, the consumer does not know anything about it. They do not cut any figure worth mentioning.

I am not trying to whack the people who retail goods. They are doing a legitimate business, and Mr. Parker touched upon that. The cost of distribution in this country is something that is a perfect scandal; there is no question about it.

We have made money in our business at times—big money at times. I am not here to deny that. All these statistics that have been poked at me, most of them are true, I guess. But if you take 25 years, instead of going back three or four or a half dozen or ten, they will tell a different story. The average has not been so big. We have had these periods when we have made money. I have known a mill to make 40 or 50 per cent in one year, when they had not been making any for five or six years, to speak of, but perhaps had lost money. That is the nature of the business.

But if you are going to help out the consumer you have to get at something else besides the tariff. If you are going ahead to get some revenue for the Government, that is another matter.

COTTON GOODS—BRIEF OF S. B. CHASE.

An impression prevails that the tariff on cotton goods has been largely advanced by the so-called Payne-Aldrich bill. This is not the case so far as it applies to 80 to 90 per cent of the cotton goods produced or consumed in this country.

Except in the very highest schedules, which do not apply to any considerable proportion of goods consumed in this country, the rates are identical with the Wilson bill.

The Wilson bill reduced the rates of duty on cloths made from coarse yarns from 33½ to 50 per cent, on medium goods from 22 to 33½ per cent, and on cloths made from fine yarns from 11 to 22½ per cent.

Previous to the Wilson bill no element for classification was taken into consideration in fixing the rates of duties excepting the count of the threads per square inch.

It was proven to the satisfaction of the framers of the Wilson bill that duties to be just and fair should be based also upon the fineness of the yarns used in the construction of the cloth, and the so-called Fall River schedule was adopted. While that schedule was not perfect from the standpoint of high-tariff or low-tariff men, both schools of thought regarded it as the most perfect and scientific ever enacted. Subsequent tariff bills have retained this principle, and, as before stated, but few changes have been made. We appreciate the fact that there is an apparent demand for a further revision of tariff schedules, and do not propose to offer objections to a reasonable modification of rates. We are willing to try to adapt our business to such rates as will afford us an opportunity to compete with our foreign rivals. We do not believe this committee or the people of the country at large will require us to do business on a basis that will not afford a decent living to those engaged in the industry according to the American standard.

Public sentiment and legislation is making every effort to eliminate child labor, to shorten the hours of work, to provide compensation for accidents, and to increase in many ways the obligations of the employer to the employees. Progress in these lines has already largely increased the cost of production.

We feel that the approach toward lower duties should be made with great care and moderation. Drastic action in that direction may, and we think will, lead to demoralization and suffering among a large body of people whose wages may be lowered or whose employment may be utterly taken away.

While making no objection to a reasonable reduction of rates, we think it should be done by slow and successive steps.

We wish to point out the difficulties and dangers attending the method of ascertaining the numbers of yarns contained in a fabric and of the ad valorem system. Yarns in the finer numbers especially are subject to great variation in size even when spun upon the same machine. A slight variation in the diameter of rolls on a mule or frame owing to unavoidable difference in thickness of roll covering will cause a variation of as much as 20 per cent. For instance, cloths made from No. 100 yarn will have individual threads as coarse as No. 90 and as fine as No. 110, and we doubt if any expert at the customhouse would be able to properly classify a fabric by sizing the yarns.

A simple method of evading an ad valorem duty will be the consignment by foreign manufacturers of goods to a sales agent in this country, he putting an estimated nominal value upon the merchandise which may enable him to evade a large fraction of the duty intended to be collected.

Respectfully submitted.

S. B. CHASE,

Treasurer King Philip Mill, Fall River, Mass.

I also append the following article, which expresses very forcibly the views of Mr. Robert Kenneth MacLea, in which I most heartily concur:

OVERDOING TARIFF REDUCTION—PUSHING THE PENDULUM BEYOND ITS NATURAL LIMIT IS NOW REFLECTED BY A SWING TOO FAR IN THE OTHER DIRECTION.

(By Robert Kenneth MacLea, formerly consulting expert of the Tariff Board.)

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The importance of the following article will be appreciated. During the recent campaign, Mr. MacLea was an ardent supporter of Mr. Wilson, not only arguing in his behalf at the various tariff exhibits in New York, Brooklyn, and elsewhere, but in organizing and handling the details of one of the greatest demonstrations ever given to a candidate for the Presidency. As chairman of the executive committee for the famous Wilson parade, in which nearly 100,000 men were to march all day and thousands of business houses to shut down in honor of the occasion, he accomplished the seemingly impossible. This great pageant set for Saturday, November 2, had to be called off because of the funeral of the late Vice President Sherman, which took place at the hour when Mr. Wilson was to have reviewed the great body of industrial workmen. Mr. MacLea is an expert on tariff matters and administration, and is recognized as a leading authority in this country.]

Textiles, O fickle "goddess of azure" in woman's world, thou art to prove the means of making or breaking another party of "political power" as of old.

Chagrin and unhappiness reign in the textile world to-day because, like a bolt of lightning out of a clear sky, the new Underwood tariff on textiles (wool and cotton particularly) was thrust upon the commercial horizon on the afternoon of April 7. Nothing approaching it had been thought of by even the most ardent advocates of a low tariff. It stunned. Honest men, who have never been guilty of asking or wishing for favors at the hands of the Government, and who stand highest in the cotton industry, had done everything possible to show the facts from all angles to the Ways and Means Committee at Washington, influenced by President Wilson's prelection statement at Hartford, Conn., September 25, 1912, used all over the land to elect him, in which he said:

"What the Democrats propose is a very practical thing, indeed. They propose to unearth these special privileges and to cut them out of the tariff. They propose not to leave a single concealed private advantage in the statutes concerning the duties that can possibly be eradicated without affecting the part of the business that is sound and legitimate and which we all wish to see promoted."

Then again, to more fully reassure the people of the business world, he said at Pittsburgh on October 17, 1912:

"The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade. It proposes merely a reconsideration of the tariff schedules, such as will adjust them to the actual business conditions and interests of the country."

So it came about that the cotton textile men of the South met the new power at Washington in "the spirit of accommodation" and showed frankness and willingness to help the new administration.

Business proceeded normally from January 22 and 23, when the hearings were held, until April 7, when the terrific cuts in cotton textiles were uncovered. Steadily since the cotton market has declined, until at the time of writing over 100 points, or \$10 a bale, has been lopped off the farmers' holdings of unsold cotton. The radical cuts in cotton tariff have done this thing. Cloths have felt the influence, too. Great declines from day to day have put the market down in quick order to the low, unprofitable level of 1911. The equivalent can be estimated only in millions of dollars of unnecessary loss.

The reason for this chaotic condition is simple. Men who know had publicly stated that some of the rates proposed on textiles are below the difference in cost of production between here and abroad, which is *freo trade* pure and simple.

It seems almost incredible that the attitude of the lower branch of Congress is such as it has proven to be. The Ways and Means Committee has sought and obtained advice and information from all directions. Much of it has been thrown in the wastebasket, and they have brought out a bill on cotton textiles which will hit some parts of the industry a blow it is unable to stand.

Approximately 10 to 12 per cent of the distribution in this country consists of fine plain and fancy cotton cloths, which under the census of 1910 amounts to about \$50,000,000 at mill valuation, but over \$100,000,000 consumers' values. These productions are made by a class of mills which can not hope to compete successfully with the English production under the American conditions if these proposed rates become a law.

According to the census of 1910, there was over \$200,000,000 worth at mill value of all other cotton-mill productions (excluding cloths). Portions of this part of the industry are facing absolute disaster. Quilts, for instance, dutiable presumably at 25 per cent under one paragraph, are really dutiable at 10 or 12½ per cent under another, which is extending "special privilege" to certain importers who have been most active with the Ways and Means Committee, and will turn the entire business on this class of material to Germany. The same remark applies to an enormous quantity of cotton blankets. Space does not permit of giving the details of many similar examples whereby whole industries of this or that class will be hurt beyond calculation and unnecessarily.

There are a large number of mills making a different class of goods that will not suffer, especially under the proposed rates, which are calculated to prevent the secondary distributor or middleman from asking too much for fabrics converted by him. This, however, is confined only to plain goods.

The great complaint of the people and the trade of this country with the Payne-Aldrich law on cotton textiles was the special graft written into the law for the benefit of a handful of manufacturers, who have already received their just deserts, for internal competition directed at their productions as a result of the publicity achieved by their alliance with Senator Aldrich four years ago, has brought all such goods to their lowest level of values in the home market.

But the Democrats in the lower branch of Congress have apparently placed the honest business man in the cotton industry on trial *instead of appreciating that they themselves are on trial*. There is still time for the upper branch of Congress to eradicate these errors, and I sincerely believe Mr. Wilson will not permit such gross injustice to be perpetrated. At any rate, Congress should understand that it could do more in textiles to cheapen the cost of living to the consumer with a proper pure textile law than by such ridiculous cuts in the cotton tariff.

The statement made by Mr. UNDERWOOD in his published explanation of the new bill that "no part of the committee's work has been founded upon a belief in the cost-of-production theory, and the theory is absolutely rejected as a guide to tariff making," shows a political stubbornness in adhering to the opposite of business requirements. Mr. UNDERWOOD states in his latest excuse for the cotton schedule:

"When we consider that the average ad valorem rate of duty levied at the customhouse on manufactures of cotton goods, for example, is 45 per cent of the value of the article imported, and the total labor cost of production of cotton goods in this country averages only 21 per cent of the factory value of the product, that the difference in labor cost at home and abroad is about as one to two, and that 10 or 11 per cent of the value of the product levied at the customhouse would equal the difference in the labor wage, it is apparent that our present tariff rates have been misused for the purpose of protecting profits for the home manufacturer. This is not only true of the manufacturer of cotton goods, but of almost every other schedule in the tariff act. To protect profits of necessity means to protect inefficiency."

Why stop at labor cost? Let Mr. UNDERWOOD and the powers who must make our tariff laws study the *conversion* cost of cotton cloths, of which the labor cost is but a small portion. Take ordinary plain cloths containing yarns of from 20s to 30s. It will be found by examination of the 1,285 different constructions fully analyzed by the Tariff Board report that over 700 gray cloth constructions show a spread of conversion costs of from 9 to 57 per cent on plain fabrics containing not higher than No. 30s yarns. Certainly this represents goods that have successfully gone into market distribution. Why are the conversion costs, which are the actual costs, ignored? Particularly when they are actually known after an investigation. The only excuse Mr. UNDERWOOD can give for comparing the difference in labor cost alone is that the Republican Party used that basis as an argument for its intended tariff making four years ago, which on further investigation it had to abandon.

The proposed reductions will not cheapen the great mass of fabrics for the consumer. It will transfer the business on a great part of the fabrics used from the United States to England. The retailer will still get his profits and so will the middleman who remains in business. The interference with business as a result of these proposed tariff rates is already greater than it should have been. The Ways and Means Committee, in justification of its low rates, claim that it has reduced the cotton-cloth tariff from 42.74 to 26.69 per cent. The absurdity of this statement can be seen—yet it is made broadcast throughout the country—when it is known that these figures are based on the small amount of importations during 1912, which were fine goods and which were already coming in in a competitive way with American-made materials and amounted to but 2 per cent of the distribution.

With the new rates the real reductions are so great that the average is *16.23 per cent*—this is *injustice*. The rates should be compared with the known distribution of fabrics used in the industry in this country. This shows to business men a strong reason for a permanent tariff commission or tariff board for the study and elucidation of the various phases of trade. It is because politicians are apt to think more of their constituents than of the welfare of the country in tariff making

that such strong political changes are witnessed from year to year. But as President Wilson said, prior to election on September 21 last, "For there is a God in the heaven; there is justice in the souls of men." So I say let justice be done to the hundreds of thousands of mill workers dependent upon a successful continuation of business in the many branches of the cotton industry, as well as those who have built up the industry and asked only that the rates be fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILDER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILDER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WILDER. Mr. Chairman, I hope to obtain forgiveness, either in this world or the next, for constantly harping on this manufacturing side of these propositions. But cotton is one of the large industries of this country, one of the largest, and the wage scale paid is low, one of the lowest. There are many mills in my district making an extensive variety of cotton goods from the commonest to the high grade, such as Lancaster-Bigelow, carpet; Parkhill-Southbridge, printing; big yarn mills, and so forth.

Now, I understand it is the purpose of this bill that is before us to reduce the tariff on this schedule as a whole, purposely, substantially. The query in my mind is, as a manufacturer, whom is this coming out of? I know of one schedule at the present time—on gingham—where over one-half of the amount of gingham used in this country of that class is imported. This of itself indicates that the tariff is low enough, does it not?

I want to repeat that, that more than one-half of a certain class of gingham consumed in this country is imported, and in the case of those gingham the tariff has been cut in two. The cut is about 50 per cent on that schedule. Now, whom is this coming out of?

Presumably we are trying to lower the cost of living. I wish we might. But is there any virtue in lowering the cost of living by taking it out of our poorest class of people? I ask again, Whom is this reduction coming out of?

If some goods are sold at such a price that one-half of the amount consumed is coming in now from abroad—and that is true also with respect to other smaller portions of the cotton schedule—and the tariff is lowered, what is going to happen? That is a plain, simple, academic proposition. What is going to happen?

If the American manufacturers compete with the foreigner so that the foreigner's goods do not come in, something must be reduced, must it not? Do any of you gentlemen know that the cotton manufacturers of this country, year in and year out, are making less than 5 per cent on the selling cost of their goods? Can you then come down more than 5 per cent without losing all your profits? I am stating this as a practical man. Where is this reduction coming from? It will come from where it always comes from.

This should be clearly understood if the cost of goods is to be lowered; and if the cost of goods is to be lowered, there is only one place for it to come from, and that is from the workingman, because it is all work. Go through it and find out what there is in the manufacture of goods, and you will see that there is nothing but work from first to last. It is all labor.

Mr. FORDNEY. What is the percentage of labor?

Mr. WILDER. It is all labor, figured through from the beginning. Either directly or indirectly and remotely, it is all labor.

Now, there is but one alternative, if these goods are brought in from abroad—that is, if \$100,000,000 worth of goods from abroad comes, \$100,000,000 worth of work is thrown out, is not it?—including work on the goods in the building of factories, and in the machinery, and the tools, and the selling, and every other expense and activity that enter into the production. It represents just so much lost abroad to this country. And if those goods, as I say, must be lowered in price in this country, the cost must be lowered, and it can come only out of the workingman.

Gentlemen, do not make a mistake about this. If the goods come in from abroad, one of these two things must happen, and in either event it is loss. I do not know of any way by which you can figure it out otherwise, either in this tariff bill or any other. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, under the agreement I was to have 5 minutes on each of the paragraphs numbered 264 and 265. I ask unanimous consent now that I may have that 10 minutes at this time, and not take it when those paragraphs are reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent to have the 10 minutes to be allowed on paragraphs 264 and 265 consumed in general debate at this time, and not to be used at that time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Ten minutes of that time was to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] anyhow, and I yield to him 15 minutes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, no section of our great country has grown faster in industrial development than the Southland in the last 30 years under the American protective system or policy. In mining development, in agricultural and manufacturing growth and development, and especially in the cotton industry, I challenge any section of the United States. We have a new South. While the other side of the House will vote almost solidly for this bill, there are thousands and thousands of Democrats among their constituents who believe in a protective tariff. Prior to the Civil War the South was exclusively an agricultural country, with cheap slave labor; but the great God had stored in our mountains and hills inexhaustible quantities of coal, iron, marble, kaolin, zinc, copper, and other minerals, and away up and down the slopes of the Allegheny and Cumberland Mountains the finest body of hardwood timber on the American Continent.

In those days before the war we were sending our money from every State in the South to New England for every piece of calico that our people needed. When we did not purchase in New England we shipped our raw material 3,000 miles across the ocean, to be made up by foreign operatives in the cotton mills of Manchester, England, and reshipped the finished article across the Atlantic Ocean, to be purchased and used in the South. We paid the freight both ways. But times have changed and conditions have changed in the South. I match the southern business man and manufacturer against the business intellect of any set of men in the world on equal terms and conditions. We took from New England more than half of the manufacture of American cotton goods. We have a splendid lot of cotton mills in Virginia and the Carolinas, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, and in other States of the South. There are 850 of these mills, representing \$300,000,000 in plants, houses, and machinery, with more than 200,000 operatives. We have built many new manufacturing towns and cities. We have furnished better wages to the boys, girls, and men, and through them we have put more money in local circulation for the professional men, the coal operators, the merchants, and the tax-gatherer. The farmer has a new and better market for his cotton and the railroads have greatly increased their earnings.

What is this bill? It is the most injurious and destructive bill to the interests of the South that was ever written by mortal man, the Wilson bill not excepted.

What has the South to gain in this bill for the future increase of her commercial, agricultural, and manufacturing interests? Our rivals in Pennsylvania exacted tribute from the southern people for more than a hundred years under a protective tariff. You have given them free iron ore in order to meet the iron furnaces of the South in competition in the Mississippi Valley and on the Atlantic seacoast. You have reduced the price of pig iron until you have made it impossible for the southern furnaces to sell a dollar's worth of pig iron on the Pacific coast in competition with the cheap Chinese pig iron. You have made it impossible for Birmingham and Tennessee to sell in successful competition along the Atlantic coast with pig iron made in Germany and England, not to mention the furnaces of Pennsylvania. You have given up our iron ore, our pig iron, our zinc, our lead, and our coal market in New England. You are going to destroy a great industry of a sovereign State of the South—Louisiana—which has followed the Democratic banner ever since its creation. By this legislation you will bankrupt countless people in that State, throw their machinery into the scrap heap, and wipe out \$100,000,000 of their investments, and turn the operatives loose without employment.

And here is this cotton schedule. Why, the southern cotton manufacturers met in this city and appealed to you in a letter which was read to your caucus. More than 140 of the cotton mills of the South have never paid a dividend. A number of them have gone into the hands of receivers. Instead of encouraging them, instead of helping them, now that you are in power and are writing the tariff bill, you turn your backs upon them. Is it fair? Is it just?

I love the people of the South, my own, my native South, and, God helping me, as long as I am a Member of this House I will never cast a vote against her interests or one that will retard her progress or development. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We purchased abroad last year \$65,000,000 of cotton goods. Although we grow 60 per cent of the cotton of the world, what did we export? We exported \$50,000,000. We bought \$15,000,000 more than we sold in foreign lands. And you are not satisfied with that? Southern men helped write this tariff bill, which says, "We are not buying enough from England

and Japan; let us buy more." This bill, according to your own figures and reports, estimates we are going to buy from foreigners in the first year of its operation \$12,568,000 more rather than buy it from our own people—from the 850 cotton mills of the South—making under the first year of the Underwood bill the valuation of total imports of cotton goods \$77,821,000, which sum will be taken out of this country, out of the channels of trade, sent to foreign lands, giving employment to foreigners when we have an army of deserving American working people here at home.

You say this is Democracy. You say this is a compliance with your promise when you wrote in your platform that no "legitimate industry" in this country would be harmed or injured if you were intrusted with power. Will it harm the cotton mills of the South and the working people in these mills to take every year \$12,000,000 additional from them and place those orders in Manchester, England, and in Japan? The cotton industry of the South is a legitimate industry. I dare you to say that it is not. Why, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means says that under the Payne tariff bill we are putting money into the pockets of the "special interests." When we pay wages to the men and women, boys and girls employed in American cotton mills, is the money going into the pockets of the "special interests"? Take the 200,000 people in the South, many of them girls and boys who are aiding in the support of the families that need the money; they are all a part of the so-called "special interests."

Oh, but you say there is a high-tariff wall around America. Last year, under the Payne tariff bill, we permitted to come into this country free goods to the value of \$881,512,000. There was no high-tariff wall to keep them out. The foreigners sold more goods coming in free last year than they did of goods paying a duty. This is the first time this has happened in 17 years in this country.

What do you propose to do in this bill? You say we are not now getting enough on the free list. We are going to add \$102,400,000 to be admitted without the payment of duty, making a total under your bill with the amount imported free under the Payne law last year \$983,915,000. In other words, this amount of goods will be sold in competition with American mills and wage earners without paying a cent of duty.

How about Japan, where they pay 10 or 15 cents a day to women and the men 22 cents a day in their cotton mills? Why, they have constructed in their manufacturing cities the best type of English-made cotton machinery. Where the mills of New England and the South furnish cotton goods on the Pacific coast the Japanese have sold in the past two years cotton goods to the amount of \$1,300,000 in this country as against \$10,470 in 1890 and \$292,915 in 1910.

What will they do if the duty is reduced? Mark the prediction: Within 12 months after this bill becomes a law the Japanese importation of cheap cotton goods will be three times what it is to-day.

Mr. KITCHIN. How much is it to-day?

Mr. AUSTIN. In two years it was \$1,300,000. Then, when the Panama Canal is opened and you have cheap water transportation to Japan, they will capture and control the markets of the Eastern States.

Mr. KITCHIN. How much do we send there?

Mr. AUSTIN. My good and genial friend, the Demosthenes of the House that saved a satisfactory duty on peanuts of his State, North Carolina, in this bill, asks me how much we send there.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me ask the gentleman. He said that China sent a million and a half dollars' worth of cheap goods to this country.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I said Japan. If not, I meant Japan.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, the gentleman knew, if he knew anything, that she did no such thing. The gentleman knew another thing—that we export ten times more of the cheap goods that are imported from all the world. He knows that we export to China in competition with Japan five times more cheap goods—cheap cotton cloths that are imported into this country from all countries in the world.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman says I made a misstatement as to cotton goods imported from Japan. I will hand him the Government reports from the Bureau of Statistics, furnished me by the Department of Commerce, on Japanese imports.

Mr. KITCHIN. Those are not cheap cloths; they are all figured fancy Japan goods.

Mr. PETERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who saved free coal for Massachusetts at the expense of the coal industry of West Virginia and Virginia.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman give me a few minutes more? I want to answer the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. You had better give him half an hour, for it will take that time to answer.

Mr. MANN. I will give him as much time on this side as the gentleman will give him from that side.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have not control of the time.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I thought the gentleman had them all by strange hold. I yield three minutes more to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. AUSTIN. Now I will give the gentleman the figures.

Mr. KITCHIN. The figures the gentleman has given me do not show a yard of cloth coming from Japan—it is cotton waste.

Mr. AUSTIN. Look at all the schedules. The gentleman talks about our exports.

We shipped to China cheap cotton goods to the amount of \$29,814,000 in 1906, and last year we shipped \$7,454,000, showing a loss or difference in the two years quoted of \$22,359,000. The English trade papers complained that the Japanese, with their new machinery and their cheap labor, have been enabled to drive them out and supplant them in a number of the Provinces of China in the sale of cheap cotton goods.

Take the question of hosiery—

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

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I will not yield with only three minutes at my disposal. Take the question of hosiery. There are 10 or 12 mills in my town, and the people of the South have a large number of mills making hosiery all through the South, with practically every dollar of it southern capital. What are you doing with that industry under this bill? You are increasing the importation of hosiery \$1,500,000. Most of that is in wages, and you are giving that trade to Germany. That is what you are doing—taking it from our mills and wage earners and giving it to Germany.

I am going to put in the RECORD an interview from one of the leading cotton manufacturers in my town, one of the ablest and best Democrats in Tennessee, a man who recently came within 4 votes of being elected United States Senator—Col. L. D. Tyson—in which he says that this proposed legislation is drastic and will prove injurious to the cotton mills and to the South. What else? I will give you also in the RECORD a statement from Robert Kenneth MacLea, who supported President Wilson and who made addresses in New York City in his interest and who was selected chairman of the committee to get up that great industrial reception to President Wilson, as a candidate, which was called off on account of the funeral of Vice President Sherman.

Here is an open statement, a letter, stating that the Democratic Party had violated its promise in its platform, and that the President had violated his promise in speeches made in Pittsburgh and in New Jersey, when he said that no legitimate industry would be crippled or injured by the Democratic Party, and that the party was not for free trade and would not favor legislation that would endanger any legitimate, honest business in this country. [Applause.] I will also add a copy of the letter of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association of the South read in the Democratic caucus and a day letter or telegram from a Tennessee cotton-mill company.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Daily Journal and Tribune.]

COL. L. D. TYSON'S INTERVIEW.

"Blue" is no name for the cotton-mill operators of the South. In North and South Carolina, in Alabama, and in Georgia they are in very bad spirits, and do not know to what ends the action on the tariff as to the cotton schedule will bring the cotton business. The cut in the schedule is pronounced by cotton men as being "drastic," and its effects will probably begin to be felt after September.

Col. L. D. Tyson, who, with James Maynard, Esq., went to Washington recently to present the position of the cotton operators of the Southeastern States, returned to the city yesterday evening. Mr. Maynard went on to New York and the East.

In reply to a query as to how the cotton-mill men expect their business to be affected by the tariff revision, Col. Tyson said:

"The cut on all cotton goods has been very drastic. A cut was expected, but it has placed the tariff below anything that had been expected or anticipated. We had no idea that the tariff would be placed as low as it is now scheduled to be reported on for passage. The cotton men, in fact, are pretty blue.

"I do not know what effect the revision will have on the business. The cut amounted to as much as 50 per cent in some items. Cotton underwear and hosiery were cut from 80 per cent to 25 per cent. On cloths the revision was from about 60 per cent down to 25 per cent. On yarns it was 40 per cent as the highest down to 5 per cent as the lowest, and, of course, the cuts were different on different yarns. I haven't the proposed schedule before me and can not give the details as to these cuts.

"Many think that they will have to shut down their mills and many workers will be thrown out of employment if the bill is passed as it now stands, and it looks as if it would pass. If there is any change in the present schedule, it will have to be made in the Senate. It

seems that Mr. Wilson is doing everything in his power to get the bill through as it stands.

"I don't know when the bill will become effective, whether immediately on its passage or at a given later date, but the operators do not look for a probable change in the conditions resulting from it before the 1st of October; that is to say, nearly all mills have orders which will keep them running until about that time, and unless the present proposed bill causes much agitation it may be that there will be no change in the business until the contracts now operative are filled.

"Of course, the bill will curtail all projected enterprises in the textile industry, and I don't suppose there will be another spindle put in the South for some time.

"The yarn men seem to be in the most unfortunate position of any of the textile manufacturers, as the cut is, of course, worse there than anywhere else, unless it was in hosiery and underwear.

"What I have said as to the conditions is the consensus of opinions among the cotton men. For my own part I think the Ways and Means Committee has gone too far. Of course, there must be a revision. I expected that. It was in the Democratic platform, which demanded a substantial revision, but the proposed revision has not only been substantial but it has been drastic."

[From May issue of Dry Goods.]

OVERDOING TARIFF REDUCTION.

(By Robert Kenneth MacLea, formerly consulting expert of the Tariff Board.)

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The importance of the following article will be appreciated. During the recent campaign, Mr. MacLea was an ardent supporter of Mr. Wilson, not only arguing in his behalf at the various tariff exhibits in New York, Brooklyn, and elsewhere, but in organizing and handling the details of one of the greatest demonstrations ever given to a candidate for the Presidency. As chairman of the executive committee for the famous Wilson parade, in which nearly 100,000 men were to march all day and thousands of business houses to shut down in honor of the occasion, he accomplished the seemingly impossible. This great pageant set for Saturday, November 2, had to be called off because of the funeral of the late Vice President Sherman, which took place at the hour when Mr. Wilson was to have reviewed the great body of industrial workmen. Mr. MacLea is an expert on tariff matters and administration, and is recognized as a leading authority in this country.]

Textiles, oh, fickle "Goddess of Azure" in woman's world, thou art to prove the means of making or breaking another party of "political power" as of old.

Chagrin and unhappiness reign in the textile world to-day because, like a bolt of lightning out of a clear sky, the new Underwood tariff on textiles (wool and cotton particularly) was thrust upon the commercial horizon on the afternoon of April 7. Nothing approaching it had been thought of by even the most ardent advocates of a low tariff. It stunned. Honest men, who have never been guilty of asking or wishing for favors at the hands of the Government, and who stand highest in the cotton industry, had done everything possible to show the facts from all angles to the Ways and Means Committee at Washington, influenced by President Wilson's prelection statement at Hartford, Conn., September 25, 1912, used all over the land to elect him, in which he said:

"What the Democrats propose is a very practical thing, indeed. They propose to unearth these special privileges and to cut them out of the tariff. They propose not to leave a single concealed private advantage in the statutes concerning the duties that can possibly be eradicated without affecting the part of the business that is sound and legitimate and which we all wish to see promoted."

Then, again, to more fully reassure the people of the business world, he said at Pittsburgh on October 17, 1912:

"The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade. It proposes merely a reconsideration of the tariff schedules, such as will adjust them to the actual business conditions and interests of the country."

So it came about that the cotton textile men of the South met the new power at Washington in "the spirit of accommodation," and showed frankness and willingness to help the new administration.

Business proceeded normally from January 22 and 23, when the hearings were held, until April 7, when the terrific cuts in cotton textiles were uncovered. Steadily since the cotton market has declined, until at the time of writing over 100 points, or \$10 a bale, has been lopped off the farmer's holdings of unsold cotton. The radical cuts in cotton tariff have done this thing. Cloths have felt the influence, too. Great declines from day to day have put the market down in quick order to the low, unprofitable level of 1911. The equivalent can be estimated only in millions of dollars of unnecessary loss.

The reason for this chaotic condition is simple. Men who know had publicly stated that some of the rates proposed on textiles are below the difference in cost of production between here and abroad, which is free trade pure and simple.

It seems almost incredible that the attitude of the lower branch of Congress is such as it has proven to be. The Ways and Means Committee has sought and obtained advice and information from all directions. Much of it has been thrown in the wastebasket, and they have brought out a bill on cotton textiles which will hit some parts of the industry a blow it is unable to stand.

Approximately 10 to 12 per cent of the distribution in this country consists of fine plain and fancy cotton cloths, which under the census of 1910 amounts to about \$50,000,000 at mill valuation, but over \$100,000,000 consumers' values. These productions are made by a class of mills which can not hope to compete successfully with the English production under the American conditions if these proposed rates become law.

According to the census of 1910 there was over \$200,000,000 worth at mill value of all other cotton mill productions (excluding cloths). Portions of this part of the industry are facing absolute disaster. Quilts, for instance, dutiable presumably at 25 per cent under one paragraph are really dutiable at 10 or 12 per cent under another, which is extending "special privilege" to certain importers who have been most active with the Ways and Means Committee, and will turn the entire business on this class of material to Germany. The same remark applies to an enormous quantity of cotton blankets. Space does not permit of giving the details of many similar examples, whereby whole industries of this or that class will be hurt beyond calculation and unnecessarily.

There are a large number of mills making a different class of goods that will not suffer especially under the proposed rates which are calculated to prevent the secondary distributor or middleman from

asking to much for fabrics converted by him. This, however, is confined only to plain goods.

The great complaint of the people and the trade of this country with the Payne-Aldrich law on cotton textiles was the special graft written into the law for the benefit of a handful of manufacturers, who have already received their just deserts, for internal competition directed at their productions as a result of the publicity achieved by their alliance with Senator Aldrich four years ago has brought all such goods to their lowest level of values in the home market.

But the Democrats in the lower branch of Congress have apparently placed the honest business man in the cotton industry on trial, *instead of appreciating that they themselves are on trial*. There is still time for the upper branch of Congress to eradicate these errors, and I sincerely believe Mr. Wilson will not permit such gross injustice to be perpetrated. At any rate, Congress should understand that it could do more in textiles to cheapen the cost of living to the consumer with a proper pure textile law than by such ridiculous cuts in the cotton tariff.

The statement made by Mr. UNDERWOOD in his published explanation of the new bill that "no part of the committee's work has been founded upon a belief in the cost-of-production theory, and the theory is absolutely rejected as a guide to tariff making" shows a political stubbornness in adhering to the opposite of business requirements. Mr. UNDERWOOD states in his latest excuse for the cotton schedule:

"When we consider that the average *ad valorem* rate of duty levied at the customhouse on manufactures of cotton goods, for example, is 45 per cent of the value of the article imported, and the total labor cost of production of cotton goods in this country averages only 21 per cent of the factory value of the product, that the difference in labor cost at home and abroad is about as 1 to 2, and that 10 or 11 per cent of the value of the product levied at the customhouse would equal the difference in the labor wage, it is apparent that our present tariff rates have been misused for the purpose of protecting profits for the home manufacturer. This is not only true of the manufacture of cotton goods, but of almost every other schedule in the tariff act. To protect profits of necessity means to protect inefficiency."

Why stop at labor cost? Let Mr. UNDERWOOD and the powers who must make our tariff laws study the *conversion* cost of cotton cloths, of which the labor cost is but a small portion. Take ordinary plain cloths containing yarns of from twenties to thirties. It will be found by examination of the 1,285 different constructions fully analyzed by the Tariff Board report that over 700 gray cloth constructions show a spread of conversion costs of from 9 to 57 per cent on plain fabrics containing not higher than No. 30 yarns. Certainly this represents goods that have successfully gone into market distribution. Why are the conversion costs, which are the actual costs, ignored? Particularly when they are actually known after an investigation. The only excuse Mr. UNDERWOOD can give for comparing the difference in labor cost alone is that the Republican Party used that basis as an argument for its intended tariff making four years ago, which on further investigation it had to abandon.

The proposed reductions will not cheapen the great mass of fabrics for the consumer. It will transfer the business on a great part of the fabrics used from the United States to England. The retailer will still get his profits, and so will the middleman who remains in business. The interference with business as a result of these proposed tariff rates is already greater than it should have been. The Ways and Means Committee, in justification of its low rates, claim it has reduced the cotton cloth tariff from 42.74 to 26.69 per cent. The absurdity of this statement can be seen (yet it is made broadcast throughout the country) when it is known that these figures are based on the small amount of importations during 1912, which were fine goods and which were already coming in in a competitive way with American-made materials and amounted to but 2 per cent of the distribution.

With the new rates the real reductions are so great that the average is 16.23 per cent. This is injustice. The rates should be compared with the known distribution of fabrics used in the industry in this country. This shows to business men a strong reason for a permanent tariff commission or tariff board for the study and elucidation of the various phases of trade. It is because politicians are apt to think more of their constituents than of the welfare of the country in tariff making that such strong political changes are witnessed from year to year. But, as President Wilson said prior to election on September 21 last, "For there is a God in the heaven; there is justice in the souls of men." So I say let justice be done to the hundreds of thousands of mill workers dependent upon a successful continuation of business in the many branches of the cotton industry, as well as those who have built up the industry and asked only that the rates be fair.

LETTER TO THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS.

APRIL 12, 1913.

HON. A. MITCHELL PALMER,
Chairman Democratic Caucus, House of Representatives,
Washington D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the annual meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, held this day, a committee was appointed to present to the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives a protest on behalf of the cotton manufacturers of the United States against the rates proposed in the bill known as H. R. 10, introduced on April 7, 1913, by Hon. O. W. UNDERWOOD and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

This association begs to present to your body a resolution adopted by it at its meeting held in April, 1912, which resolution reads as follows:

"That this association records itself as favoring such reasonable revision of the cotton schedule, based upon differences in cost of production and other conditions, at home and abroad, as shall be consistent with the raising of revenue and the conservation of our home markets."

At a subsequent meeting of the tariff committee appointed by this association the following resolution was also adopted:

"We favor the reasonable revision of the cotton schedule based upon figures at which importations are actually being made and can be made, as shown by the comparative manufacturers' selling price at home and abroad, as shall be consistent with the raising of revenue and conservation of our home markets."

Acting upon this resolution, the tariff committee, at public hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, presented from time to time statements, in which this association, with frankness and at length, gave information with regard to conditions affecting the industry and suggested such reductions as in the judgment of the association could be consistently made without injury to the domestic industry of cotton

manufacturing, and at the same time in consistency with the policy of reasonable downward revision and tariff for revenue.

We recognize the propriety of there being adopted at this time such provision in the tariff as would bring domestic and foreign manufacturers into competitive relation.

To the best of our belief the schedules suggested by this association to the Ways and Means Committee contained the lowest rates which could be in reason adopted without danger of injury to the industry of cotton manufacturing in this country.

We recognize, of course, that any suggestions made by ourselves are necessarily addressed to the discretion of the honorable committee charged with the consideration of the subject, and we can only say that we have with perfect frankness presented to the committee all information bearing upon the subject which could be obtained by us. We have not asked the committee to accept our unconfirmed statements upon these subjects, but we have in every instance referred the committee to the findings of the Tariff Board, confirming and proving the correctness of the statements made by ourselves to the committee. In addition, we supplied the committee with other authoritative data, fully confirming the statements of the representatives of the association.

It is therefore with the greatest regret and consternation that we have seen the publication of rates on cotton products recommended by the Ways and Means Committee.

In all sincerity we state to your honorable body that if the rates thus suggested are made effective we believe the injury to our industry will be unparalleled.

We earnestly enter a protest against the suggested rates and state with positive conviction on our part that the effect of these rates will be to transfer a far larger proportion of cotton manufacturing from the United States to foreign fields, where cheaper labor and other favorable conditions obtain, than the Ways and Means Committee can have any conception of.

In an absolute conviction of the truth of our statements we appeal to your body not to make reduction in the rates as drastic as presented in the bill referred to, and would conclude with the statement that if the bill becomes enacted into law a condition of depression will follow in the industry of cotton manufacturing which will, in our judgment, be appalling. Cotton manufacturing is an industry confined not to one community, but distributed throughout a large portion of our country, in portions of which it is the chief industry. It is an industry in which hundreds of thousands of employees are engaged, in which there are many plants, with many thousands of stockholders.

There is absolutely an untrammelled competition between manufacturing plants in the cotton industry, so that there is no condition presented of a monopolistic industry whose control needs in any sense to be broken.

In these views we respectfully present our earnest request that further consideration be given to the cotton schedule in the bill referred to.

Very respectfully,

AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
W. A. ERWIN, President.
C. B. BRYANT, Secretary.

DAY LETTER FROM A TENNESSEE COTTON MILL COMPANY.

NASHVILLE, TENN., April 30, 1913.

HON. RICHARD W. AUSTIN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We beg to protest against the adoption of the present proposed tariff rates on cotton goods. The American Cotton Manufacturers' Association rates were placed before the committee sincerely and honestly, and are as low as the industry can stand without being permanently injured. If the proposed rates are passed, wages must be reduced and the industry seriously injured, much of it wiped out. Please save us by voting for the amendments that will embrace rates proposed by the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association.

WARIOTO COTTON MILLS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALLIN].

Mr. WALLIN. Mr. Chairman, a little later I wish to offer an amendment to paragraph 266 of the bill. I do this in behalf of the great industry known as the cotton knit-underwear industry. In this industry there are about 800 factories scattered throughout the United States. Some of them are very small. Seventy-five thousand people are employed in these mills, and they pay out annually over \$35,000,000 in wages. In the bill that first came before the House, in this paragraph, there was a duty of 25 per cent *ad valorem*. That has now been changed to 30 per cent. The committee evidently thought that 25 per cent was too low, and it was right. Twenty-five per cent was too low, and 30 is too low. I hope the committee will raise it a little and give these industries opportunity to become accustomed to this close competition about which we hear so much. Whenever a doubt exists, as it evidently did with the committee in this case, I believe the preference should be given to American workers and business men, rather than to foreign labor and foreign capital.

I have figures showing the different rates of wages paid here and abroad with the hours of labor, and so forth, and I will ask to have them printed in the RECORD with my remarks, and yield back the remainder of my time.

The statements referred to are as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, April 4, 1913.

THE PRESIDENT,
Executive Offices, Washington, D. C.:

Reliable information has reached our association that it is the intention of the Ways and Means Committee to change the present tariff rates on cotton knit underwear to 30 per cent.

This drastic change means the decline of the cotton knit-underwear industry in the United States, and the amount of business which the

foreign manufacturer can do with this rate of tariff will be limited only to their facilities for manufacturing goods for our market.

Without regard to politics thousands of voters in this country were influenced by your declaration that "No legitimate industry need fear your election."

This statement was accepted in entire good faith by a great number of your fellow citizens, among whom were thousands of our own work people. We are therefore unwilling to believe that the effects of the drastic change proposed can be understood either by yourself or the individual members of the Ways and Means Committee.

The chief competition which we have to fear is from Germany and France.

To give you some idea of the rate of wages paid in those countries we quote from the report of United States consular agent, George A. Makinson, Sorau, Saxony, as follows:

"The men and women weavers generally work by the piece, and earn \$2.75 to \$3.25 per week; master weavers, exclusively men, earn \$3.50 to \$4.50; spooling, twisting, throwing, and stitching are in charge of women, who are paid \$1.90 to \$3 per week; half-timers, boys and girls over 16 years, engaged in miscellaneous light work, receive 75 cents to \$1.50 weekly."

Similar rates of wages, and even lower, are paid in France, while in Spain, see special agent series No. 46, by Ralph N. Odell, agent of Department of Commerce and Labor, covering living and working conditions of mill workers in Spain.

"Eleven hours constitute a working day, according to law, but several of the mills that I visited were running 12 hours. Work usually begins at 5.30 a. m. and ends at 6 p. m."

Spain probably employs the lowest paid labor in Europe, and in a short while our work people would be in direct competition with people whose standard of living is far below the American standard.

While we hold no brief for the wage earners employed in our industry, we believe that their interest should be considered before our own, and in behalf of the 75,000 men and women employed by us and living under American conditions we urge your careful consideration of this revolutionary chance, which threatens our very existence.

We have agreed among ourselves as to that rate of tariff which would still make it possible for us to continue as manufacturers and maintain the present wage scale.

We suggest for your consideration the rates given below, which, in our opinion, will meet every condition demanded by the Ways and Means Committee:

First. The change from a combined specific and ad valorem rate to a strictly ad valorem rate, which, however, we oppose as unjust and unfair.

Second. A reduction of the present rates, which amount to from 90 per cent to 50 per cent, to a new rate which we suggest of from 50 per cent to 40 per cent.

Third. The lowest rate which would conserve the American standard of wages and at the same time give a measure of foreign competition such as we have never known in this country.

We therefore ask that the Schedule I, paragraph 266, should be amended to read as follows:

"Shirts and drawers, pants, vests, union suits, combination suits, tights, sweaters, corset covers, and all underwear of every description made wholly or in part on knitting machines, frames, or looms, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, weighing up to and including 9 pounds per dozen, 50 per cent ad valorem; weighing more than 9 pounds per dozen, 40 per cent ad valorem."

This letter is an appeal to you for the very existence of one of the most worthy American industries, and to your sense of fairness, to give our committee an opportunity to demonstrate the vicious effect that the reduction proposed would have upon the existing prosperity and success of the knit underwear manufacturers of the United States.

A copy of this letter is being mailed to each member of the Ways and Means committee of the House and to each member of the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Respectfully submitted.

KNIT UNDERWEAR MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION.

Per Jos. Feldenheimer, Secretary-Treasurer; Andrew Frey, President, Utica, N. Y.; Clifton P. Baker, Boston, Mass.; L. M. Flesh, Piqua, Ohio; P. H. Hanes, Winston-Salem, N. C.; W. C. Spaulding, Minneapolis, Minn.; Henry S. Cooper, Kenosha, Wis.; W. C. Ruffin, Mayodan, N. C.; Harry Querns, Philadelphia, Pa.; Nathan Hatch, Albany, N. Y.; William Sloane, Norfolk, Va.; Edward H. Clift, New York City; John K. Stewart, Amsterdam, N. Y.; J. W. Hanson, Macon, Ga.; Geo. W. Kavanaugh, Waterford, N. Y.

RELATING TO SCHEDULE I, PARAGRAPH 329, ACT OF AUGUST 5, 1900.

JANUARY, 1913.

SIR: The cotton-underwear manufacturers' tariff committee of the National Association of Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers, representing manufacturers engaged in the knitting industry in nearly every State in the Union, submit for the consideration of your committee some statements, which we trust will receive full and careful consideration.

The present tariff rates are exactly the same under the Payne law as they were under the Dingley law, there having been no change or increase of rates whatsoever, and we ask that the present rates shall remain unchanged.

Our business is one that can be engaged in by small manufacturers with limited means in almost any community.

There are about 800 concerns engaged in the manufacture of knitted cotton underwear scattered all over the United States doing a total business of over \$60,000,000. The amount of wages paid out by these 800 concerns represents fully 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the total, or about \$35,000,000.

There has never been a trust or combination formed by manufacturers in our branch of the knitting industry for the purpose of controlling either selling price or output, and we do not believe that a trust, combination, or monopoly would be possible owing to the small amount of money it takes to engage in the knitting business.

Furthermore, there is no American industry in which competition is so keen and returns from investment or enterprise so unsatisfactory; as a proof of this statement we can point to at least 125 failures in the knit-underwear business within recent years.

We enjoy no advantages on account of being nearer the source of our raw material than foreign manufacturers, as cotton can be delivered as cheaply in Hamburg, Havre, or Barcelona as it can be delivered in the leading manufacturing cities of this country.

We enjoy no advantage owing to the use of special and more rapid machinery, inasmuch as the foreigners have adopted and are building the same class of knitting and sewing machinery that we use.

The present rate of duty is absolutely essential to the continued existence of manufacturers in our line. Any lowering of the rate would result eventually in the closing down of the mills of this country, throwing out of employment thousands of wage earners, who receive compensation three to four times as great as the same class of employees receive in foreign countries, where the help are better trained and more settled.

Skilled sewing-machine operators in this country earn from \$1.50 to \$2.50 per day. Other classes of labor, such as winders, knitters, and general help earn fully three to four times as much as similar classes of help in France, Germany, or Spain, and we know from the prices paid for knitted underwear sold in the West Indies and the Latin-American countries to the exclusion of American goods that if the tariff were lowered it would be possible to bring into the United States an unlimited quantity of goods which would undersell the cheapest of the American products.

The rates of duty should not be based alone upon the difference in labor costs of manufacturing and greater expense of doing business in this country as compared with foreign countries, but should also take into consideration the higher rates of interest, the greater cost of installation.

The cost of building and equipping a cotton underwear mill in the United States is fully 70 per cent greater than in Europe; therefore a mill constructed and equipped abroad with a capital of \$100,000 could not be duplicated in the United States for less than \$170,000. This would result in a corresponding reduction of general expense in favor of the foreign manufacturer.

The foundation of all these higher costs for construction, equipment, and maintenance lies in the higher wages paid to American artisans and laborers in the building, mechanical, and other trades and industries drawn upon by American manufacturers, and are most important factors in the cost of production.

If the tariff should be reduced the jobber and retailer would give preference to foreign goods, but the consumer buying the foreign article would still pay the fixed retail selling price; thus there would be no advantage whatever to the consumer but a greater profit to the retailer.

At this point we wish to emphasize the fact that in spite of the increased cost of living, the quality of our class of manufacture has steadily improved, but the fixed selling prices to the consumer for the past 20 years have remained the same.

The concerns engaged in this line of business use great quantities of cotton yarns, spun largely in the Southern and Eastern States; pearl buttons, cotton fabrics, bindings, cardboard, and many small wares from other sections of the United States, and these industries would likewise be adversely affected by the lowering of the present rate.

Furthermore, the American manufacturer would be compelled to curtail output as importations increase, and in a short while all these industries would be removed from this country to foreign countries.

Of course we always have the alternative of reducing wages to offset the cheap labor, greater number of working hours, and lower standard of living which obtain in foreign countries, applying to our own as well as the collateral branches named; but we can not believe that it is the intention or desire of your committee to inflict such conditions upon our workpeople, and, as American citizens, we hope that such will not be done.

We urge upon you that a specific duty is absolutely necessary in fairness to our industry, in which there are so many grades and classifications of goods, and also for the reason that an exclusive ad valorem duty makes it possible for the foreign manufacturer to use our market as a dumping ground, disturbing conditions in this country, which a specific duty will prevent, and at the same time eliminate the opportunity for undervaluation.

In conclusion, we invite the closest investigation of our statements, and we stand ready to prove the facts which we have set forth.

Respectfully submitted.

Andrew Frey, chairman, Utica, N. Y.; Clifton P. Baker, Boston, Mass.; L. M. Flesh, Piqua, Ohio; P. H. Hanes, Winston-Salem, N. C.; W. C. Spaulding, Minneapolis, Minn.; Henry S. Cooper, Kenosha, Wis.; W. C. Ruffin, Mayodan, N. C.; Harry Querns, Philadelphia; Nathan Hatch, Albany, N. Y.; William Sloane, Norfolk, Va.; Edward H. Clift, New York City; John K. Stewart, Amsterdam, N. Y.; J. W. Hanson, Macon, Ga.; George W. Kavanaugh, Waterford, N. Y.; Joseph Feldenheimer, secretary, Philadelphia.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had sufficient time to say all I would like to say on this schedule. I will take the time to say this, that in the United States there are 29,500,000 spindles in our cotton mills. In England there are 54,200,000 spindles in their cotton mills. We supply England with practically all her raw cotton, and with her 54,200,000 spindles she consumed last year three and a half million bales of cotton, and with our 29,500,000 spindles we consumed nearly 5,000,000 bales of cotton, showing that our cotton has gone abroad and found cheap labor that makes the finest grades of goods. According to the census report there are 1,306 cotton mills in the United States, 669 of which are located in the Southern States and 637 in the Northern States. In the cotton mills the average wage is \$265 per year for 300 days' work. In the States of North and South Carolina 428 out of 669 cotton mills are located, or 64 1/2 per cent of all the cotton mills in the South. In the States of North Carolina and South Carolina 61 1/2 per cent of all the employees in the southern cotton mills are found. The wages in the cotton mills of North Carolina and South Carolina are 85 1/2 cents per day, figuring 300 days for a year's work, while in the North the wages are \$1.36 a day; yet Mr. Parker, president of 16 factories, I believe, all located in those two States, North and South Carolina, came before the Committee on Ways and

Means and recommended lower rates of duty on cotton goods, and said with the rates recommended by him the mills of the South could run and compete with the mills of Europe. When asked whether or not there was any difference in the wage scale between the South and the North in cotton mills, he said there was not. He was mistaken, sadly mistaken. My friends, I want to have read in my time, if you please, a letter which I have just received.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RUSSELL). Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., April 27, 1913.

HON. J. MITCHELL PALMER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice in a quotation from your speech on tariff matters you say "some of the manufacturers may close down out of spite, etc."; this regarding principally the textile factories.

Why do not you and those who believe with you that we can compete successfully with foreign manufacturers arrange to take over these concerns as fast as they close—as they did in 1894-1899—and demonstrate the practicability of your theories?

With Mr. Redfield, you could organize a syndicate to do this, getting those brainy, financial men of Texas and the South to join with you and "prove up." This is where you failed before and thus lost out to the protectionists. Get in ahead of them this time, as they will certainly close down—some have already done so, more will, and we will have thousands out of employment and the scene of those days be reenacted.

That great business element of the South has never had a chance to "show us," as they say in Missouri, what they can do along manufacturing lines, and now is your and their chance.

With the extraordinary high cost of manufactured goods to-day no wonder the people have authorized you to take over the Government. Think of it! We have to pay as high as \$15 to have a suit made to order right here in industrial Detroit; 10 to 15 cents for socks; even calico, the favorite garb of our southern women, costs them here 5 cents a yard; ginghams, from 7 to 10 cents a yard; can't get a decent piece of underwear for less than 25 cents, while we are forced to pay 5 cents for two papers of pins! And nails—just think of it—cost our carpenters 2 cents per pound, and they are only getting from four to five dollars a day to drive them, though there is a prospect of their getting decent wages, as they are demanding a raise right now.

Just think of it! Our housewives can't get a sewing machine under \$12.50, though it is warranted for 10 years, with all attachments. Forty-five per cent tariff on these; awful! And think what the housewife has to pay for her sugar right now—11 pounds for 50 cents. Such extortion! Our beet-sugar magnates holding up the wholesale price at \$4.35 per 100 pounds. Why, I can recollect way back in the good old days of the Walker tariff—I am 79 now—when all calico cost me for wife's dress was 12½ cents a yard. Nails were 6 cents per pound. To be sure I got \$1.75 a day for driving them. Then the farmer's wife brought in 20 dozen eggs to the storekeeper and exchanged them for 8 yards of calico for a dress, or paid for it with butter at 8 cents, or a dozen of chickens at \$1.25, while now she can buy a whole dress for less than one of her chickens. Its outrageous the way we are being robbed by this awful tariff. A whole hen now of respectable size she is paid about \$1 for, while the eggs she brings in in her auto, the 20 dozen, will buy her a silk-dress pattern. No wonder the common people are kicking at such prices as we are forced to pay to the trusts. Why, our bricklayers are only getting \$6 a day here, but as they are going to demand a raise perhaps they will be better paid when you knock out the iniquitous Payne-Aldrich bill. Do you note how much cheaper print paper is since it was put on the free list from Canada? I have not heard any paper boasting about it, but the Canadian paper maker is putting the tariff in his pocket. I understand, instead of it going into our Treasury. But I am glad to note one thing in your new bill, borax goes back on the free list, from which the Payne-Aldrich bill took it and put on a tariff of 2 cents per pound, when, to the wonder and consternation of toolmakers, the price actually went down 50 per cent. "Do I sleep, do I dream, are there visions about, is protection a failure, and to be wiped out?" a la Bret Harte. But do not forget, while relieving the workman, that you will take off the internal-revenue tax on butter substitutes, that 10 cents per pound when colored and the lighter tax when plain. I do not think you can cheapen calicoes and muslins, socks or underwear, but you can cheapen this substitute for cow butter very much to the poor man, as it actually increases the cost of it. Now, do try and take over the factories your bill will close, and show the American people that you can not only compete with all the world but drive them out of their market, both here and abroad.

I would like to have the whole of your speech, but will have to be satisfied with the short extract from which I quote.

Respectfully,

H. PARKER,
512 Fourth Street, Detroit, Mich.

During the reading of the letter,

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Illinois for sufficient time to finish reading the letter. It will take but a minute or two more.

Mr. MANN. I yield the gentleman one minute additional.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yield enough to have the letter finished; it is very good; it is extraordinary; it states facts. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise not so much to ask for the protection of cotton mills which now exist in Oklahoma as to plead for legislation which will bring cotton mills into existence in our new State.

If judged by the number of its cotton mills at present Oklahoma would have no great interest in this schedule, but if judged by the possibilities of having cotton mills in the future, Oklahoma is deeply and vitally interested in this schedule.

The census of 1910 shows that in 1909 Oklahoma cultivated to cotton 1,976,935 acres of land, on which was produced 555,742 bales of cotton, which was valued at \$35,399,356. But seven States in the Union produced more cotton in 1909 than Oklahoma. The raising of cotton is one of the chief industries of our State, and contributes largely to the wealth of our people.

Agriculture is the chief industry in Oklahoma.

As I have said before on this floor, Oklahoma is, however, capable of becoming a great manufacturing State.

In a recent bulletin issued by the Bureau of the Census referring to the manufacturing interests of Oklahoma it was said:

A marked increase in the independent industrial activities of the State commenced with the development of the old fields in 1907 and the discovery of natural gas. This cheap fuel has attracted manufacturers who have established a number of new enterprises. An abundance of coal and lumber and the location of such minerals as gypsum, cement rock, asphalt, granite, limestone, and zinc have further stimulated manufactures. In 1899 the total value of manufactured products amounted to only \$8,133,000, as compared with \$24,459,000 in 1904 and \$53,682,000 in 1909.

There were in Oklahoma at that time 2,310 manufacturing establishments, employing 18,034 persons, including proprietors, salaried employees, and wage earners. Thirty-eight million eight hundred and seventy-three thousand dollars of capital were invested. In wages and salaries these manufacturing establishments paid out \$9,285,000.

The bulletin issued by the Census Bureau on Oklahoma does not report a single cotton factory. However, there are a few cotton factories in the State at the present time.

Oklahoma is a large producer of raw cotton. She has almost an unlimited supply of cheap fuel. Her coal fields are extensive and almost inexhaustible. Natural gas exists in such abundance as to give promise of lasting for an indefinite time. Her oil fields in extent and productiveness are hardly surpassed in any State of the Union. There are few, if any, States in the Union better supplied with fuel than Oklahoma. Cheap fuel is one of the primary elements in developing and maintaining industries.

While I shall have the honor to in part represent the State of Oklahoma in this Congress, I shall deem it my duty to vote for national legislation which I think will contribute in the largest degree to the material growth and development of my own State.

The provisions of this bill are intended, as I understand it, to invite and secure competition in manufacturing lines from foreign countries. The Ways and Means Committee, in their report, estimate that in every line of manufacture the reduction of the tariff duty will largely increase the importations to this country from abroad.

The importation of additional cotton goods from abroad will not encourage the establishment of cotton mills in my State. Competition from abroad in cotton goods will not tend to develop cotton factories in Oklahoma. The policy which this bill inaugurates will not encourage men with capital to come to Oklahoma and invest their money in the building and operating of cotton manufacturing establishments.

And what I say of cotton factories is, of course, true of any and all other kinds of manufacturing establishments. I believe that the provisions of this bill if enacted into law will retard the development of Oklahoma in the line of manufacturing industries.

The largest city in our State, Oklahoma City, the capital of the State and the commercial center of the State, I am proud to say, is in my district. The daily papers of that city frequently call attention to the importance of securing for that city mills and manufacturing establishments. Not long ago I read in one of those papers an article telling of the steps which were being taken by some enterprising citizens to establish in Oklahoma City a great cotton factory that would bring millions of money to the city, give employment to thousands of intelligent workmen, and thus contribute to the prosperity of citizens of the city regardless of their business or occupation.

There is not a city in Oklahoma that would not give a reasonable cash bonus to secure a cotton mill or any other important manufacturing industry. Will the reduction of our tariff, the opening of our markets to foreign products, the increase of competition by the sale of goods manufactured abroad—will these things encourage the investment of capital in new mills in Oklahoma or elsewhere in this country? Certainly not.

I am therefore in favor of national legislation that will aid my own State in its material development, that will encourage the founding of new industries within its borders, that will add to its wealth and population and multiply the blessings enjoyed by all our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman on the other side will use some of his time. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixteen minutes, as the Chair has kept it. Mr. PETERS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, cotton manufacturing is a great industry in the State where I live and the district which I represent. We not only have factories that produce the common, coarser grade of goods, but in the city I live in and in other parts of my district there are factories that produce the finer grades of goods.

There have come to me but few objections to this bill. These people who have erected those factories, the native people, the Georgians, are not protectionists. They are Democrats in every sense of the word. They believe in the Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue, and not a tariff for protection. It is true there have been a few who have left the Democratic Party upon the matter of the tariff, but they were men who cared more for their own personal fortune than they did for the interests of the entire country.

I hold in my hand a letter just received from the president of a cotton factory in my district, and I propose to read it. We are not to be lured from our devotion to the party to which all these men belong by saying that we are to be benefited by maintaining upon the statute books a tariff such as now is carried upon the goods that they produce. A majority of the cotton manufacturers in the State of Georgia, while they may believe, some of them, that the rates of this bill are too low—I do not blame them for wanting the rates as high as they can get them, whether they manufacture cotton goods or whether they manufacture woolen goods—but the cotton manufacturers of the State are not devoted to these highly protected goods and do not ask for them. This is the letter to which I refer:

We are noticing the tariff agitation with a good deal of interest, and, while we are Democrats and standing by the party, we hope you will try and make things as light on us as possible. We do not propose going Republican even if our business is damaged. We had arranged capital to double our plant, and while we have been compelled to suspend for the present we really believe we are going to stay in business and do our building at an early date.

That is but an indication that an attempt has been made to frighten these people, and they are not to be driven from their party allegiance by an effort to say that their business is to be destroyed.

Now, I want to call attention to another fact. The chief cost of erecting a factory in the South is in the cotton machinery, which is 50 per cent of the cost.

I read from a cotton manufacturer in my State who is as well posted as anybody, and he says:

These burdens, particularly in the matter of high cost of machinery, are probably the most serious which American mills must contend with. Practically the direct effect of the high cost of machinery makes it necessary to employ almost double the capital needed in establishing foreign mills, and American mills must earn from 60 to 80 per cent more per spindle in order to secure a fair return on the investment over European mills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes more to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, after going through the various costs of cotton machinery per spindle, and how much it costs in this country, and how much in England and Germany, he says:

Cheaper machinery will place this country nearer on a parity with foreign competitors and enable us to better compete with them in the struggle for foreign trade.

Now, what have we done in this bill? The Republicans put in the basket clause 45 per cent on mill machinery, and because of that tax of 45 per cent on mill machinery it has cost the cotton manufacturer, when he built a mill in the South, an amount equivalent to 50 per cent of the cost of the factory. And, says this man, Mr. G. Gunby Jordan, of the Phoenix Mill, in Columbus, Ga., who knows what he is talking about and who has had as wide an experience as any man in the South, that cheaper machinery will place the manufacturers of the South nearer on a parity with their foreign competitors and enable them better to compete with them in the struggle for the foreign trade.

And, at last it is the foreign trade that the people who manufacture cotton goods in the South are seeking. Take off the tax, as we have done in this bill, reduce the tariff upon cotton mill machinery from 45 to 25 per cent, cut it in two, reduce the rates upon the indigo and the other dyes they use, giving them a fair chance in the markets of the world, and they do not need any protection upon their goods and do not ask for it.

Mr. Chairman, one other word. It was stated here in a debate this morning by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], whom I do not see present, in a reply that he made to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS], that Georgia had no law upon its statute books in reference to the employment of children in its factories. On the impulse of the mo-

ment, when he named Georgia as one of those States, I said that that was not true, and it is not true. I had occasion to call attention to that fact in the last session of Congress in reply to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Michael E. Driscoll, who made the same statement in reference to the State of Georgia. Now, I am not familiar with the laws of the other Southern States on that subject, but I put in the RECORD last year the laws of the State of Georgia on that subject, in which I showed and demonstrated that the people of Georgia in 1889 had had the laws placed upon their statute books which prohibited the employment of children in factories under a certain age.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, if I have time; yes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I would like to inquire if you have in Georgia a board of inspectors whose duty it is to visit your mills and see that the law is complied with?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, I will answer the gentleman. And not only that, but by statute the grand jury twice every year especially investigates the question of the enforcement of the law and reports results to the court. In the city where I live I have seen men indicted and convicted for the violation of that law.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I am glad to hear of that, because that is an advance.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. And I will say to the gentleman that I have read the laws of his State in reference to this matter, and we in Georgia have in great measure copied the laws of Massachusetts in that matter.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Every other State could do it with advantage, too.

Mr. BARTLETT. Massachusetts has led the way often and often again in the enactment of good laws, and we are not ashamed to follow them when they are good. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be anything of an expert upon the technicalities of the cotton schedule, and I shall not discuss this schedule in the manner in which it has been discussed by minority members of the committee here with regard to its details; but I want to call attention to a few general propositions with respect to this particular schedule.

The history of tariff revisions during the past few years makes the questions arising out of the revision of Schedule I amongst the most interesting in all the work of tariff changes, because it is what happened to Schedule I and what did not happen to Schedule K that so incensed the public mind that the people began digging into the entire Payne law, until it was condemned from cover to cover in this country from ocean to ocean.

Despite the fact that a Republican President had declared that Schedule K was indefensible; despite the fact that no satisfactory testimony was offered to the Committee on Ways and Means to justify the retention of the then existing rates, much less increases in the rates, Schedule K was permitted to be rewritten in the law under the Payne revision in exactly the form that it had been upon the statute books for generations. Schedule I fared even better, for while seeming reductions were made in Schedule I in the House, when it reached another branch of the American Congress it was so manipulated that had it not been for the unceasing activity of some patriotic and hard-working statesmen over there the country would never have waked up to the discovery that the cotton manufacturers of the country were protected under the Payne-Aldrich revision to a very much higher degree than they had been under the previous law.

Anybody who wants to get an interesting side light on recent Republican methods of revising tariffs ought to read a little volume which was published about four years ago, entitled "The speeches of ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE in the United States Senate," for in that work he showed how the cotton manufacturers had entered the Senate of the United States and indirectly were able to accomplish what plain persuasion and arguments never would have accomplished before the Ways and Means Committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

I think I am well within the mark when I say that to these two causes—the failure to make any change in Schedule K and the willingness to make changes indirectly and by subterfuge in Schedule I, in the interest of the cotton manufacturers of the country—was due more than to any other thing the universal

condemnation by the people which followed the enactment of the Payne law.

Another interesting thing about this schedule is that the recent history of its proposed revision reveals in a striking way the real attitude of the old-fashioned protection Republicans upon this much-advertised Tariff Board proposition. The Tariff Board, named by a Republican President, conceived by Republican legislators in this House, and born in an appropriation bill, went to work upon the cotton industry, and finally made quite a voluminous report. After it had been made, one of the most distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress and one of the most able tariff makers who has sat in this House certainly during my time, went to work upon this Schedule I with the intent and purpose of writing a bill which would be in exact accordance with the findings of the tariff board which he and other Republican Members had defended and which his President had appointed. The gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Hill, who is no longer a Member of this House, but whose ability to construct tariff legislation with accuracy and regard for the facts from his point of view—I mean with regard to the principle upon which Republicans would write a law—no man will gainsay, and whose industry, capacity for work, and desire to do what in good faith he started out to accomplish no man in the House will criticize—this gentleman prepared a revision of Schedule I in collaboration with experts who worked for the Tariff Board.

He had the assistance not only of the experts of the Tariff Board, who really did the work for this Tariff Board, but he sat day and night with the distinguished Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Curtis, who is in the Treasury Department in charge of the administration of the customs laws, and who is himself a considerable expert, than whom perhaps no man in the country could better say whether the language of the proposed bill was in exact accordance with the recommendations of the Tariff Board. With all this help, Mr. Hill wrote and finally introduced his cotton schedule revision bill.

Well, one day, just when the gentlemen on the other side were criticizing us because in writing our metal schedule bill we refused to wait until the Tariff Board had come in with its report, when they were criticizing us because we reported a Schedule K revision which did not take into consideration any of the findings of the Tariff Board, Mr. Hill brought his bill into the Ways and Means Committee and offered it as a substitute for the Underwood bill, because, as he said, having stood for a Tariff Board and his party having stood for a Tariff Board he wanted to present a bill which was in exact accord with the Tariff Board's report. He submitted it as a Republican Tariff Board substitute for the Underwood cotton-revision bill, and my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], would not vote for it, and every Republican member of the committee, with the exception of Mr. Hill, repudiated it absolutely. Why they did so I do not know, except that they are not prepared or ready to follow a Tariff Board, even of their own creation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. Here is a telegram from the president of the Tariff Board:

HARTFORD, CONN., April 18, 1913.

Hon. AUGUSTUS H. GARDNER, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Hill received assistance from staff of Tariff Board in preparation of his bill, but the bill was never officially considered by the board. Personally, I was too busy at the moment to consider his rates in relation to our report, and the same was true of most members. I stated to him throughout that I was not prepared to indorse it without further consideration. You can use this, but will try to write more detailed statement.

HENRY C. EMERY.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman will agree with what I have said about his distinguished fellow citizen of Massachusetts, Mr. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Curtis, will he not?

Mr. GARDNER. Except that I have always understood he was a Democrat. He is an excellent man, even as a Democrat.

Mr. PALMER. He will agree with me in saying that no man in the country perhaps, or certainly in the public service, is better qualified to determine how the language of a proposed act will conform with the findings of any other board of the public service?

Mr. GARDNER. If it were not for the fact that we had found in that table 18 absolute mistakes in figuring, we might agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. I should like a little more time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. PALMER. I am not quite clear, from the gentleman's statement, whether it is the Tariff Board schedule in which he

has discovered the 18 mistakes or Mr. Hill's table or Mr. Curtis's table, and I have as much confidence in Mr. Curtis's ability to decide a question of this kind as I have even in the ability of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. He says that the bill was written just as closely as language could make it in accordance with the report of the Tariff Board. Mr. Hill believed so, and his opinion would have as much weight with me as that of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. GARDNER. Can the gentleman quote from the RECORD any such statement from Mr. Curtis, and couple it with the statement he made that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] voted against that bill?

Mr. PALMER. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman said Mr. PAYNE voted against the Hill bill on the floor of the House.

Mr. PALMER. No; I said Mr. Hill offered this bill in the Committee on Ways and Means and it got his vote, and he could not get anybody else to vote for it.

Mr. GARDNER. But the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] voted for it on the floor of the House, and the gentleman knew it.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is mistaken about that. I declined to vote on the ground that I had never seen the bill until it was read in the committee, and because it was nearly all ad valorem rates.

Mr. PALMER. I do not think the gentleman will dispute the accuracy of my relation of it.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. PALMER. I do not want to do the gentleman an injustice. I am not excusing or justifying the action of the gentleman from New York or anybody else on that side; I am simply commenting on the fact that the Tariff Board revision of the cotton schedule, in spite of all we have heard about the infallibility of such a commission, could not receive the vote of more than one member of the Ways and Means Committee in the Sixty-second Congress.

Now, it seems to me, in view of that kind of history, that it is about time that we heard less about the Republican desire to have a tariff board prepare legislation for the body which is charged by the Constitution with the duty of preparing such legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I think this is very illuminating, and I wish the gentleman would go on with his narration as to the cotton-schedule bill. What became of the bill which came out of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. KITCHIN. May I interrupt the gentleman? The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Hill, produced a substitute in this House—the Hill bill. Did not the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], who is now a Republican, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], now a Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] all vote for it?

Mr. PALMER. I can not speak about the number of Members who voted for it. I will simply say that Mr. Hill, relying as a sincere man would, having stated that the Tariff Board was a proper thing in revenue legislation, upon the report of that board, appealed from his fellow members of the Ways and Means Committee and went upon the floor of the House with his bill, where the miserable support he got for it was the most severe condemnation of the Tariff Board that has ever been uttered in the country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is not the gentleman incorrect about the support it received?

Mr. PALMER. Well, it was inconsiderable.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Are not the rates that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has brought in nearer the Hill bill than the bill you bring in to-day is nearer the bill you had last year?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, that is beside the question.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think he will find that every Republican on this side of the House voted for the bill except the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], Mr. Ames, of Massachusetts, and myself.

Mr. PALMER. That may be true; and if I said it was inconsiderable support I will say that it would have been much more considerable if the gentleman from Tennessee had voted for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. I am a standpatter from Standpattersville.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman is not for a tariff board?

Mr. AUSTIN. If it is right, I am; and if it is wrong, I am not.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from Tennessee voted against the Hill bill because the rates were a good deal lower than the rates in this Underwood bill, and you thought it would destroy all the industries of the country?

Mr. AUSTIN. I voted against both the Hill bill and the Underwood bill because the rates were not high enough.

Mr. KITCHIN. They were lower than the Underwood bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. I voted against both because the duties were too low.

Mr. KITCHIN. Were not the rates in the Hill bill lower than in the Underwood bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know.

Mr. PALMER. Now, Mr. Chairman, if gentlemen are willing, I would like to make my speech myself. [Laughter.] I want to discuss, as I said in the beginning, the schedule in a somewhat general way. We have heard from our friends from New England, as, indeed, we have heard from other parts of the country, from the friends of the cotton manufacturers, that this revision of the cotton schedule will ruin them, will put their mills out of business; and I suppose we have heard as awful things about the dire effects of the revision with respect to this schedule as we have with respect to any in the whole tariff bill. According to the census reports, the total production in this country of all the articles covered by Schedule I amounts to \$1,500,000,000 in round figures. Of course, it is possible that the census has duplicated many of them; but as near as we can get at it, speaking in round terms, \$1,500,000,000 worth of these goods are made in America. If that figure, by reason of duplications in the census reports, is high, it does not change the force of the argument I make, except in slight degree. Last year the imports amounted to \$24,358,360, which was 1½ per cent, or to be exact, 1.58 per cent, of the total American production in 1910 of the articles covered in this schedule, and the exports during the same year were \$50,769,511, or \$26,000,000 more than the imports.

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. PALMER. I can not yield just now.

Mr. AUSTIN. I just want to correct the gentleman's figures.

Mr. PALMER. I will yield if the gentleman thinks I have made a mistake in my figures.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman's figures on the exports are correct, but Mr. O. P. Austin gave me the imports as being something over \$63,000,000, and he gave them to me to-day.

Mr. PALMER. That is a mistake.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has deducted from that the laces, which we do not make here, amounting to \$37,000,000 of these \$63,000,000. Deduct that \$37,000,000 and that leaves \$26,000,000 for cloths and yarns.

Mr. PALMER. Yes. I am discussing the imports of the kind of articles covered by Schedule I in the present bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. They contain laces.

Mr. PALMER. They are not in Schedule I.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then you have transferred them?

Mr. PALMER. That is true. The gentleman ought to keep up with the march of events.

Mr. AUSTIN. You change them so often it is hard to do that.

Mr. PALMER. The point I am making is this: While it is easily possible that in readjusting rates over an entire industry in the country we might make such a change as would bring some distress to one particular mill here or there, yet we can not, in legislating for 100,000,000 people and a country as great as this Republic, stop because here and there a pin may be put down where somebody is going to squeal.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, when the Underwood tariff bills were prepared in the Sixty-second Congress we were anxious to know as accurately as we could find out what would be the effect of the reduced rates on imports, and we had estimates of imports and the revenues resulting therefrom made, not by the Committee on Ways and Means, but by experts in the Treasury Department.

As was shown in our first report, when the Underwood bill providing for a revision of the woolen schedule came into the House, those estimates were made by experts in the Treasury Department, then controlled by the Republican Party, and they based their estimates upon a system of calculation which had been in vogue in the Treasury Department in making such estimates for many years. They figured the effect of the reduced

rates in the Dingley law and made calculations in advance. They figured the effect of such reductions as appeared in the Payne law, and made calculations in advance as to probable imports, and the amount of the imports which followed the changes in the Dingley law and in the Payne law came so close to the estimates made by these experts before the laws were put upon the statute books that it is a safe conclusion to assert that the basis which they adopted was a conservative and proper one. These same gentlemen, figuring in exactly the same way, make the estimate that under the present reduction of Schedule I the imports by reason of the reduced rates will increase to \$36,927,000—that is to say, from \$24,000,000 to \$36,000,000, or from 1½ per cent to 2½ per cent. Let me ask you if there is any man of sense and experience in this House who believes that an increase of imports of the articles covered by this schedule from 1½ per cent to 2½ per cent of the American production is going to injure or destroy the legitimate industry of cotton manufacturing in this country?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman, along the same line of reasoning, whether, in his judgment, the slight prospective increase in importations will materially affect the prices of these commodities?

Mr. PALMER. Well, I will get to that in a moment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Before the gentleman gets to that proposition I desire to ask him this question: Was the Underwood cotton bill a year ago, or two years ago, framed on a policy for revenue only?

Mr. PALMER. It was.

Mr. MURDOCK. Where does the present schedule differ from that Underwood bill?

Mr. PALMER. It was framed with the further thought in mind, which runs through every Democratic effort at making a tariff, that those things which are the necessities of life, even at the expense of revenue to the Government, must have duties which will modify the prices of the articles in the interest of the consumer. Now, let me go a little further, and I will answer the gentleman before I conclude. Production in this country of a billion and a half. Suppose that the merchants on Pennsylvania Avenue, here in the city of Washington, were doing a business of \$1,500,000 per annum in a certain line of goods. Suppose that the merchants in the city of Baltimore were sending over into this market to the people of Washington, to compete with those merchants, \$24,000 worth of goods; and then suppose that we would pass a law which would have the effect of reducing the freight rates or express tariff to such an extent that by reason of that reduced rate of transportation, which is nothing but a tariff, the Baltimore merchants would be able to increase their sales in the Washington market from \$24,000 to \$36,000 a year. Do you believe that those merchants on Pennsylvania Avenue, doing a business of \$1,500,000, would go out of business, would close up their shops, cash in, or throw their labor out of employment because \$12,000 worth of additional goods from Baltimore came in here? Why, no; you do not, and they would not. What would they do? Why, they would pay a little more attention to the efficiency of their working force. They would get up a little earlier in the morning and perhaps work a little later at night. They would devise means to attract the people so that custom should come to them and keep this competition from Baltimore down to the point of safety, and they would be content with a little less profit in order that they might keep that competition down to the point of safety, and they would be compelled—indeed, they would be glad—to sell their products at a little less profit to the Washington consumer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, that is exactly what will happen in the cotton industry. If this reduction were so low that the floodgates would be open and foreign goods would come in here in enormous quantities your mills might close down and labor might go out of employment; but if the reductions are sufficiently moderate to permit only a moderate increase of importation the only effect will be a reduction in the price of the product to the American consumer at the expense of the profits of the American manufacturer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman was present when Mr. Chase, of Fall River, testified to a sale of goods that he made and what he found they were selling for by the retailer. It was a statement before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PALMER. I do not remember it. I might have been present; I do not know.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman permit me to state it?

Mr. PALMER. I really have not the time to permit the gentleman to do that.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Well, this is very important, and I should state it, I think, in line with what the gentleman said.

Mr. PALMER. I decline to yield for that purpose. The gentleman is going to state something from memory which must appear in the RECORD.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. It is what I heard—what he told me himself.

Mr. PALMER. I want to conclude by adding simply this: That that idea, if you follow it out, will run through all the line of manufactured products in this country, and labor will not be touched by reason of the reduced price of the product, because the amount of production by the American manufacturer will not be materially decreased.

Why, this \$12,000,000 increase of importations can be largely absorbed in the growing population in this country, and yet the American manufacturer will be compelled to keep his price down in order to keep those imports to the point of safety for himself.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. In the illustration the gentleman has given he has spoken with the utmost fairness, I think—

Mr. PALMER. I am trying to.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. He has referred simply to the negligible increase in importations. Does he expect more than a negligible decrease in prices?

Mr. PALMER. The imports are going to be negligibly increased, because the American producer will considerably reduce the prices of his product. That is what keeps the competition down to the point of safety for the American producer. He must keep his price down or the competition from imports must be very much larger.

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

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. On pages 34 and 35 of your report, you say you are going to increase the imports to about \$140,000,000. Sixty per cent of that in wages would be about \$80,000,000. Would not that hurt any laboring people in this country?

Mr. PALMER. That is a fallacious argument that has sunk into the mind of my distinguished friend, who is a self-confessed, high protection standpatter, and proud opponent of the tariff board legislation, which he ought to get out of his head.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman declare that there is a trust in the cotton business?

Mr. PALMER. I have not declared so.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman declare there is a trust in the wool business?

Mr. PALMER. I have not declared so. I think there is something like a Woolen Trust.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that the price is kept down to the consumers, as far as woolen and cotton products are concerned in the United States, because there is actual competition in the industries in this country, and that mill works against mill, and the wits of one mill owner operate against the wits of another mill owner, right here in the United States?

Mr. PALMER. The answer to that is that while competition takes place at certain seasons and under certain conditions, there is another kind of competition which they do not have, which will come from the lowering of this tariff wall. The people of this country do not make all these things with equal efficiency and economy, and the manufacturers here do not make some of them as cheaply as they can be made abroad, beyond question, so that in particular lines only, not generally, this competition will take place.

Mr. MOORE. There is such competition now, is there not?

Mr. PALMER. I am not going to talk about trusts. I am trying to discuss this bill and stick to the subject without making a political speech, and I think I am succeeding fairly well. [Applause.] I just wanted to add this one thought, that in any line of industry in this country where we moderately increase imports the effect will be, as I have stated, to reduce the price of the product in order that the American producer may keep down that foreign competition to the point of safety, resulting in benefit to the American consumer. And the earnings, in all those branches of industry where that will be the result, and especially in the industry covered by the cotton schedule, have

been so enormous, taken in a large and general way, that the American manufacturer can afford to reduce the price of his product and still get as a return upon the capital that he invests as much money as you and I in that or other lines of industry should expect to get or ought to have. [Applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman's time expired? I think there is a little time left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. DONOVAN. Of course, I being an amateur, it is only an intelligent Member that I can get any information out of.

Mr. FITZGERALD. After that—after that. [Laughter.]

Mr. PALMER. After that, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. I understood the gentleman to say that our exports were \$50,000,000. That is true, I think?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania familiar as to where those goods went? Did they go to Europe wholly?

Mr. PALMER. Not to Europe wholly.

Mr. DONOVAN. The statement was made here that some had gone to China, and the statement was also made here that the trade with China had fallen off in six years about \$22,000,000.

Mr. PALMER. Well, what is the gentleman's question?

Mr. DONOVAN. Is it true that our export trade has fallen off to the amount of \$22,000,000 in six years with China, for instance?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no; it has increased.

Mr. DONOVAN. Increased to China?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; as I understand it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I challenge that statement.

Mr. PALMER. Well, I present, in answer to the challenge of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], the figures of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Those figures that he quoted are from the Department, too.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No challenges here; I will not stand for them. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] concluded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, have I the floor?

Mr. DONOVAN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to give the gentleman the floor if I can get time later.

Mr. DONOVAN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I listened, as I always do, with interest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], but on this occasion I listened with some surprise to the statements made by him—I think not in his usual fair and candid manner—concerning the Hill bill and the circumstances of its being drawn and presented. I doubt very much whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania is posted on the facts as well as one might assume from the statements which he made.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that this side of the House, which stands for a tariff commission, is willing now, as it has been for the last year, to vote for a cotton schedule based on the report of the Tariff Board. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Tariff Board did not recommend tariff rates. It found facts. Mr. Hill undertook to draw a bill which, in his judgment, would conform to the facts. I discussed the matter with Mr. Hill on several occasions. When he had drawn the bill he himself did not pretend that there was not or might not be a difference of opinion as to what a bill should be, based upon the facts found by the tariff commission.

This side of the House has never contended that when a tariff commission reported the facts as to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, that of itself wrote the bill, or that everyone would accept the same figures in the bill as following the facts found by the commission. Everywhere people have differences of opinion as to what certain facts find. They have differences of opinion as to what the facts are which are found no matter who may find the facts, and when the Hill bill was presented to the Committee on Ways and Means without any previous agreement among the minority members of the committee the rest of the minority members declined to commit themselves on the bill as conforming with the findings of the Tariff Board without an opportunity of making a full examination.

Subsequently, upon the motion to recommit the cotton-schedule bill, Mr. Hill made the motion to substitute his bill. He did it with my consent, although he did it and voted for it, and the rest of the Republican Members of the House who voted for it—and most of them did—voted for it as against the Underwood

bill, not then being fully satisfied that it conformed with the findings of the tariff commission.

Further examination of that bill has convinced the Republicans of the House, in the main at least, that the Hill bill did not conform to the findings of the Tariff Commission. But we shall offer a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with directions to bring in a cotton schedule which will conform with the findings of the Tariff Board; and when we put forward the proposition that we are willing to establish a tariff commission to ascertain facts upon which tariff legislation shall be based we carry with our action the good faith of accepting the legislation which is to be actually based upon the facts which are found by the commission, and which as to the cotton schedule were found by the Tariff Board. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIES. What is the status of the debate as to time?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] whether he will consume some time now or what disposition he wishes to make of the balance of his time? I believe I have 11 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERS. I will use some of my time now.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me ask the gentleman when he is going to move a recess.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] submitted a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps that has been answered by what has occurred since.

Mr. DIES. I wanted to know how much time remained to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] has 55 minutes remaining, or 45. There was 10 minutes taken from the paragraph while the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair. Adding that time the gentleman from Massachusetts has 55 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIES. I should like to have 5 minutes from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PETERS. I have promised to yield to one or two other gentlemen first.

Mr. MANN. May I ask when the gentleman intends to move that the committee rise?

Mr. FORDNEY. Why not rise now?

Mr. PETERS. I think the general debate had better run a little longer—until half past 6. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] five minutes.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, in the exceedingly brief time allotted to me I am only going to refer to one or two questions that have been involved in this discussion.

During the last four or five years that tariff debate has been going on in this House I have never heard a single Republican discuss the question of cost of units of production in the discussion of any schedule. In their comparisons between the wages paid here and abroad it has always been by the day, the week, or the year. We have always contended that the amount of efficiency on the part of the American laborer has been equal to the productive capacity of the foreign labor, the price being taken into consideration. We have not always had at hand the evidence to show this fact, and I want particularly to show this with reference to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] in his discussion this afternoon. I am going to quote from an editorial in the Wool and Cotton Reporter, published in Boston, Mass., the direct representative of the cotton and woolen industries of this country, for the purpose of establishing our position.

Weavers in the domestic industry will operate 8, 10, and sometimes 12 nonautomatic looms on plain cloth, a condition which is not noted in foreign countries, because it is an exceptional case where a weaver will operate 6 looms in the foreign industry, and in the majority of cases the number operated is only 4 on plain cloth.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. I have only five minutes. Do not ask me to do that, please. This editorial continues:

To show more clearly the general situation, it can be said that in the domestic industry a weaver will ordinarily operate 6 and even 8 dobby looms on fancy work, the usual number operated being 6, and in most domestic mills a weaver will also run 6 Jacquard looms on the majority of Jacquard cloths which are being produced, while this number is never even approached in foreign countries, the number of looms on dobby work being less than 4, and for Jacquard work less than for dobby work. This condition is noted because of the strict rules which are formulated by the manufacturers and union organizations, and because of the standard set prices for weaving. On any kind of fabric which is made on an automatic loom there is absolutely no comparison between the domestic industry and that of

foreign countries, because American mills are so far in advance that no comparison is possible, and while the number of automatic looms in England is increasing, the domestic industry is equipped with probably over fifteen times as many automatic looms, and for a much smaller total number of looms. The use of better cotton makes possible the operation of a greater number of looms per operative in the domestic industry, thus placing the domestic manufacturer on a much more equal basis than the mere wages which are paid to the operative would indicate.

There is ample proof that the production per operative in the domestic industry in the majority of cases is much larger than that of the foreign operative, and manufacturers who speak the truth admit it to be a fact.

Now, gentlemen, this is your witness whom I have had on the stand, and I have read from an editorial written by the proprietor of that journal. It establishes our position pretty conclusively that the efficiency of American labor on the Jacquard looms, which make the same quality of high-grade cloth that the gentleman exhibited here, is from three to four times as great in this country as the labor in the best English mill.

Mr. FARR. Who is the editor of that paper, please?

Mr. CLINE. I do not know the editor. This paper represents the textile products.

Mr. FARR. Published in Boston?

Mr. CLINE. Published in Boston.

Mr. FARR. Oh, yes; that gentleman was before the committee and fought the industry.

Mr. CLINE. Now, I want to say just another word about my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] on the question of the condition that exists by virtue of this bill. My friends, we have had this bill before this country for two successive years. The exports of the various items in this schedule were \$35,000,000 in 1910, \$45,000,000 in 1911, and \$52,600,000 in 1912, an increase of 50 per cent on the very articles that we are discussing in this schedule.

My friend from Tennessee goes into predictions as to what will happen—industries will close down, men go out of work, and it is the most vicious bill that ever was written in this country. Now, you can not fool the American people; you can not fool the people down in Tennessee. I am quoting from Cotton, a magazine published at Macon, Ga., giving a direct account of the mills existing in the southern country and the products they have and the amount of money that is invested. There is not a Southern State but what is putting money into new industries in the cotton line every month in the year. In Nashville the Warioto Cotton Mills are investing \$15,000 in remodeling their factory.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have a telegram from that company saying that it will ruin them.

Mr. CLINE. The Elwood Manufacturing Co., incorporated with a capital of \$50,000, is another. Nashville has a manufactory of waterproof cloth, and Memphis only last month organized a company with a capital of \$250,000 to go into the cotton industry. Now, I say you can not fool the people of Tennessee; they know that the profits of this business are sufficient to warrant them in investing their money in these enterprises.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me ask the gentleman if any cotton mills were built after the Wilson bill became a law?

Mr. CLINE. Oh, the Wilson bill seems to worry the Republicans. That song has been sung at every opportunity. I am talking about the conditions that exist now.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am speaking of the conditions under the Wilson bill.

Mr. CLINE. I am talking about the conditions that exist now, when the country knows that we are going to pass this bill, and they are ready to put their money into these enterprises.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have a telegram from the Warioto Co., at Nashville, Tenn., protesting against the bill and saying that it will ruin their industry.

Mr. CLINE. The article from the Cotton magazine is as follows:

TENNESSEE.

Nashville: The Warioto Cotton Mills are to invest about \$15,000 in the remodeling of their present buildings and erect an office structure. Plans and specifications have been prepared. This company operates 25,000 ring spindles, 700 looms.

Englewood: The Englewood Manufacturing Co., of this place, have incorporated with an authorized capital of \$50,000 for the manufacture of knit goods.

Nashville: It is reported that Reeves & Ely Co. have recently incorporated to manufacture waterproof cloth.

Memphis: The Memphis Cotton Manufacturing Co. was recently chartered with a capitalization of \$250,000. Of this it will invest \$100,000 for the purchase of a site and erection of buildings, where it will install machinery for the manufacture of cotton goods from lint cotton.

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the textile industry would be very much surprised if it heard that the editor of that news-

paper which has been read is its official representative. The editor is my friend Mr. Frank P. Bennett. He has not been looked upon in the light in which the gentleman pictures him. Yet there is a good deal of truth in what he says. It is true that we use automatic looms, and it is true that English trades-unions frown on their introduction into Great Britain. But for the most part these automatic looms are used on coarse goods, and that is the very reason why the Green-Gardner amendment makes the duties on coarse cotton cloth less than is provided in the Underwood bill.

In the city of New Bedford, which largely manufactures fine goods, 90 per cent of the looms are nonautomatic and only 10 per cent are automatic. The reason is that New Bedford manufacturers, as I am informed, find that the automatic looms are not suitable for the production of goods such as they make. Automatic looms, as I understand it, produce a cloth with a rough surface, and ladies who are paying high prices for fine fabrics do not like the feeling of rough dress goods. Moreover, although the cost of tending 15 looms—and that is about the number of automatic looms which, on an average, one man operates—although the actual cost of loom tending is small, the cost of superintendence is very great. In addition, various high-class employees must be employed in connection with automatic looms beyond what is necessary in connection with ordinary looms. I have been told that the automatic loom constantly breaks threads, but, of course, is unable to mend them again. For this reason it is desirable to use coarse yarns which are not readily broken.

These are the various reasons assigned by manufacturers for the circumstance that the use of automatic looms for fine goods has never gained a satisfactory footing.

As to coarse goods the case is different. Automatic looms are under the ban of the British weavers' unions, whereas those looms are extensively used in this country. That is the reason why the Green-Gardner amendment makes a lower rate than does the Underwood bill for coarse cloth made from yarns below twentys.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the editor of the paper—Mr. Bennett—alluded to by the gentleman from Indiana, came before the Committee on Ways and Means as an enemy of the cotton and wool industry, and so asserted himself. The hearings are quite full of his testimony. It is not true, and there is no evidence anywhere in any official report, that the labor in the cotton or woolen mills is more efficient in the United States than abroad. There is evidence in abundance that in the cotton and woolen mills of England the son follows his father with an apprenticeship of four years at very low wages. If I had the time to present it, I could show that the labor in the cotton mills and woolen mills in Europe is more efficient than in the cotton and woolen mills of the United States. There is an abundance of proof of this kind. I defy any man to show reliable reports, official reports, or any other kind, to the contrary, unless it be something from some man who is an enemy of the industry.

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. 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 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.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 7.45 p. m.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 7.45 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

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 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 con-

sideration of the bill H. R. 3321, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has 44 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Alabama permit me to make a suggestion to him? Why not read the paragraphs that are not to be amended and adopt such committee amendments as the gentleman desires before we finish debate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is satisfactory. Without objection, Mr. Chairman, we will read until the crowd gets in.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

262. Plushes, velvets, velveteens, corduroys, and all pile fabrics, cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface; any of the foregoing composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, except flax; and manufactures or articles in any form, including such as are commonly known as bias dress facings or skirt bindings, made or cut from plushes, velvets, velveteens, corduroys, or other pile fabrics composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 6, after the word "fiber," insert the words "except flax."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

263. Curtains, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille, or of which cotton chenille is the component material of chief value, tapestries, and other Jacquard figured upholstery goods, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber; any of the foregoing, in the piece or otherwise, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 67, line 14, by striking out the period after the words "ad valorem" and insert a semicolon and adding the words "all other Jacquard figured manufactures of cotton or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 30 per cent ad valorem."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. As I understand it, we will have the right to recur to five of these paragraphs for the purpose of offering amendments?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I do not think it will be necessary to read them through again.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to ask a question in connection with this amendment, or would it be in order at some later period?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand there is no debate. The amendment has been adopted.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will wait until we recur to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

265. Stockings, hose and half hose, selvaged, fashioned, narrowed, or shaped wholly or in part by knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, including such as are commercially known as seamless stockings, hose and half hose, and clocked stockings, hose and half hose, all of the above composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, finished or unfinished; if valued at not more than 70 cents per dozen pairs, 40 per cent ad valorem; if valued at more than 70 cents per dozen pairs, 50 per cent ad valorem. Cotton gloves, knitted or woven, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 2, strike out the words "Cotton gloves, knitted or woven," and insert the words "Gloves, by whatever process made, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

266. Shirts and drawers, pants, vests, union suits, combination suits, tights, sweaters, corset covers, and all underwear of every description, made wholly or in part on knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, finished or unfinished, not including stockings, hose and half hose, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 8, after the word "unfinished," insert the words "not including such as are trimmed with lace, imitation lace, or crochet, or as are embroidered and."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

269. Towels, dories, bath mats, quilts, blankets, polishing cloths, mop cloths, wash rags or cloths, sheets, pillowcases, and batting, any of the foregoing made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, whether in the piece or otherwise, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer two committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report them.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 69, line 8, strike out the word "doilles."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 69, line 12, after the word "otherwise," insert the words "not embroidered nor in part of lace and not otherwise provided for."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama that the Clerk has concluded the reading of the schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman let me call his attention to an obvious error in paragraph 255 which I do not think has been corrected?

It says, as to yarns, "Nos. 1 to 9, inclusive, 5 per cent ad valorem; Nos. 10 to 19, inclusive," and so forth, "7½ per cent ad valorem." Now, there is a No. 9½ and a No. 19½ all the way through.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that, but last year I took that up with the Bureau of Standards in fixing this classification. We had a letter which was read to the House last year. I do not have it at my hand now. In that letter it was stated that none of the yarns could be stated with absolute accuracy—that is, they only approximate the number—and, of course, the importer in bringing in the yarn will not make it 9½ or 19½, because he would thereby throw it to a higher rate. He would throw it to the basket clause, which would bring a higher rate.

Mr. PAYNE. He would not on all, but he would on some of them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We had the matter up last year, and I wrote a letter to the Bureau of Standards, and published the reply then.

Mr. PAYNE. He might do that on some of the higher numbers.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I looked into that last year and, as I say, published the letter; and as the yarns are only approximate I do not think there will be any difficulty about making it 9 or 10.

Mr. PAYNE. I think it might give rise to litigation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think so. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the highest rate in this bill on yarns is 25 per cent. The basket clause is 30 per cent. Of course, the cloth goes higher. But that difficulty does not arise in the cloth paragraph, and in this paragraph I do not think any importer would try to enter it at a higher rate than he would have to pay in the regular way.

Mr. PAYNE. If he brings it in at 9½ he would have to perjure himself to get the rate fixed at 10.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They said at the department that it was difficult to ascertain that with absolute certainty.

Mr. PAYNE. They do import them now, I understand.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are numbered that way, but it is very difficult to tell the difference between No. 9 and No. 9½.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not suppose they would perjure themselves in order to come in.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] is to close the debate, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is expected to be here.

Mr. MURRAY. He is on his way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not sure that the gentleman from North Carolina will be here, and I will be glad if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] would use up his time.

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing to use the time if only one speech follows.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So far as I know there will be only one. The gentleman from Illinois is right about it, but I do not like to cut out the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] if he happens to come in.

Mr. MANN. I know; but I do not want to go ahead and have both the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Massachusetts to follow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand now that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] will not speak.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield nine minutes of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] this afternoon devoted a great deal of his time to a discussion of the Tariff Board and the bill intro-

duced at the last session by Mr. Hill of Connecticut revising this schedule, based upon the report of the Tariff Board, and tried to make much of the fact that there was some disagreement among Republicans on that subject as to the exact terms of that bill.

Now, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania and every other Member on that side of the aisle could only forget their prejudices for a little while, and exercise a little of that intellectual honesty that was spoken of so often this afternoon, and examine into the purposes and theory of a tariff board they will certainly see, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] explained this afternoon, that it is not the purpose or thought of anybody that the Tariff Board will make a report that will determine exactly the rate that shall go into each item of every schedule. What does happen and what has happened with reference to this report is that it does set limits between which there may be honest differences of opinion among Republicans as to a tariff along protection lines, and among Democrats as to a tariff along revenue lines. Between those limits there may be, Mr. Chairman, honest differences of opinion, but outside of those limits there can not be any differences of opinion.

And with reference to the bill that is before us—the Democratic bill—if those gentlemen would examine the report of that Tariff Board as to the cloth and yarn schedules of this bill, they will find that the Hill bill does come within the limits of the report of the Tariff Board. They will find that the cloth paragraph also does, but it is the first one that they have introduced, revising the schedule, that does do it.

And what is the situation, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Democratic revision of Schedule I?

In 1911, at the special session, they introduced and passed through this House a bill revising the cotton schedule. I voted for that bill. I tried to show at that time that that bill, so far as these coarser cotton cloths were concerned, purchased by the great masses of the people, was a protective bill and not a tariff for revenue bill at all. We all know what happened to the bill finally.

A year went by. In March last the Tariff Board made its report upon the cotton schedule, and last August the Democrats again brought in a cotton bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] stated that during that year they had given this cotton schedule deep thought and careful study, and I do not know but prayerful consideration, that he and his committee had examined thoroughly the report of the Tariff Board, and after all of that study and all of that information, they had come to the conclusion that their bill of 1911 was absolutely perfect, without a flaw, and they introduced into the session last year the same bill identically, word for word and rate for rate. That bill went through this House, and here we have the third bill. But this bill is not at all like the two previous bills that the Democrats have brought in. Out of 37 rates in this bill and in the previous bill they have changed 22, or nearly 66 per cent of the rates.

Now, what has brought about this change among the Democratic leadership to change these rates in this cotton schedule? I am speaking now of these paragraphs under consideration. What has happened since that time? Only one thing, and that is that the cotton manufacturers, whom our Democratic friends have so often reviled as writing tariff bills, have appeared and testified before the Committee on Ways and Means, and either this bill has been rewritten because of the testimony and statements of the cotton manufacturers or else you have gone to the report of the Tariff Board, but have not been frank enough to acknowledge it.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the Democracy have so much pride of opinion that they would not have been willing to change those rates in any particular, except for a circumstance that happened in the hearings last winter that compelled them to do so. And what was that? Why, the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association itself proposed a bill to the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means revising this cotton schedule, and in that bill they proposed to reduce the rates upon coarse cotton cloth 50 per cent lower than they did in their bills of 1912 and 1911, and, of course, they could not have come in here and put in a bill calling for rates on coarse cotton cloth 100 per cent higher than the manufacturers themselves asked for.

But though you have reduced those rates 50 per cent upon the coarse cotton cloths, I challenge any gentleman upon that side of the aisle to show that it is a tariff for revenue only. It is a protective tariff, a tariff that every Member upon this side of the aisle can vote for, because the rate is not large, but it is a rate that no man upon that side of the aisle, unless he is willing to say that he is voting for protection, can vote for. And why, Mr. Chairman? Because in these coarse cotton cloths the report of the Tariff Board shows, and the testimony of the

cotton manufacturers themselves shows, that we can and do compete with the world in those cotton cloths.

Why, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the gentleman from Georgia read a letter from a southern cotton manufacturer, in which you remember he said, "Treat us as lightly as possible." Well, you have done so. He has nothing to complain of as to the coarse cotton cloths that he makes down in Georgia. Give the New England manufacturer the same protection in his higher counts that you have given the southern manufacturer in his low counts, and you have a protective bill from A to Z in this cotton schedule.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on these coarse cotton cloths we are not only competing with the world, but in 1911 we sent 11,000,000 yards to Canada, not only in competition with Great Britain, but with a tariff charge of 7½ per cent against us. The tariff upon these cloths into Canada from this country was 32½ per cent. The tariff from England was 25 per cent. So that you can not say that this is a tariff for revenue only so far as these cloths are concerned. If you be intellectually honest, you will admit that you are protecting the southern cotton manufacturer in the things that he makes so largely.

You have lowered some rates because you were compelled to. You have raised others, either because of the demand of the cotton manufacturers, or else because you have studied to some purpose the report of the Tariff Board. If you would take another year to study the subject, you might get a fair and consistent bill. We are ready to do the work now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues from Massachusetts on the opposite side of the House have presented their views to the committee, and have shown at least that there is irreconcilable differences in their views.

We have reached the time in our industrial history when the old prohibitive-tariff system is outgrown. It may have been necessary to have had high rates of duty to raise the revenue in war time, and it may have been beneficial in some instances to continue them afterwards; but that it should be necessary to continue the prohibitive tariff rates which have been in existence on cotton goods for the last 10 or 15 years nobody who has studied the industry can believe.

My colleagues from my own State on the other side have tried to get together and get some common point of view. Their singular lack of success has been shown by their views this afternoon, when one amendment presented by my colleague, Mr. GARDNER, received its severest criticism from his colleague, Mr. GREENE.

It has been stated that the cotton industry will receive a terrible blow from the enactment of the rates in this bill. I believe the result will show not that the cotton industry will suffer but that it will be put on a sounder basis by the rates we propose in the bill. We have had prohibitive rates. They have placed a heavy burden on the consumers, and I believe have not been to the ultimate advantage either of the industry or the people employed in it.

The result of prohibitive rates has been to tremendously overstimulate certain branches of the cotton industry. Some concern will make tremendous profits, there will be a rush into that branch of industry, and the market will be overproduced. The unnatural production forced by prohibitive rates must be invariably followed by overproduction and depression.

This bill places rates on a competitive basis. The rates on yarns and cloths and all cotton products are at points which will allow reasonable importations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS. No; I can not yield now.

A careful investigation has been made of the increases which it is thought would be stimulated by adopting the rates recommended in this schedule. The importations in cotton last year were \$24,000,000.

It is estimated that under this bill which we have before us imports will be increased to \$36,000,000, an increase of \$12,000,000. See what that increase amounts to, when compared with the huge product of this industry. In 1904 the total production in the United States of cotton goods, including cotton small wares, according to the report of the Census Bureau, was valued at \$450,468,000. In 1909, the last year for which we have corresponding statistics, manufactures of cotton in this country were valued at \$628,392,000, or an increase in five years of \$177,900,000 in the total production of the mills and factories of this country, an average yearly increase of over \$35,000,000. It will be seen that an increase of importations of \$12,000,000 is by no means going to ruin any industry which increases its yearly production by three times that amount and which exported last year goods to the value of \$31,388,998.

It is absurd to claim that this tariff will revise the cotton schedule in such a way as to throw men out of employment or to upset the industry. Such remarks are made largely by those who desire to create a feeling of uncertainty, to create a political feeling against a party for their own political purposes, or else they are lamentably blind to the facts concerning the industry.

I believe firmly that the industries of the whole of our country are going to be put by this tariff bill on a firmer, sounder foundation. Removed from the uncertainties of tariff discussions and from the unfortunate overstimulation of prohibitive duties, our industries will develop on a sound basis that will make the next years ones of prosperity. Connected with that prosperity will be the name of the man whose sound judgment has shaped the preparation of the bill, the chairman of our committee, Mr. UNDERWOOD. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, this side surrenders the balance of the time in general debate. I understand that the gentleman from Illinois has still 15 minutes on amendments to be offered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there are 15 minutes yet remaining. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] going to yield to his colleague [Mr. TREADWAY] for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman to ask the question in his own time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] would yield to answer a question.

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ADAMSON). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I intended to ask the gentleman a question before he finished his remarks. I would like to ask, in view of the fact that the amendment just adopted to section 263, at the request of the committee, puts all other Jacquard goods at a 30 per cent rate, why the rate is not made 35 per cent, as in the other portion of this section? We read in section 263 that "Jacquard figured upholstery goods," etc., bear a rate of 35 per cent. Why is the distinction made between one kind of Jacquard goods made on a Jacquard loom and another?

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, there was some doubt in the minds of the committee whether the Jacquard goods referred to would come in under section 269 or under the basket clause at 30 per cent, and to remove that doubt they were fixed in section 263, which contained the other Jacquard goods, and were fixed at 30 per cent, which was the rate intended by the committee.

Mr. TREADWAY. Just one other question, please. An amendment was adopted to section 269 striking out the word "dollies." The particular question I would ask now has to do with mills making quilts. I understand that it is the intention of the committee to have it construed that Jacquard quilts will, of course, come in under 30 per cent rate rather than under section 269, line 8, where the word "quilts" appears.

Mr. PETERS. That will bring all Jacquard quilts under 30 per cent rate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is to be recognized to offer an amendment to paragraph 263, and then I yield five minutes to him from this side.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a new paragraph, as a substitute for paragraph 263.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out paragraph 263 and insert the following:

"263. Curtain, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille, or of which cotton chenille is the component material of chief value, tapestries and other Jacquard figured upholstery goods, if valued at not over 30 cents per square yard, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber; any of the foregoing, in the piece or otherwise, 45 per cent ad valorem; if valued at more than 30 cents per square yard and not exceeding \$1 per square yard, 50 per cent ad valorem; if valued at more than \$1 per square yard, 55 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have not indulged in general debate on the cotton schedule, although I come from the greatest textile city in the United States—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman put the rates higher than in the Payne law?

Mr. MOORE. No; 5 per cent less on the lower grades.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The last division is higher, and that is the important division.

Mr. MOORE. That is on the finer goods that are used by the richer class of—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The reason I asked the gentleman—is there any indication that this industry is not prospering under the Payne bill?

Mr. MOORE. The industry at present is prospering.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I ask the gentleman why did he raise the rates.

Mr. MOORE. Under the Dingley bill the industry did not prosper, because the mills were working half time and some of them quarter time and because generally there was a retardation of all production of upholstery goods in the United States. This is a case that illustrates as clearly as any I can present the necessity of a protective-tariff duty. Foreign upholstery manufacturers were able to keep their goods in this country under the Dingley law. The rates were raised in the Payne law, and as a result of the raising of those rates the mills began again to thrive in the United States, and particularly in my city. I know personally that men were walking the streets for want of work because the Dingley rates were too low. Now, I know personally that when the Payne rates were in effect the mills began to work again full time and the employees had plenty to do.

The industry is thriving now because every mill is working full tilt and doing the very best it can with the raw material on hand to fill orders in anticipation of what is coming. That may account to a very large extent for the statements that some gentlemen have advanced here as to our present prosperity. The textile mills to-day, with what raw material they have on hand, are working full tilt in order to prepare for what is to come. Now, as I said, I did not discuss this matter under general debate. It is one of the unwritten laws of this particular session of Congress that a man who comes from a district where there are interests of this kind must leave the whole discussion to a Member who comes from a district where nothing is known about it and in which there is no interest. In fact, this seems to be a session of Congress where a man who is a lawyer can discuss everything until the cows come home and settle questions affecting industries whether he knows anything about them or not. I do not want to offend the other side of the House or this side of the House when I say the discussion we have just had on the cotton schedule illustrates better than anything else could have done that we are not now prepared to pass an intelligent or scientific cotton bill.

The differences of opinion upon both sides, the lack of information upon all sides, the utter disregard of the men actually engaged in the business, who know by experience what is best for the trade, confirms the statement I have made. Oh, of course the gentlemen upon the other side say that the man who is interested in the business naturally will take care of his local interests. I would like to know a lawyer of this House who will refuse to discuss here problems of law in which he is interested and which only serve to confuse the public mind and delay public business; hair-splitting, while the men who want business done wait to have it done. I have presented this amendment in the interest of the industries of my city. If that is a crime, it can not be helped. I am ready to plead guilty to an effort to persuade you to stay a bill particularly with respect to upholstery products, so that the mills engaged in this industry may not be placed upon half time and the men now employed will not be put upon the streets.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the remarkable unity in the Republican Party in its effort to write a tariff bill is well illustrated by the last two speeches that have been made on that side of the House. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], although he advises his Republican colleagues to vote for our cotton schedule, says we have not reduced it enough, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], not satisfied with our cotton schedule, not even satisfied with the Payne bill, not only proposes to raise this paragraph under which he admits the business interests of the country affected by it have prospered, but proposes to raise it and ask you to vote to raise it above the rate in the present Payne law. Now, where does the Republican Party stand?

All of you gentlemen stand for a revision by a tariff board. The most complete report that you had in the last Congress by a tariff board of your own creation was on the cotton schedule. You have had it before you for study for two years, and at the end of that time, still proclaiming that you believe in a revision of the tariff by a tariff board, we find one distinguished gentleman representing you here complaining that this bill is too high, according to the Tariff Board reports, and the other distinguished gentleman, the Representative from Pennsylvania, is not only not satisfied with this bill, but is not satisfied with the Payne bill; but under your theory of a tariff board revision

he desires to raise the rate still higher and increase the burdens on the American people, when he admits on the floor that the industry is prosperous under the present rate.

Now, I do not want to indulge in captious criticism, but I am perfectly willing to accept the captious criticism that that side of the House throws us. That is your business. That is what you are here for. You are the critics of the Congress, as we have been sometimes in the past. It is the part of the Government that belongs to you [applause on the Democratic side], and I do not want to invade your privilege, but I ask you, and the country is going to ask you, when you proclaim yourselves in favor of a revision by a tariff board, and you have had the best report of a tariff board, that you stood for and proclaimed all right, before you for two years, and you can not agree among yourselves on a rate that should go into this schedule. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] is to be recognized to offer an amendment to paragraph 266, after which I yield him the 5 minutes' time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 9, page 68, paragraph 266, instead of—
"Composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 30 per cent ad valorem."

To read:
"Composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 50 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is not to restore the Payne duty of 1912 of 60.27 per cent. It is not to restore the Dingley rate of 61.41 per cent ad valorem, but it is simply asking the Democratic Party to give the manufacturers and workmen of the city of Philadelphia, which I have the honor in part to represent, the same rate—50 per cent ad valorem—that was given them in the Wilson-Gorman bill of 1896.

I do not intend to take the time of the committee in discussing the fiscal policy which is being put into effect by the Democratic Party and the overturning of the protective principle, under which this country has obtained its great growth and under which wages have been maintained at a standard higher than in any other country in the world. The city of Philadelphia, which I have the honor to represent in part, is the greatest manufacturing city in this country. It is also known throughout this and all other countries as the city of homes, containing, exclusive of hotels and apartment houses, 350,000 dwellings, the major part of which are occupied by mechanics and other wage earners. The fact that the city of Philadelphia is regarded as the home city of the country is due almost entirely to the splendid opportunities for employment in these manufacturing industries, and I therefore feel that I would be recreant to my trust if I did not raise my voice to protest against the passage of this bill, which so seriously affects virtually every industry in Philadelphia. I feel that I should call attention to the fact that inasmuch as the Ways and Means Committee admitted that an injustice had been done in reducing the duty on knitted underwear from 60 to 25 per cent ad valorem and withdrew this paragraph from the Democratic caucus in order to increase the reduced duty to 30 per cent ad valorem that it is quite probable that other mistakes have been made. The increase from 25 to 30 per cent will not afford the slightest protection to Philadelphia's underwear industry. Where we are paying our employees from \$1.75 to \$2.50 a day the same class of operators in Germany are receiving only from 50 to 75 cents a day. Where the foreigners are able to sell in this country at \$2.50 a dozen, including their profit, our Philadelphia manufacturers, without counting profit, must pay \$3.00 a dozen to turn out the same kind of underwear. The same thing is true of hosiery and all other textile interests, in which Philadelphia has millions of dollars of capital invested and on which thousands of our workmen are dependent for a livelihood.

It has been intimated that the Republicans are engaged in calamity howling and that no harm will really be done to American industry by the passage of the Wilson-Underwood bill. For the information of Democrats who hold this view, I merely wish to cite an instance of what is already happening. In Bradford, England, the firm of Joseph Benn & Sons has long been engaged in the worsted business. After the passage of the Dingley tariff law they found that they could more profitably make in this country such goods as they had formerly made in their English mill for export here. So they established another plant in Rhode Island to make goods for the United States market.

In both mills they made the same kind of goods, with the same kind of machinery, and of identical raw material. The conditions are practically identical in all respects except the wages paid.

Many of the employees of the Bradford mill came to this country when the firm established itself in Rhode Island, and they testify that sorters who receive \$7.79 in the English branch of the business receive \$16.50 per week in the Rhode Island branch. Mechanics receive \$7.30 in the English branch and \$15 per week in the Rhode Island branch. Weavers receive \$3.41 a week in the English branch and \$12 per week in the Rhode Island branch. They say that if they lived the same way in the United States as they do in England they could save at least half of their wages.

If what the Democrats have said is true, namely, that the working people of this country will prosper under the new bill, it would seem that the firm of Joseph Benn & Sons would be willing to continue in business; and yet on April 18 last the following announcement was posted on the door of the firm for the information of 1,500 American employees:

The provisions in the new Wilson-Underwood tariff bill make it absolutely impossible for us to successfully compete with imported goods. Therefore the stoppage of machinery will take place immediately.

JOSEPH BENN & SONS,
HARRISON BENN.

Mr. Benn has stated publicly that the notice speaks for itself. He has explained that it is not the intention of the company to close up all its factories at once. There will be a lay off of employees a few at a time, at intermittent periods, which will depend probably on the question of orders that are to be filled in the future. Mr. Benn is quoted as saying:

There is no mystery in the closing of our mill. I find that under the proposed new tariff act I can make goods in Bradford, England, and land them in New York at about 4 cents a yard cheaper than I can make them in Rhode Island and ship them to New York. On 13 numbers or styles I find that I can save from 10.6 per cent to 14.6 per cent a yard by making the goods in the Bradford plant and shipping them to New York. For that reason I have ordered all work that is being done stopped at this plant, and am sending a cable to the Bradford plant to start 500 pieces of goods to take the places of the goods which we have stopped making here.

This is a concrete example of what is taking place in the textile industry, and I merely call it to the attention of the Democratic Party for what it may be worth to them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALLIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WALLIN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 68, paragraph 266, line 9, by striking out the figures "30," after the word "fiber," and inserting the figures "40" in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALLIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I inadvertently misled the Chair by asking him to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] to offer his amendment before the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] had been disposed of. I now ask to have a vote upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], which is now pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Chair to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] to offer an amendment to paragraph 270, and then I will yield him five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] offers the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for paragraph 270:

"Lace window curtains, nets, nettings, pillow shams, and bed sets, finished or unfinished, made on the Nottingham lace-curtain machine or on the Nottingham warp machine, and composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, when counting 5 points or spaces between the warp threads to the inch, 1 cent per square yard; when counting more than 5 such points or spaces to the inch, one-half of 1 cent per square yard in addition for each such point or space to the inch in excess of 5; and in addition thereto, on all the foregoing articles in this paragraph, 20 per centum ad valorem: *Provided*, That none of the above-named articles shall pay a less rate of duty than 50 per centum ad valorem."

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that with Schedule C, metals and manufactures of, we would have seen the

finish of the injuries that will be inflicted upon the district which I have the honor to represent—injuries which will follow directly from the provisions in this bill—but I find that a lace mill in the district, employing 400 or more people, will be in serious danger if the reduced tariff in this section of the bill becomes a law. Therefore I have offered my amendment as a substitute for section 270. The amendment constitutes the existing law.

I am in receipt of a communication from the secretary of the Chartered Society of Amalgamated Lace Operators of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, under date of April 24, 1913, which reads as follows:

To the Hon. JOHN R. FARR:

DEAR SIR: I am mailing you under separate cover a petition from the employees of the Scranton Lace Curtain Co. Knowing, as you do, the hardships that we, the employees, went through during the time that the Wilson bill was in effect, and you understanding the local conditions, I am sure I can thank you in advance for your voice and influence in regard to this matter.

I am, yours,

JAMES GOODALL, Secretary.

SCRANTON, PA.

Now, the friends of organized labor have an opportunity to save an industry which employs organized labor. It is one of the best organized industries in this country, and is now on a competitive basis with the product of foreign industries, paying 68½ per cent more wages than are paid in England, and three times the rate of wages for a 9-hour day that is paid in Scotland for a 10-hour day—industries with which our Scranton industry is in direct competition. One-third of the capacity of the Nottingham machines in this country is now unused. Importations are increasing.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Is that a communication from an organization of labor?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Has it a seal on it?

Mr. FARR. Yes. It reads, "The Chartered Society of Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America, Branch No. 3."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Has it got the organization seal on it?

Mr. FARR. Yes; it has its seal on it.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I mean the seal of the organization.

Mr. FARR. It has the seal on it. There is no question about it. I know the organization.

Now, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] has been made acquainted with that fact, as a member of organized labor, I am looking for his support.

In the petition to which I have referred these petitioners say:

We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the honorable Senator and Congressman from our district to vote against the recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee concerning laces and lace curtains.

The adoption of the recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee means an increase in foreign competition and also means less employment and a reduction in the pay envelope for the undersigned.

Mr. Chairman, I desire the members of organized labor on that side of the aisle to remember that in Scranton and elsewhere in all these industries in this country engaged in the manufacture of Nottingham laces we are paying three times the wages that are paid in Scotland for the same kind of work and for just as much work, and I am going to ask them if they are going to support this provision to put this industry in danger?

Relative to the lower tariff, Mr. Paul B. Belin, treasurer of Scranton Lace Co., writes me as follows:

As a matter of fact, the existing duties on our imported yarns run about 26 per cent, and under the new bill they will average about 22 per cent, which is practically inappreciable. On the coarser numbers, which are spun in the South, we will not be able to get a better price, owing to the fact that the duties in most cases are raised rather than lowered; so that, with cotton out of the way as a negligible quantity apparently, we would be forced to compete on wages.

As a local man, you are quite well aware of the position we have always taken in reference to this matter, and you are also quite well aware that we have always paid more than anybody.

As an actual fact we are paying just exactly three times as much wages as the Scotch lace manufacturers, who will compete directly with us if this bill should pass. We work 9 hours a day, whereas the Scotchmen work 10. At the present moment there is practically very little difference between our prices and the prices of Scotch or English curtains. It is only due to our strenuous selling efforts that we are able to keep out the Scotch and English curtains, and if they were given an advantage of 20 per cent on the low-grade curtains, as proposed in the new tariff bill, I, for one, fail to see how it will be possible for us to run the mill, as I am quite sure there is no possibility of reducing wages.

Trusting you will use your earnest endeavors to prevent any such bill being passed, I am,

Very truly, yours,

THE SCRANTON LACE CURTAIN CO.,
PAUL B. BELIN, Treasurer.

I notice a communication to a gentleman on the other side of the aisle, my colleague, Mr. CASEY, in which the writers say there are numbers of skilled mechanics in the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., mills now idle.

Now, the question has been asked here frequently as to why this difference of wages in foreign countries exists. We are not nearly so much concerned with wages in foreign countries as we are with the wages paid our working people, and I repeat that here is an opportunity to maintain a splendid industry, furnishing the product at a price lower than it was sold for before the industry was established in this country, paying splendid wages to a splendid class of people. The passage of this bill will mean the displacement of a large number of male employees. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if I understood the gentleman aright, he stated that he had communications from the men who were working in these mills appealing to him that this industry should not return to the disastrous condition in which it was under the Wilson bill. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. FARR. That is what the gentleman wrote to me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And the gentleman charges, I suppose, that the rates in the Wilson bill were the cause of this industry being in such a disastrous condition.

Mr. FARR. At that time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is your opinion about it?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very good illustration of how a Republican wants to make up a tariff bill—the "scientific method." He comes before this House and appeals to the House to return to the rates under the Payne bill because the workmen in the factory in his district have written to him that they want to be saved from the disastrous conditions that were forced on them by reason of the enactment of the Wilson bill. Now, he feels sure about that, because I have just asked him, and that is the great issue that he has brought before this House on these Nottingham curtains.

Now, under the Payne bill these curtains in 1912 had a rate whose ad valorem equivalent was 52 per cent. Under the Wilson bill the rate was 50 per cent.

Mr. FARR. That is a difference of 52 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And to the difference between 50 per cent and 52 per cent the gentleman attributes some calamitous conditions. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I can not yield now.

Mr. FARR. I will explain the difference, if you will permit me to do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the difference.

Mr. FARR. Of course you do.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the difference. The difference is that the gentleman now knows what the Wilson rate was, and he did not know it when he made his speech. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FARR. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did know, and I can explain the difference, and the gentleman knows the difference, but he does not want me to state it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman talks most of the time in this House, but I ask him not to talk in my time.

Now, the gentleman reminds me of a condition I met with in the campaign last fall. It is a well-known fact that when Mr. Dingley wrote the Dingley bill he adopted the Wilson rates on the iron and steel schedule, with one or two insignificant changes. Otherwise the Wilson bill and the Dingley bill were the same on the iron and steel schedules. When I was making a speech last fall in a town in Connecticut a gentleman rose in the audience and he said, "It does not make any difference about what you say about this matter. We remember when our iron and steel works were closed under the Wilson bill."

I asked him if he attributed that to the rates in the Wilson bill, and he said he did. I then asked him if they had prospered under the rates in the Dingley bill, and he told me that they had had the most amazing prosperity that they had ever known. Then I invited him to the platform, with both the Dingley bill and the Wilson bill lying there, and I promised him I would turn Republican if he would find any material difference in the iron and steel rates between the two bills, and he has not found them yet. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is about the condition of you calamity howlers. Because Mr. Wilson's bill happened to run into a Republican panic, a panic that was brewing before the bill was ever enacted, you are ready at all times and on all occasions, whether there is a change in the rate or not, to attribute those conditions to the enactment of a law that had nothing to do with it. [Applause.]

Now, so far as this particular schedule is concerned, everybody knows that this class of lace curtains are made almost entirely by machinery. They are machine-made goods. They are taking possession of the American market, as far as the American market can absorb the goods.

There may be a part of the industry that does not employ the full number, so far as the capacity of the machines are concerned, but that is due to the fact that the enormous profit these men have made in the past year has invited capital into making Nottingham lace curtains until they have increased the production beyond the capacity of the American market to absorb it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] was to be recognized to offer an amendment to paragraphs 264 and 265 without debate.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: I move to strike out, in line 18, page 67, the figures "20" and insert the figures "30."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 18, page 67, by striking out "20" and inserting "30."

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the further amendment, on page 68, on line 1, strike out the figures "40" and insert "70," and, in line 2, strike out "50" and insert "71."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 68, line 1, strike out "40" and insert "70"; in line 2, strike out "50" and insert "71."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

273. Flax, hackled, known as "dressed line," 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 70, line 6, after the word "line," strike out "1½" and insert "2½."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the old rates, as I recall them, of the paragraphs corresponding to paragraphs 272 and 273 were, respectively, 1 cent per pound in the former paragraph and 3 cents per pound in the latter. The rate in paragraph 272 has been reduced to one-half of 1 cent. There seems no good reason, then, for not assenting to a similar reduction of one-half of 1 cent on the present dressed-flax rate to 2½ cents. The product referred to in paragraph 272 is the raw material for the commodity in paragraph 273.

There is in my district, in the town of Andover, one of the few hackling-flax plants in the United States—one of the half a dozen, I am told. About two months ago the operatives of that plant sent me a petition, asking me to come over from Lowell to Andover and listen to their story in connection with these two paragraphs of the tariff.

I went there, and in an upper room in one of their mill buildings during the noon hour, the men having hurried back from dinner in order to be present, they explained their grievance. They told me, with every apparent sincerity, that if these compensatory duties between undressed flax on the one hand and the dressed flax on the other were not retained this branch of their activity, employing 100 men more or less in this mill alone, would be driven out of business, because the men in this country who make use of the flax would in that event have the hackling done on the other side, where they could have it done more cheaply than they could here. They pleaded with me, and I plead with you now, to retain this compensatory duty undiminished, so that this industry, one of only a half a dozen in this country, and one which in no wise keeps up the price of the product or interferes with any other manufacture, may not be legislated out of existence.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the copious interchange of unfavorable opinion on this floor in the last few days I deem it a bad time to tinker with the hemp market, as proposed in the amendment just offered. I would not, however, be impolite enough to remind the gentleman of the old adage: "No thief e'er felt the halter draw, with good opinion of the law." Gentlemen here are not culprits, nor fit subjects for a halter. They are merely the apologists for the real thieves—the beneficiaries of the robber protective tariff. I am constrained, however, by these complimentary remarks to lament the decadence of honesty in this country. A wicked and degenerate world makes the doubled-barreled minority miserable.

There are no honest men among the Democrats, it seems. The very mildest characterization made of their duplicity and meanness is by that meek and elegant gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who says we are not frank, and sometimes not decent.

Honesty is confined to the scattered, disjointed, dismantled, discordant fragments of the stand-pat Republicans and the new-fledged Bull Moose Party, which, like the wasp, is bigger at its birth than it ever becomes in after life. [Laughter.] Great God! Is that all the chance there is for honesty in this world? Both of these other bodies have admitted that they are honest; that is, each admits it for itself but denies it to the other fragment. The Democrats, however, have the excuse for their meanness that they are ignorant, because both the other bunches have also called them ignorant. Our critics will find that the Democrats understand this bill. A waiting country and a suffering people, for 50 years wandering in the wilderness, being robbed of their earnings, hope for it soon to become a law and that it may long bless the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But if honesty is confined to the stand-patters and Bull Moose adventurers described, I say, Come on, fire and brimstone—there will be no Lot found exempt from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. [Laughter and applause.] If there were anybody escaping and looking back, to be transmuted into pillars of salt, there would not be enough to save the old fragmentary stand-pat party nor the Bull Moose claimants to a monopoly of holiness.

Mr. Chairman, there are several wonderful things under the sun that have been developed by this debate. My extremely witty friend from Philadelphia [Mr. MOORE], who makes a joke out of the most serious and sacred things, excuses robber protection in this country by showing how little was collected at the ports and how little was the per capita share of each citizen. Great heavens, that is the very objection we have to it—that it is an infernal, infamous system that collects one-eighth of the tax for the Government, which any honest man would be willing to pay for the support of his Government, but licenses the robbers to take the other seven-eighths of the tax and put it in their own pockets. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He did not figure out that view of it.

Another proof of their great honesty is that all they attempt here is the plea of the criminal asking for a continuance of the case in the form of a tariff board. Whoever heard of a Republican during 50 years of misrule and misuse of power insisting on surrendering their power over the tariff to a tariff board until the election in 1910 turned them out of power in this House? Then they began to clamor for a tariff board to prevent a triumphant Democracy from revising the tariff downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They also talk about open caucuses; and their younger brother, the slab-off, the offshoot, the Bull Moose Party, also takes up the cry, and they say that they, too, must have open caucuses. Did you ever hear of Republicans while in power and capable of doing any devilment wanting open caucuses? [Laughter.] When they are reduced by an outraged people to an insignificant minority, then they begin to talk about coming out in the open, for they can not do further harm. [Laughter and applause.]

What is there now in either of these caucuses that anybody cares anything about? What would the play of Hamlet be with Hamlet eliminated? Of course, the bosses fixed everything for the Republicans while they were in the majority, whether they had a caucus to ratify it or not. The combination of that party, with all the special interests working automatically and passing the word down the line, was all that was necessary with or without a caucus, but now when there is no devilment they can do, no further inequalities to create and maintain, no further power to rob the people to enrich their favorites and pile up campaign funds for future emergencies; when their councils are vapid, meaningless, powerless, not even noticed by the newspapers, they can do nothing but talk, talk, talk, and, of course, an open caucus affords them a few more auditors and can not decrease effectiveness which does not exist. There is one remarkable thing about the Bull Moose experiment in the fortunes of political warfare, which is sufficient unerringly to indicate its paternity even if we had no other knowledge of that subject. Their much vaunted open caucus is always widely heralded and the result fully announced in advance, thereby suggesting the inheritance from its parent party of corruption and disaster of that traditional practice of having everything arranged—cut and dried—ready, so that the open caucus will have no difficulty in working smoothly and automatically, but the result is always just as predestined by some master mind who has laid the plans and prepared the way.

It would be impolite to use the word "boss" in connection with the statecraft of such great and eminent reformers.

There is another matter of wonder forced on my mind by the repeated suggestions that workmen intelligent enough to turn out the most finished articles, work which in this country commands as much as \$2.40 per day, done by the same character of workmen, are nevertheless content and happy and glad to remain in Europe and produce the same character of work at 80 cents per day. What there is in Europe to charm their senses, fill their pockets, save their money, make them fat and happy at one-third the rewards afforded in this country, my reading of history, geography, and ethnology fails to disclose. Everybody but protectionists knows that for 2,000 years most of the countries in Europe have been supposed to possess considerable general information and some special knowledge on particular subjects. The truth or fallacy of such statements must depend either on the ignorance of Europe or the poetic license of gentlemen who make inaccurate statements on the subject. Far be it from me to ascribe either ignorance or incorrect statements to distinguished gentlemen on this floor whom we have so often heard admit both their honesty and their wisdom. The only alternative is the conclusion that Europe is densely ignorant and that all our helpless pampered protected industries have to be hothoused to enable them to extort from their fellow citizens high prices for their goods made in competition with ignorant pauper laborers of Europe, who are smart enough to compete with our best workmen in the production of the finest articles for one-third the wages, but are yet too ignorant to know that they could do better in this country or that they could be happier than they are.

Now, such logical statements as that do not surprise me. I am somewhat accustomed to liberal statements in debate here, not to say fantastical nor extravagant latitude. The only thing that surprises me is that some of our enterprising brethren, who can work cheaper abroad than at home and sell all their goods cheaper abroad than they do at home do not start a newspaper over in Europe. The work over there is so cheap it would not cost much to run the paper. Those workmen are so prosperous and well satisfied they would certainly be able to take the paper, and, as they began to realize their ignorance, they would certainly appreciate the paper. By that means they might learn of this goodly land which for a small sum in a few days they could reach in safety and treble their earnings by the same work. I have no doubt some of them would move over if they were duly advised on the subject. I do not want any of them myself unless they are healthy, honest, intelligent, and wealthy, but I understand some of my protection friends are not as hard to please on the subject as I am; they actually find means to slip the information to some of those benighted people and inveigle them over here by the thousand and work them at the same old prices, still charging their customers the same old high prices for the products. The most remarkable thing, however, of this remarkable debate is the persistent calamity howl of the bifurcated minority. They have done their best to talk up a panic before it comes. Instead of infecting my part of the country with their dishonest politics they have aroused a protest from our manufacturers, who write me "for God's sake hurry through the passage of this bill; that if any harm is done to business it will not be the result of the bill, but the result of the calamity talk, the direful forebodings of disaster which the protected interests, dying hard, holding with a death grip to the instruments of their ill-gotten gain, are indulging so lustily either to postpone or defeat this bill." Of course, such continual talk can scare the timid, and money is always timid. In fact, it is afraid of anything but a Government bond, and charges for the use of itself in proportion to its fears when investing in anything but Government bonds.

You have all heard of the man who in the perfect bloom of health was nevertheless sensitive and credulous. Some of his associates planning a practical joke expressed concern about his health, and one at a time in succession met him and told him how bad he looked, asked him how long he had been sick; another one had heard of the bad reports of his dangerous malady; another one apprehended his death soon, he looked so bad. The poor loon, frightened to death, died before night. This kind of talk, however, can not kill the patient in this instance, because they have talked so long and so falsely that the American people know them, and their prophecies are no longer heeded. Bill Arp wrote about a man who hated another so bad that the unfortunate victim went to the bad, all of his hair came out, and he drowned himself in a mudhole that night. If maledictions meant hatred, the fierce denunciations of the dual and clamorous minority in this House would destroy every patriot here and permit the return to power of that horde which has held high carnival of misrule discrimination and robbery with short intermissions and slight hindrance for 50 years. That gallant old king, warrior, priest, and poet, the Psalmist

David, said in his wrath, "All men are liars." As it was easy for him to get forgiveness, I have no doubt he was forgiven for that unkind remark, but if he had lived in this day and familiarized himself with the jargon of protection apologists he would have been able to conclude in his sober judgment that some men in high places are careless about their information and reckless about their statements. He might have been tempted to sing in the sweetest strains of sacred verse his religious opinions about the heterophemy of discredited politicians, the dissensions of divided political camps quarreling over the method of their destruction while rallying at the victors and indulging in the wildest flights of hyperbolic language. Selah. [Loud applause.]

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I admire the sympathy of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] for the employees affected by paragraphs 272 and 273, but I can not admire his accuracy. He complains that in changing the rates we have made rates which now place the men engaged in hackling flax at a disadvantage. I will inform him that we have cut much of the rates in half, using exactly the same language. At present paragraph 334 of the Payne Act fixes 1 cent per pound. We have made it one-half of 1 cent per pound. Section 273 of the present bill takes the place of section 335 of the present law and reduces the rate from 3 cents to 1½ cents per pound. I think my arithmetic is accurate on this; and if not, I hope I will be corrected.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Is not it a question as to the protection afforded to the workman what the difference is between the two items and not what particular divisor you use in connection with each item?

Mr. PETERS. If we divide you receive the same ad valorem rate which you have at present.

Mr. ROGERS. You have 1 cent between the two rates in this Underwood bill. You had 2 cents between the two rates as compensatory duty in the old bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the question of organized labor has been brought up here this evening by a gentleman for whom I have great regard, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR], who I believe is sincere in what he advocates, but who has been deluded by the party and the people with whom he has been associated. I stated the other day that organized labor, in the main, was not in favor of a protective tariff; that they were aware of the fact that a protective tariff did not protect labor but protected the big business interests of the country, the manufacturers who were bringing in foreigners here by the shipload for the purpose of keeping down their wages; and I want to quote again from the Secretary of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Morrison, who is a man for whom all who know him have great respect for his integrity, honesty, and loyalty to a principle, and I believe at this time he ought to be in closer touch with the organized labor movement, even labor as a whole, than most any other man, because his position requires him to keep posted in regard to those things, as the organizers report to him from different parts of the country. So he ought to be in a position to know whereof he speaks, and this is what the Secretary of the American Federation of Labor states:

THREAT TO SHIFT TARIFF BURDEN TO LABOR RESENTED—SPEAKER FOR 2,000,000 WORKERS CALLS CRY OF PROTECTED INTERESTS A SHAM—WAGES WON'T BE CUT—"PROTECTED INDUSTRIES NOTORIOUS FOR LOW PAY OF EMPLOYEES," SAYS MORRISON.

[By Samuel M. Williams, staff correspondent of The Evening World.]
WASHINGTON, April 29.

The American Federation of Labor has 2,000,000 enrolled and organized members. Employers of a number of these members are saying that reduction of the tariff duties, foreign competition, and lower prices for commodities will bring also a reduction of workingmen's wages.

At the headquarters in Washington of this greatest of labor unions Frank Morrison, general secretary, the man in closest touch with its activities and sentiment, was asked what would be the result if tariff reductions brought wage reductions. This was his answer:

"Labor's wages will not be cut. Labor's wages can not be cut because, in many industries, they are already at the lowest living point. If attempt is made there will be strikes all along the line. It will be fought to the finish. We are in the midst of a tremendous campaign of organization to strengthen the position of labor against further exploitation for the benefit of capital.

"It is notorious that, as a rule, the higher the tariff protection an industry has enjoyed, the lower the wages paid to its employees. Some of the most favored of protected trusts, like steel, sugar, wool, cotton, beef, have paid the worst starvation wages. Simply because capital is liable to lose some of its protection profits the burden can not be shifted to labor and the worker made to contribute the loss out of his own pocket.

PROTECTED INTERESTS HAVE EXPLOITED LABOR.

"Capital has had protection, but labor has had to face unrestricted competition. Importations of goods are taxed, but immigration is free.

Employers have taken advantage of this fact and exploited labor to the very limit, until now the exploited victims are revolting.

"The cotton manufacturer, the silk manufacturer, the steel manufacturer have had the advantage of a protected market for their products. But when labor sought its share of the rewards there was no law to prevent the coming in of foreign labor to beat down wages. The price of manufactured products could be raised to the limit of production, but the price of the labor could be kept down to the minimum by untaxed drafts on Europe. There was merely the price of transportation to be reckoned.

"Now, let us see what is happening. The swarms of unskilled foreign labor, brought in originally to combat American labor, are turning on their employers. The demonstrations of the Industrial Workers of the World are the logical result of this exploitation of humanity. They were unorganized. They were, in many cases, ignorant and unable to speak the language of the country. The employer took advantage of their helplessness and screwed down wages until the men and women simply could not stand it any longer.

PROTECTION FOR LABOR, NOT PRODUCTS ONLY.

"They broke out in revolt in Lawrence, and now in Paterson. We of the American Federation of Labor are not responsible for these conditions. Capital has brought them on itself, because it sought to combat and defeat organized labor with unorganized labor. And you see the results.

"We believe in protection for American labor, not protection alone for American products. While a literacy test may not be the best qualification for admission to this country, yet I favored the immigration bill along that line which President Taft vetoed last year.

"Since the law to-day gives practically free admission to foreign labor the American Federation has undertaken on its own account a propaganda to restrict immigration. We are sending everywhere throughout Europe notices to check the incoming tide at its source. We are urging that any proposed removal be deferred for two or three years until economic conditions in this country have opportunity to adjust themselves to a better basis. Otherwise we shall have a great mass of unskilled, unorganized labor dumped in upon the market, resulting in decreases in wages, increases in strife, and widespread suffering.

"Our reports from the country at large indicate that to-day there is about an even demand for labor. There is no appreciable slackening in industry, but there is a clearly defined tendency toward shading off the rewards of labor. It is not at present so much in the form of actual cut in wages as it is in the demands for increased output, which is equivalent to lower wages. Take the case of certain iron and steel mills around Pittsburgh. Every new manager coming into power has fresh schemes for more economical production that result in less net return to the laborer.

ONLY CHANCE OF LABOR IS IN ORGANIZATION.

"We are entering an era of vital interest to all classes of wage earners, because of changing economic conditions. We believe that the only way to protect the laborer is by organization, and the American Federation of Labor is concentrating its efforts along that line.

"We are having rapid growth in numbers. The two million mark has been passed for the first time. We are endeavoring to bring the unorganized in, to make them strong where they were weak. We are printing a newspaper in 18 languages to circulate among this great mass of foreign workingmen who have been so horribly exploited, not only to their own suffering, but to the injury of their fellow workers of America.

"No; there can be no reduction in wages, because some of the tariff-protected trusts are in danger of losing their protection. The workingmen of America realize too clearly the state of affairs to permit that. I do not know just what will happen, but labor is determined to fight any proposition to reduce its rewards."

Now, it may be said by gentlemen on that side of the House, as was said by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER] the other day, that the labor man who makes statements of that sort has not got any brains in his cranium, but I want to say, if the gentleman is here, and if not I am sorry he is not here, that men in that position do not get their convictions from the same source that the gentleman from Washington does. He, no doubt, gets his convictions from where he has his profits, in a shingle industry and the timberland business in the Northwest—and it might be of interest to those who are here to know that there has been a recent strike in the shingle industry in that locality due to the fact that they were not paying wages so that they could live up to the standard that American workmen should live. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Those things might be of interest to the gentleman, if he were here. It may also be of interest for you to know that men who do not know the needs of the laboring people of this country and know how they have suffered due to the combined forces of the great combined manufacturing interests of this country beating down the price of labor—big business—come to this Congress asking for protection under the name of labor, and when they get their protective tariff exercise their influence everywhere and all the time to crush labor down, as the great Steel Trust in recent years has done, and used their influence to encourage the importation of large numbers of foreigners; and in advertising for labor in that locality they express their preference for the foreigner while the American workman is walking the high-ways looking for work. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

273. Flax, hackled, known as "dressed line," 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not rise for the purpose of discussing this paragraph except incidentally. My real purpose is to preach a funeral sermon over the remains of an infant industry, an industry that had promise of future development equal to that almost of the cotton industry. I wish to point a moral from its untimely demise.

Mr. Chairman, if you were to ask the first man you met on the street whether it were possible to raise flax in this country suitable for the making of good linen cloth, he doubtless would tell you no. And I have no doubt that any majority member of the Ways and Means Committee would make the same statement from the fund of misinformation that has written this bill. The statement never has been and is not now true. It has always been possible to raise flax in this country suitable for making linen cloth. The difficulty has not been there, but in the fact that the process by which flax straw was made into flax fiber, suitable for spinning, was so disgusting in its nature that American workmen would not engage in it. It was the custom to rot the flax in a river or a small stream to separate the fiber from the chive or gum of the straw.

The result was a condition so disgusting, as I say, that American workmen would not work in it. But in the last four years a chemical process has been discovered by which the former one can be eliminated, and which is performed under conditions suitable to the American workmen. A syndicate of eight gentlemen was formed in Chicago for the purpose of experimentally developing the industry. Out of the fertile acres of the district which I have the honor to represent they chose some hundreds of acres upon which to try the experiment of raising flax for linen cloth. It is only necessary to say here that that experiment proved an unqualified success. The farmers received on the average of \$2.95 per acre for the sale of the flax straw in addition to the seed that came from it. Process by process and stage by stage these patriotic men developed the industry until they succeeded in securing a fiber that would produce a linen yarn as fine as 60 lea, a quality very nearly as good as that which is raised in Ireland, Scotland, or France, at a price slightly but not very much higher than the cost of production in those countries. They wished to make this industry distinctly American, from growing the flax to weaving the cloth. These men came to Washington with a view of retaining a duty upon the flax and linen cloth sufficient to permit the industry to live. The hearings are full of the promise of that industry. Yet they were refused the necessary protection, and within the last 10 days they have notified their manager in my district to shut down their mill and cancel the contracts with the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, this industry does not die a natural death. It is murdered at the hands of a ruthless majority, destroyed before its sun had fairly risen in the very morning of its usefulness. The beautiful blue of the flax blossom will no longer adorn the fields, but in its place we shall have the sear and unromantic yellow brown of the oats and the wheat. The music of the mill and the factory turning the flax straw into fiber will be stilled, and in the place of the song of the toiler we shall listen to the plaintive wail of the idler, the tramp, and the beggar. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANTRILL and Mr. CAMPBELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL] is recognized.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to take a position to-night in striking contrast to the position taken by the gentleman on the other side who has just taken his seat in discussing this schedule of flax and hemp. The district which I represent and the district which is represented by my colleague, Mr. HELM, on the floor of this House produce practically all of the hemp that is grown in the United States. This bill has cut the rate one half. Back in the old days, if I am correctly informed, the tariff on hemp was as high as \$60 a ton, and it is now cut under this bill to \$10 a ton.

But I want to say to this committee, holding up the farmers of central Kentucky as the true exponents of Democracy, that since this bill was reported I have not had a single letter from a farmer in my district protesting against the action of this committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The farmers in my country realize that to impose a duty of high protection upon jute and manila and other fibers that come

in competition with hemp would be to lay a tax upon every grain grower in the country for his binding twine and his sacks, and upon the cotton growers of the South for their burlaps; and the farmers of central Kentucky, the truest Democrats in the country, are not making a single protest, because they are willing to surrender their own particular interests if it is for the common weal and welfare. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Fellow Representatives, I do not to-night make a request that the grain growers of the West or the cotton growers of the South shall be taxed in order that the hemp growers of Kentucky may grow rich at their expense. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If we are to be sacrificed on the altar for the common good and for the benefit of democracy, well and good. We do not ask that the rest of the country be taxed for our benefit. I commend the example of the farmers of central Kentucky to gentlemen on that side of the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

275. Hemp, and tow of hemp, one-half cent per pound; hemp, hackled, known as "line of hemp," 1 cent per pound.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit surprised at the extremities to which my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the chairman of the committee, is driven in his attempts to defend this "indefensible" bill that is now before the House. [Laughter on the Republican side.] It was well illustrated by the speech that he made, closing the debate on the cotton schedule. And, by the way, he said he had been in the party of critics for the Lord knows how long—15 or 20 years—and that we are the critics now, and then he turned around and began to criticize our people. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

He says that the gentleman from Pennsylvania criticizes this bill because the rates of duty in the cotton schedule are not high enough. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] was talking about high-priced goods when he said the duties were not high enough, and he was seeking to raise those. Then the gentleman from Alabama said the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO] criticized the schedule because the rates were too high. Yet I understood that the gentleman from Wisconsin, or at least the House did, even if the gentleman from Alabama did not, was criticizing the rates on the low-priced goods, the coarse goods, and said they were too high, and also said that the rates on the high-priced goods were not high enough.

Then the gentleman from Alabama gave an account of how he slew some unsuspecting Republican—I think it was in Connecticut—in the campaign last fall. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The Republican was complaining that in 1894 the industries in his community were suspended and the people did not get work. Of course that man was testifying from the facts that he knew and from conditions that he had seen right there in Connecticut when the metal industry was suspended, when he said the shops were idle and the people were not able to find employment. Those were the facts. Then the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means says he stated to that Republican that the rates in the Wilson bill were as high as the rates in the Dingley bill on the metal schedule, and says that he offered that unsuspecting Republican in Connecticut some book, perhaps of comparison, showing the rates of the two bills, and promised him that if he would find a single rate in that schedule—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I said there were several rates that were different. Stick to it.

Mr. PAYNE. That is the way I understand the gentleman. But I do not care whether it was several rates or a dozen. The gentleman from Alabama promised that if not more than a dozen or so of the rates were not found to be as high in the Wilson bill as in the Dingley bill, he would turn Republican; and he said he has not heard from that man since. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Why, the man after hearing that speech probably did not desire to have him become a Republican. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

Why, if you would examine that schedule you would find 50 rates that were higher in the Dingley bill than in the Wilson bill, and if the committee had put all the rates in the Wilson bill in a column side by side with the rates of the Dingley bill they would find a good many more differences, because there were so many blanks in the Wilson bill. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Oh, the differences in rates occur along on every page or so. Take it on page 131, lead in sheets: Wilson bill, 32.34 per cent; Dingley bill, 58.89 per cent. In the next paragraph, 54.50 per cent in the Wilson bill, as against 58.71 per cent in the Dingley

bill. Go on a little further, and on paragraph 158 you will find 31.77 per cent in the Wilson bill, as against 49.50 per cent in the Dingley bill. Type metal, 31.15 under the Wilson bill and 42.90 under the Dingley bill. And so we go on down the line. We get to some more interesting articles that are made down there in Connecticut; small hand goods. There are lots of them.

Mr. MOORE. I want to call the attention of the gentleman—

Mr. PAYNE. Do not interrupt me. I can point out any number of them. Articles not specially provided for, 35 per cent under the Wilson bill and 45 per cent under the Dingley bill. Lead articles, 35 per cent under the Wilson bill and 45 per cent under the Dingley bill; metal and metal compositions, 35 per cent under the Wilson bill and 45 per cent under the Dingley bill; nickel wares, 35 per cent and 45 per cent; pewter wares, 35 per cent and 45 per cent; platinum wares, tinfoil, zinc wares, 35 per cent and 45 per cent. We will go back further than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, let me read the metal schedule for the information of the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will give you the information right now.

Mr. PAYNE. Now the gentleman gets in to amend his speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I am going to amend the gentleman from New York—not my speech. I never did understand how the Republicans ran their heads on the rock, which they did four years ago, until to-night. Here is a distinguished gentleman, a gentleman of charming personality, and we could not understand how he made the mistake he did in writing the Payne bill until to-night. My distinguished friend from New York has served more years on the Ways and Means Committee than any other man that has ever served on it as chairman, and yet he gets up here and tries to contradict my statement by reading to you the ad valorem equivalent. Now, I will ask my friend, Was not the tax on pig iron under the Wilson bill \$4 a ton, and was it not \$4 a ton under the Dingley bill?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I can not repeat from memory the schedules of the Wilson bill that I have not read now in these 20 years.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My friend knows it was; but he reads you the ad valorem equivalent, as if the price of pig iron never changed. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Because the specific rate, when worked into the price of the ad valorem equivalent, very clearly makes a change. And the distinguished new member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, was rampant to join his colleague from New York and point out the difference in the ad valorem equivalent of specific rates in different years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, of course, my friend knows that the rate on pig iron was the same under the Wilson bill and the Dingley bill; yet I find the ad valorem equivalent in 1896 under the Wilson bill was 22 per cent and a fraction, and under the Dingley bill it was 27 per cent. So you can go on through the schedules. You can take all of these rates, and you will find that—

Mr. PAYNE. Come down to paragraph 130.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There are one or two places—

Mr. PAYNE. You have only picked out one so far where the specific rate was the same.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will read you some more if you want to hear them.

Mr. MOORE. Take the upholstery schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You will find, if you go right through this schedule on these various rates, that the specific rates were the same in all except a few differences, and here is the book right in my hand; but when you come to the ad valorem equivalent, of course you find the difference, because the ad valorem equivalent of the various iron and steel articles changes with the change in price, which change in price produces a different ad valorem equivalent, which the gentleman from New York, when he is reminded of the fact, knows just as well as I do.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; and you know that the rates were different just as well as I do. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] seem to have some difference of opinion with regard to the relative rates of the Dingley bill and the Wilson bill. In a way both of the gentlemen are no doubt in some degree correct; but as a matter of fact the controversy between them is, in my opinion, relatively unimportant. The real question, the one that interested the American people most tremendously, was what happened under the Wilson bill and what

occurred under the Dingley bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] My dear friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] may have proved to his satisfaction, may have drawn the wool over the eyes of the gentleman in Connecticut without intending to do it, with regard to the rates, but he did not attempt to disprove the only really important fact in the equation presented by the Connecticut ironmaster.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That a Republican panic was on.

Mr. MONDELL. And that was that the gentleman's industry was paralyzed under the Wilson bill and it was not to him material whether the rate was high or low.

My recollection is—and if I am not correct I hope some of these tariff sharps will correct me—that the average ad valorem under the present Payne law is lower than the average ad valorem under the Wilson bill of infamous memory. Under the one, depression, idle mills, 4,000,000 men out of employment, Coxey's army, soup houses, sheriff's sales, and a depleted and nearly bankrupt Treasury. Under the other, abundant revenue, prosperity, overflowing and spreading to every corner of the land, the people generally prosperous and contented. And yet the rates in the one that brought prosperity on the average lower than in the one that brought disaster. Why? Because one was drawn and framed in accordance with a logical, well understood, and clearly defined principle of protection and the other an attempt to fulfill impossible promises, a sectional makeshift, lame, halting, high here, low there, misfit, no matter what the rates were they disarranged the industries of a mighty Nation, and started its people on the road to the poorhouse. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not want to take up the time of the House in debating an ancient proposition, but I do not think we are justified in letting the few remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Wyoming go unnoticed. It is difficult to drive into the head of any Republican that the Wilson bill did not go on the statute books until August, 1894. Everybody knows, and it has been told to the gentleman so often that his memory has failed him again, that when President Harrison went out of the White House the bonds were printed and waiting for signature to take care of the deficit left by the Republican administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Everybody but the gentleman from Wyoming knows that a Republican panic was in full blast, banks failing from one end of this country to the other, in June and July of 1893, more than a year before this Wilson bill went on the statute books, and before the Democratic Congress was called in session for any purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. In anticipation of it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I knew my friend from Wyoming would say that, because we have served here together for two decades and this is not the first time he has made this speech; it is an annual production. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] And after his attention is called to the fact that the panic occurred a year before he locates his soup houses and before the Wilson bill went upon the statute books, he always throws up his hands and comes back with the same reply and says it was in anticipation of Democratic action. [Laughter.] But I want to say to my friend if that was all there was in it the country has had more than six months to anticipate the continuation in power of the Democratic Party for the next half century [applause on the Democratic side] and the soup houses have not opened up yet. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not understand it; the people think it will last but two years, and they are keeping up their courage. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are looking down on this House, and they know that the aggregation on the Republican side will never get together in two years. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

276. Single yarns made of jute, not finer than five lea or number, 15 per cent ad valorem; if finer than five lea or number and yarns made of jute not otherwise specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL] says that the farmers of that State are willing and ready, if need be, to be sacrificed upon the altar of Democratic Party expediency. Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party does not expect the farmer to permit himself to be manacled and led to slaughter on the altar of the expediency of the Republican Party; it does not believe in destroying industry. But, Mr. Chairman, I did not have an opportunity when I was on my feet before to point the moral which would naturally follow as a conclusion of the

little story I tried to relate. If the Republican Party were in power it would have prospered and encouraged this little industry in my district until we would have a flax mill in every hamlet, a linen mill in every village. The Democratic Party has destroyed it in its youth and vigor; nothing could more eloquently point out the difference in policy. The Republican Party believes in life, development, and progress. The Democratic policy leads to death, destruction, and decay. Yes; the farmers of Minnesota will still till their fields and tend their flocks and herds, but if, where peace, plenty, and prosperity now reign supreme, want, worry, and weariness shall raise their ghoulish heads, the farmers of Minnesota will know where to place the responsibility and will exact the full penalty from those who are responsible.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, for a week or two I have observed with a good deal of interest the inundation of high-tariff crocodile tears on that side of the House, and when I think of all that have been shed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and the others, not including the old high-protection war horses down on the front seat there, it seems to me there has been enough of that sort of copiousness to float all of the battleships that Capt. HOBSON would build, if he could, in the next quarter of a century. I very well recall, as a newspaper man, the scarecrow efforts of the Republican leaders and the Republican press in 1893-94, at the time of the panic, and I want to call special attention to the difference in the patriotism as displayed by the Republican leaders and press at that time and that displayed by the Democratic leaders and Democratic press during the panic of 1907-8. In 1893-94 every Republican orator and every Republican newspaper wailed calamity, calamity, calamity, in ghoulish glee, without regard to results.

In 1907-8 when the Republican panic came upon us, when the business of the country was utterly paralyzed, the Democrats everywhere, Democratic press and Democratic patriots, begged of their constituents to stand back of the banks, to be manly, to be patriotic, and to save the country from the national peril which engulfed it. The result was that we finally wiggled through by Democrats helping to hold up where Republicans would have torn down.

These Republican calamity promoters, as you might call them, have been talking all sorts of scare stuff. Why, these old Republican leaders down here, these biased men, have been talking high tariff from a holier than thou attitude all these years.

The other day I heard the statement of an earnest high tariffite, who said he had a camp in Mexico during the summer months, and that while there he bought half a carcass of beef twice a week, for which he paid 4½ cents a pound. He said the other half of that carcass was taken just across the line into the United States and sold for 35 cents a pound, and you high tariffites applauded.

The tariff on that beef, according to the statement of the chairman, was about 6 cents a pound ad valorem, but according to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] it was 1½ cents a pound specific. The cost of the carcass being 4½ cents a pound, if you estimate the tariff at the maximum of 6 cents a pound, that would make the beef cost 10½ cents plus freight within the United States line, where it was sold for 35 cents, leaving a profit of twenty-odd cents a pound for shipping that meat across the line from Mexico into the United States. It seems to me that if such conditions prevail—and I am not disputing anybody's word, for I have no reason to do so—a man could go there and make more profit than any moneybag in Wall Street. And many other high-tariff arguments made here figure out the same seemingly way.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. No; I can not yield, because I have not taken any time, while the gentleman from Wyoming has taken nearly all the time. To the gentlemen from Wyoming and Iowa and Pennsylvania and Washington, especially, who have been juggling facts and screaming calamity in this debate, and who pretend to have fear in their hearts of direful calamities to come, I wish to recite a little verse that my old friend Gen. SHERWOOD gave me the other day, and which illustrates their pretended peril:

There was a man named Joseph Cable,
Who bought a goat, just for his stable;
One day the goat, too prone to dine,
Ate a red shirt, right off the line.
Then Cable to the goat did say,
"Your time has come; you'll die this day."
And took him to the railroad track,
And there he bound him on his back.
The train then came, and the whistle blew;
And the goat well knew his time was due,
But with a mighty shriek of pain,
Coughed up the shirt and flagged the train.

Gentlemen, you are not half as bad off as you think you are, or as you pretend to be, for you may yet cough it up. [Prolonged laughter and applause.]

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. A little while ago I had the pleasure of listening, as you did, to that splendid specimen of Georgia stateship, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. ADAMSON], whose oratory is sui generis, and who has a style like unto which there is none other in this House. He denounced the Republicans for standing up for their industries and gave us a homily upon the honesty and integrity of the Democratic Party upon the tariff question. And now comes the goat story of my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART]. I anticipated that story and find it most appropriate to illustrate the Democratic position, in Texas at least, by an effusion which is the result of the day's deliberations. I would match the Sherwood poem recited by the gentleman from Indiana with—

GARNER'S GOAT OF TEXAS:

Of all the creatures in the land,
Of pedigrees supremely grand,
There's none that do respect command
Like Garner's goat of Texas.

The modest sheep may browse around
From Maine way out to Puget Sound,
But they don't count a cent a pound
With Garner's goat of Texas.

The noble steer may be of use
If freed from tyrant trust abuse;
But even that would be the deuce
To Garner's goat of Texas.

If you want wool, the wool is fair;
If you want hair, the wool is hair;
If you want meat, the meat is there!
That's Garner's goat of Texas.

So, while you kick the wool of sheep,
And beef and mutton make so cheap,
Protective tariff now will keep
The Garner goat of Texas.

Oh, wondrous breed of Lone Star State,
Premier of wool and hair, thy rate
Of 10 per cent is truly great—
Thou Garner's goat of Texas!

[Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

280. Gill nettings, nets, webs, and seines made of flax, hemp, or ramie, or a mixture of any of them, or of which any of them is the component material of chief value, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. But I rose more particularly to refer to a few remarks made in one of the infrequent intervals in which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] has honored us with his presence. He has been abusing the Republican Party for so long and in such unmeasured terms that while he has not been here much during the debate he imagines that we must have been abusing the gentlemen on the other side as he habitually abuses us. For fear nothing of that kind had occurred in his absence he concluded his interesting remarks by referring to us as he ordinarily does, the mildest term used being, as I recall, something like robbers, looters, despoilers, partners of the wicked trusts, and agents of special interests.

Now, the fact is that during this discussion, so far as I have heard it, no one on this side has said anything that brought into question the motives of anyone on the other side. We are assuming that, misguided as you are, you are trying in your poor, misguided way to carry out some impossible promises you have made. But it is just barely possible that not here but elsewhere, after this bill passes and has been analyzed, some people will suggest this, that, while the bill may have been drawn in good faith, it was drawn with devilish ingenuity. Some may suggest that industries were sacrificed without benefit of clergy, certain regions left with all of their opportunities for development taken from them, and all so artfully as not to entirely wipe out a Democratic majority in the country.

The newspapers are blessed with free print paper, without regard to the effect on the American makers of paper, who, however, only occupy a few districts, which are probably Republican anyway. The woolgrower is not expected to affect many districts, and the sugar grower of Louisiana is a Democrat, anyway, whatever you do to him. As for the beet-sugar grower, it may be suggested by some one that he has not enough influence to greatly change congressional representation, and thus jeopardize your control.

And then there are the powerful automobile makers. Our tariff of 45 per cent on the machine and all its parts compelled their manufacture here. Your rate of 45 per cent on the complete machine gives the manufacturer control of the market. Your rates of 20 and 30 per cent on parts gives the manufacturer a chance to import an automobile complete, except tires and name plate, at an average rate of less than 25 per cent. The powerful and influential manufacturer has a high protection—the workman who makes the parts whistles for a job; but the workman has not much influence, some folks think, while the automobile manufacturer is most influential and the largest advertiser in newspapers and magazines in the country. Some folks may think this all looks very peculiar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, we have enjoyed ourselves with our political debates for two hours, and I would like to address myself to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] in order to see if we can not agree to swap tobacco between the lines, and do business for an hour, read the bill, and confine ourselves to the actual amendments.

Mr. MANN. I am quite willing to have the rule enforced, so far as I am concerned, for the balance of the evening session.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to read down to the wool schedule if I can.

Mr. MANN. I think that is desirable, too. There are some amendments that will be offered and discussed on this side.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not mean to cut out amendments, but if we can have an understanding for an hour we will—

Mr. MANN. I am quite willing that the gentleman shall confine himself to the rule for the next hour.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman does not intend to go into Schedule K to-night?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

281. Floor mattings, plain, fancy, or figured, including mats and rugs, manufactured from straw, round or split, or other vegetable substances, not otherwise provided for in this section, and having a warp of cotton, hemp, or other vegetable substances, including what are commonly known as China, Japan, and India straw matting, 2½ cents per square yard.

Mr. MOORE and Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 71, paragraph 281, lines 12 and 13, by striking out the words "including mats and rugs."

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the hilarity of the occasion has been dispensed with, so that we can now get some information concerning the amendments which I shall offer, since they concern some important business enterprises and a large number of good citizens in our section of the country and the good and cheap living of our citizens everywhere. There is possibly some inconsistency between the words which would be the subject of the amendment which I offer, "including mats and rugs manufactured from straw, round or split, or other vegetable substances not otherwise provided for in this section," and the paragraph below, which provides for mats and rugs made of flax, hemp, jute, and other vegetable fibers. Apparently the paragraphs seek to make a distinction between the products of vegetable substances, on the one hand, and vegetable fibers on the other. This difference may be sound and sensible to a botanist, but not to the average American business man when it imperils his industry.

This paragraph 281 changes existing law by including "mats and rugs" within its provision along with mattings of the same material, and differentiates them from the paragraph below, which includes the general subject of mats and rugs though of kindred materials and for exactly the same use. My amendment is designed to place the mats and rugs where naturally they would seem to belong, in the paragraph covering the general subject of mats and rugs. Whether this classification and grouping is sound and fair depends on the viewpoint. If the sole object is to bring into one class articles of the same material, irrespective of the business situation, use, and consequences, then, of course, we must submit. But if natural and necessary business conditions and uses and the proper revenue to be obtained and the proper values of the articles should be considered, then the committee is wrong and the items should be changed. The particular reason why this ought to be done is, briefly, this: The mats and rugs which would be covered by

the amendment which I have offered and the one which I will offer to the next paragraph come into competition with those made in this country, known as Crex or wire grass rugs, made in Minnesota and Wisconsin. The mats and rugs made in China, Japan, and India, covered by my amendment, are made by the cheapest sort of oriental labor and in surroundings often filthy and sometimes bearing disease.

The labor in the Orient receives a wage of from 17½ to 25 and 30 cents a day, while the rugs and mats with which they compete here in this country are made by a high class of white labor of our own people, paid from \$1.90 to \$3 and \$4 a day, and in new and most modern and sanitary factories and from the most cleanly and healthful materials.

Two of the large factories are in the district which I have the honor to represent, but of course there are others competing strongly for our domestic trade, which has developed within the last few years and really constitutes one of the industries which are of great benefit to our whole section of the country. It is not merely a local industry. I do not plead for that, but it is an industry which has aided in the development of some of our farming districts by utilizing wire grass, a waste product heretofore, and thus has increased fivefold the value of such lands and furnish remunerative and diversified employment to many hundred men in our rural districts. The factories in our cities employ a high and deserving class of our people and supply a cleanly and cheap and very artistic floor covering which our people did not get before and would not secure if you allow it to be supplanted by the cheaper, doubtful, and less durable and valuable competing product of the Orient.

Now, this paragraph reduces the rate from the existing law that would cover this sort of material from about 7½ cents to 10 cents a yard to 2½ cents a yard, or at least 66⅔ to 75 per cent. The committee must realize and their hearings clearly show that the present rate and conditions are highly competitive and absolutely necessary for the existence of this important industry. The existing tariff on a standard 12-yard rug is about \$1.09, while the difference of labor cost alone is more than \$1.22. So the rate in this paragraph is utterly inadequate and will be ruinous, and for that reason it is difficult to conceive why this particular class of grass mats and rugs are singled out from all of the other classes, from other fibers, and included in this paragraph, where naturally they would not belong. So for that reason, for the reason of giving an industry that is struggling for existence a fair chance, preventing misapprehension, and preventing difficulty and litigation in the future and making a logical arrangement of these two paragraphs, I have ventured to suggest this amendment, and trust that the committee will consider it. Now, these mats and rugs are in the basket clause and have a tariff rate of about 20 per cent. There is no complaint about that rate. But you reduce this rate to 2½ cents per yard, which would be from 5 to 10 per cent, and this you realize would be practically nothing, and be ruinous to this new and struggling industry. The sole reason of more convenient classification by the customs officials on account of the material of which it is composed should not be a sufficient reason for the committee to consign a very deserving and struggling industry to the cemetery. Rather should your committee indicate its purpose to place all materials and articles together which properly can be, and articles of kindred materials and for the same use together, as my amendment seeks to do.

I realize that the committee have already considered this subject. I have read the hearings. But at the same time it should be understood that the people in several States are vitally interested in successfully carrying on the industry which has been started so auspiciously, and we earnestly urge the very best consideration for the amendments I have offered. I only seek to continue the policy laid down by the distinguished chairman of the committee—that of a fair, competitive tariff. We do not ask more. You have given us far less now as well as an inconvenient and illogical arrangement. But by classing all rugs and mattings together, striking them out of paragraph 281 and including all of them in paragraph 282, you thus place together all articles for the same use of kindred materials and which compete with each other. My amendments striking out the words "including mats and rugs" from paragraph 281 and including "grass and its substitutes," after "flax," in paragraph 282, accomplishing all of these very desirable purposes, and I very much hope they will be acceptable to the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that this amendment was placed here intentionally. Heretofore, under the Payne bill, these manufactures of mats and rugs fell under paragraph 463, in the sundry schedule, and we had that same paragraph in this bill on sundries, where, if the gentleman's motion should prevail and they were stricken out of this para-

graph they would fall at 25 per cent under the sundry schedule, and the rate now is higher than that.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Would they not fall under paragraph 282? The next paragraph is "Mats and rugs made of flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber except cotton."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I have the book here. They fell in paragraph 463, and that was put in intentionally. If the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] prevailed, they would now fall in paragraph 379 and be taxed at 25 per cent. As a matter of fact, they have a better rate where they are. But the purpose of putting them in here and putting a specific rate on this particular paragraph was to prevent the undervaluation of these mats and rugs that have been complained of, mostly coming from Japan; and the gentleman's motion, if it prevailed, would have the effect of reducing the rate under which they are taxed in this bill.

Mr. MANN. Of course, if the gentleman's motion should prevail, a further motion could be offered. Does the gentleman from Alabama happen to be familiar with the grass-mat industry that has grown up in the Northwest?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I have no detailed knowledge about it; but the matter came up in the hearings in our committee and was discussed, and the expert of the Treasury Department, Mr. Nevius, prepared this provision and it was intended to bring the basket and mat provision from the sundry schedule and place it here.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Would not this cover the subject that the gentleman has in mind? In the next paragraph, after the word "flax," insert the words "grass and substitutes therefor." Would not that cover the subject?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It might carry it to a higher rate here, but it would throw these Japanese mats into a paragraph where they never have been heretofore and where they do not belong, because they are not composed of the same fiber.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. But that is what the gentleman is doing now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. We are simply bringing them back to the paragraph with the other manufactures of straw, whereas, they not being mentioned in the old law, the courts have held that they fall in paragraph 463, in sundries.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. But, Mr. Chairman, these mats that I have in mind, that would be covered by the language I suggest, are not the mats provided for in that paragraph. They are not the same kind of mats. They are not a cheap, ordinary kind of mat, but they are a high-grade mat, made from grass.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The decisions of the courts do not sustain the gentleman in that. The decisions of the courts threw them into the sundry schedule.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. But the decisions of the courts would have to follow the language of the gentleman's law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They would if we changed the law. We changed it to carry them into the same paragraph as the other class of straw carpeting. It was simply that the words were left out of that paragraph.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. These mats and rugs cost, ordinarily, between 25 and 40 cents a yard. You make the duty only 2½ cents, or less than 10 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We may differ on the rates—

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. You place them in the wrong class. You should not place them in the class with very cheap material.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We were advised by the importers and experts who were interested in the matter and who appeared before us in the hearings that they did belong there, and we put them there for that reason.

I ask that all debate on this paragraph be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. I want to offer an amendment. I do not care to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the committee is in error when he states that the experts who were heard at the hearings classified the Japanese importations in the schedule in which they are placed. I have before me the

testimony taken at the hearing when Mr. Wirtz, one of the importers referred to, I presume, testified as follows:

For about five years we have been experimenting in Japan with the manufacture of a rug similar to this. It is not made of the same material—

He was referring to the Crex rug manufactured in Minnesota—

and it is probably not, at least at present, as good an article. It costs laid down here, duty paid, at the present time, practically the same as the domestic.

Later on, on page 3791:

Mr. WIRTZ. Those are under the 35 per cent duty. Under that 35 per cent duty, foreign competition has not been a factor.

Mr. HARRISON. What figure do you suggest?

Mr. WIRTZ. We suggest 5 cents per square yard.

He afterwards said that 5 cents a yard was equivalent to 20 per cent. Then he made this statement:

We claim that if the consumers are to have the benefit of foreign competition—and I believe the idea is to make the duty a competitive one—that it will have to be reduced, because at 35 per cent it has been shown that the manufacturers in foreign countries are not able to produce an article at a price that will compete with the domestic.

This is the testimony of a man who was partial to the importation of these competitive Japanese rugs, and he says that at 5 cents per square yard they could compete. Now, I can not understand how the committee could make the rate on this article, sent in here from Japan and China to compete with the domestic manufacture, half the rate suggested.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman will hardly maintain that the Japanese floor matting comes into direct competition with these single-piece Crex straw rugs.

Mr. MANN. Not in ordinary form.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. On the Pacific coast the Japanese rugs do come into competition under this very tariff, and that applies to a great many articles. We hear a great deal about the railroad rate protecting various products as against the Japanese. On the Pacific coast the contrary is true. The Crex rug can hardly be sold at all on the Pacific coast on account of the difference in the cost of transportation.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make this observation in support of the amendment transferring mats and rugs made of grass from paragraph 281 to paragraph 282: Here is an importer upon the strength of whose testimony the 2½ cents per square yard is imposed by this bill. As I have shown by this testimony taken by the committee, he himself puts them as competitive with the domestic article under a rate of 5 cents per square yard. He refers to them as being competitive when coming in from Japan and China under a rate of 5 cents per square yard, and complains of the present duty of 35 per cent ad valorem as unfair to the importers. Naturally that is his argument, but he himself volunteers to the committee the only testimony that the committee has where a figure is named, as far as I can find, and he says that 5 cents a yard would be fairly competitive. Yet in the face of that testimony by a great importer of these Japanese rugs this committee puts the rate at 2½ cents—one-half the figure suggested by him. What chance has a domestic manufacturer when his competitor can bring in his goods under a rate only one-half as high as he himself considers competitive?

Mr. Chairman, when you consider the fact that these rugs are made in China and Japan by laborers working at from 17½ to 25 cents a day, as shown by this very testimony, in competition with white men working in Minnesota for approximately \$2 a day—practically eight times as high wages paid by the domestic manufacturer—it is clear that this is glaringly defective as a schedule. Labor is a very important item in the manufacture of rugs and mats of this character.

The raw material in this country, as well as in China and Japan, is comparatively cheap. Many men are employed in cutting the wire grass from lands which would be otherwise practically valueless. Many men are employed in the factory weaving and making rugs. In this country the work is done by farmers and other high-class laboring men, among the best of our citizens. In Asia the work is done by a cheap, low type of man at a miserable wage, approximately one-eighth of what we pay. In this country the grass is cut from clean, new fields, handled by clean white men and women in clean, well-ventilated factories, and the result is a clean and sanitary rug upon which little children can with safety play in the homes of our country. In Asia the material for these rugs is gathered from ancient fields, saturated with the germ-laden refuse of the countless ages of an overcrowded race of inferior men. The work is done over there by the dirty hands of a subnormal type of an inferior race, and the rugs and mats when made are stored in all sorts of places and shipped in old ships with other unwholesome cargoes of the Orient, and when they finally reach the homes of the American people they are not clean or sanitary or fit to be played upon by our children.

Furthermore, all the money that is paid for these imported rugs and mats goes to China and Japan and stays there forever. The money paid for the rugs and mats of our factories stays in this country in continual service of the people. It is not fair to make a rate that will discourage or destroy this new and important industry built up in the Northwest. It is not statesmanship to legislate for the benefit of foreigners. It is not honest if this particular schedule was designed to enable large importers in New York to drive our own producers out of their legitimate markets. And whether that was the purpose of the men who urged the change or not it will have that effect. This reduction will lessen the revenue of the Government and benefit no one but the importers of Japan and New York. It is indefensible on the theory of competition and unfair as a matter of economy. I say more than that. This schedule bears upon its face the evidence of having been made without regard to the showing of facts, without regard to the rights of the domestic producer, but in solicitous consideration of the profits of selfish importers. They talk about reducing the cost to the consumer, apparently oblivious of the fact that reducing the cost to the consumers of this country will benefit no one if at the same time they reduce the producing power of the same people to a corresponding degree. Legislation destructive of domestic enterprise, laws that handicap producers, rates that favor foreigners are all unwise beyond telling. It does no good to make things cheap if the people generally have nothing with which to buy even cheap things. There must be a husbanding of our resources within our own borders, a stopping of leaks to foreign lands.

We must, of course, change laws that take from our people for the benefit of a few of our own selfish citizens, but our changes must not go so far as to put our men—men who toil—on a level contest with the degraded men of a decadent nation like China. We must not legislate like blind dreamers. Tax laws should be made according to fair business principles based on facts as they are. I hope this amendment will be accepted. It is simple justice—that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 71, line 17, after the word "matting," strike out "2½ cents" and insert "3 cents."

Mr. MOORE. This is to give additional protection. The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

282. Carpets, carpeting, mats and rugs made of flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber (except cotton), 55 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 71, line 19, amend by adding after the word "flax" the words "grass and substitutes therefor."

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I realize somewhat the problem which the committee has had, and I have tried to meet it by carrying out their theories of classification and grouping by providing clearly that the first paragraph relating to this subject, No. 281, should cover mattings made from vegetable substances, while the second paragraph, No. 282, should cover mats and rugs of all descriptions, and with a sufficient identification and inclusion of materials so that there shall not be any opportunity for fraud or misdescription. I think we all agree that this is desirable, and I have no disposition, and I would not urge the amendment if I thought it would accomplish any such result as fraud on the Treasury. But the inclusion of wire-grass rugs and mats under the rate of 2½ cents per square yard is a very gross injustice. The cheaper grades of floor mattings should not have a higher rate, but the better grade and entirely different kind of floor covering, such as wire-grass mats and rugs, certainly needs a different rate and class.

I think the language I have drawn clearly provides for this difference. The definition of each class is clear and distinct. A mat and rug covering a limited surface is an entirely different article from matting, which is extended and requires cutting and fitting. The mats or rugs made of grass or substitutes for grass are made from high grade of straw, such as is grown in the Orient—in China, Japan, or Formosa—for that purpose. That kind of an article is well known and defined, and if any court or appraiser has made a mistake in the past this language will bring them back to the right position and indicate what should be the proper class and rate; it would thus put this industry in our own country in a position to meet the intensely severe competition from the Orient.

Now, if the gentlemen of the committee are sincere in desiring competitive conditions between the oriental products and

similar products in this country, considering all the different problems of labor and distribution, here is an opportunity to use as a practical example a legitimate industry which is doing the best it can to solve some of the conditions of decent and economical living by providing a cheap, sanitary, and durable floor covering of good appearance and made of clean and healthful materials. So far these companies engaged in this business have developed an entirely new industry, are utilizing materials entirely waste before, and without any great profit. Why, the profits of this concern average only about 8 per cent per annum, while the profits of the importers of the competing products average more than 10 per cent on their goods. It does seem that our own citizens, taking the risk and making the development, employing our own citizens, should be entitled to an equal show with the importers of competing oriental products. These importers, under the rates which you have in the bill, would have an interest in developing the industry in China and Japan instead of in this country, and would greatly push these foreign goods, because it would be for their advantage to do so. I append to my remarks some advertisements of these foreign rugs competing with the domestic, to show this is what is actually going on. The customers receive no advantage of lower prices, but the dealers get larger profits, and so will push the foreign rugs. The language of my amendment is now so clear as to relieve the apprehension which the chairman of the committee has as to confusion and hereafter placing these articles in the wrong class. This would take them out of the basket clause and put them clearly where they belong, among certain classes of material made of vegetable fiber and of a certain kindred kind and shape, and all for a certain well-known and defined specific purpose, which can not be mistaken. That is, by taking all mats and rugs out of paragraph 281, it confines such paragraph to the general subject of mattings of straw and other vegetable substances. So, by including in the general subject of mats and rugs paragraph 282, all mats and rugs of flax, grass, and substitutes therefor are called for in my amendment, it makes it very clear that kindred articles should be treated together and alike.

[From Washington Post of Sunday, May 4, 1913.]

Summer floor coverings to replace those of winter.

The spring cleaning should include the replacing of winter rugs and floor covering with these cool summer ones. Not much to pay here.

Wool fiber rugs, in green, olive, red, and brown; neat all-over and medallion designs; also plain centers, with Walls of Troy border; noted for their durability. Size, 9 by 12 feet; \$8 values. Monday, choice at \$5.95.

Japanese matting rugs, in attractive woven-in designs; very effective for summer use. Size, 9 by 12 feet; \$5 values. Monday, for \$3.19.

| | | |
|--------------------|-------|--------|
| 6 by 9 foot size | | \$1.59 |
| 3 by 6 foot size | | .59 |
| 27 by 54 inch size | | .29 |

Grass matting rugs, a comprehensive display of these, embracing colors of green, blue, red, and brown; plain and striped borders. Sizes and prices as follows:

| | | |
|------------------------|-------|--------|
| 54 inches by 90 inches | | \$2.10 |
| 6 feet by 9 feet | | 3.50 |
| 8 feet by 10 feet | | 5.25 |
| 9 feet by 12 feet | | 7.00 |
| 9 feet by 12 feet | | 9.10 |
| 12 feet by 15 feet | | 12.95 |

Stenciled rugs.

| | | |
|------------------------|-------|--------|
| 54 inches by 90 inches | | \$2.45 |
| 6 feet by 9 feet | | 4.15 |
| 8 feet by 10 feet | | 6.10 |
| 9 feet by 12 feet | | 8.10 |
| 12 feet by 15 feet | | 10.10 |

Spot deliveries of "Dixie" grass rugs for the present retail season.

Always on the alert for something new and good, merchants everywhere were quick to appreciate the merits of our "Dixie" grass rugs, the latest entrant in the race for supremacy in goods of this class.

A twisted weave of selected grass, cleverly put together, durable, handsomely designed, beautifully colored and smooth in surface, made of very superior materials, attractively priced, the success of the "Dixie" grass rugs was assured from the outset.

The first product of the looms was sold last year within a few days. Production facilities were enlarged, and we are now in a position to make immediate deliveries of all patterns and colorings.

Special terms of shipment.

Stock carried in New York and St. Paul warehouses. From St. Paul we make free delivery to any common overland point of orders aggregating 210 pounds or more.

We of course have a color catalogue, and it will afford us pleasure to send you a copy. Write for it to-day.

Resolution urging the Congress of the United States, to take the necessary steps for the establishing of a Federal telegraph and telephone system rendering a local and interstate service.

Whereas the telegraph and telephone are ever-increasing public necessities; and

Whereas these services could be more certainly and more fairly rendered under a system of Government ownership of these utilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the city council of the city of Minneapolis, That it is the judgment of the council that the time is ripe for the acquisition of these utilities by the Government of the United States, and that the Congress of the United States be urged to take the necessary steps for the establishing of a Federal telegraph and telephone system rendering

a local and interstate service, such as is rendered by the Post Office Department; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be directed to send copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives and to the Senators from Minnesota and Representative from the fifth congressional district.

Passed April 11, 1913.

KARL DELAITTRE,
President of the Council.

Attest:

HENRY N. KNOTT, City Clerk.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I do not know whether any member of the committee has had any occasion to have his attention especially called to this grass mat, which I believe is called Crex, a name given to it by the manufacturer. It is an industry which has been developed somewhat in Minnesota, making a fancy sort of mat out of grass that was not utilized before, and which being established, as I understand they are now, it is being copied in Japan, where they can produce it undoubtedly a little cheaper, and producing a little cheaper grade of mat than is made here.

The rate that is fixed here in the bill would be a very low ad valorem rate, 2½ cents a square yard, and while I do not expect that the committee will agree to an amendment offhand with reference to the subject, I am quite sure that if the committee will have the opportunity to make any investigation of this, they will see that it is desirable, both from a revenue standpoint and from our standpoint, a protective standpoint, to raise the rates somewhat on that Crex grass matting, because, if it be not raised, I am quite positive the Japanese will drive the people here out of business, and then probably after that all we will get will be ordinary Japanese floor matting. Of course, this is not in competition in the main with Japanese floor matting. I do not know whether the gentleman happened to notice it or not, but at one time down town at one of the stores there was a large amount of this Crex matting on exhibition in one of the windows. I took the trouble, having a little curiosity, to satisfy that curiosity in regard to it. It was a new industry and making quite a development. I think it is quite a desirable thing to aid an industry of that sort.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the witnesses before the committee did produce some imitations that the Japanese had made, but I am bound to say that they were very poor imitations. In the first place, the Japanese have not the wire grass that grows in Minnesota, and in the next place, the dyeing was of a very inferior quality, so altogether I think no one would hesitate about which to choose as between the two rugs. That is as far as the Japanese have gone up to date.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says no one would hesitate, but after all nearly every one does hesitate between buying a thing which is a little expensive and one which is very much less expensive, which looks like it. The gentleman from New York and I may proceed upon the theory that it is economy to pay a little more for an article, but I apprehend the majority of people unfortunately do not proceed on that theory, but that where two articles look alike and are apparently very much the same, they will be very apt to buy the cheaper article and drive the other out of competition with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

285. Linoleum, plain, stamped, painted, or printed, including corticine and cork carpet, figured or plain, also linoleum known as granite and oak plank, 30 per cent ad valorem; inlaid linoleum, 35 per cent ad valorem; oilcloth for floors, plain, stamped, painted, or printed, 20 per cent ad valorem; mats or rugs made of oilcloth, linoleum, corticine, or cork carpet shall be subject to the same rate of duty as herein provided for oilcloth, linoleum, corticine, or cork carpet.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get some information. I would like the attention of the gentleman from Alabama. The manufacture of linoleum is a very large industry, and I would offer amendments if I thought they would pass. I want the gentleman to state his position in regard to one or two propositions. Linoleum is made largely of linseed oil and burlap. Burlap was formerly on the free list. It comes in from India, because it is not profitable to make it in this country. Placing burlap on the dutiable list, of course, makes it more difficult for the manufacturer of linoleum to obtain his raw material, and adds to his cost. Linseed oil, I think, has also been raised, that being a raw material. The duty on linoleum, however, the manufactured product, has been reduced. If this is in line with the policy of the committee to tax the raw materials and lower the duty on the manufactured article, of course an amendment would be of no avail. I do not care to offer one if the gentleman maintains that the item is as the committee intended.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is mistaken. Neither linseed oil nor linoleum has been increased. They have been decreased.

Mr. MOORE. I said that the duty on linoleum had been decreased, but that burlap had been taken from the free list and put on the dutiable list.

Mr. PETERS. Burlap is not on the free list. It has been decreased. It came in last year at an ad valorem equivalent of 23.92, and in the bill before us, section 288, it is placed at 20 per cent.

Mr. MOORE. There is a duty on burlap now in this bill?

Mr. PETERS. Yes; and there is a duty in the present law.

Mr. MOORE. But the duty has been increased.

Mr. PETERS. No; the gentleman is mistaken. It has been reduced.

Mr. MOORE. Then I have been misinformed. I understood burlap, which heretofore had been free, had now been made dutiable. If the gentleman is right about that, I will not press the matter.

Mr. PETERS. If the gentleman will look at page 225 of the handbook, he will see that the duty on burlap is given at the ad valorem equivalent of 23.92.

Mr. MOORE. Then I may have been mistaken.

Mr. MANN. The duty on burlap is the same as jute cloth, which is nine-sixteenths cent per pound plus 15 per cent under the existing law.

Mr. PETERS. I give the ad valorem equivalent on burlaps coming under the existing law. Not exceeding 30 threads to the square inch nine-sixteenths cent per pound plus 15 per cent, which is equivalent to 23.86. Exceeding 30 and not exceeding 55 threads to the square inch seven-eighths cent plus 15, or an equivalent of 23.19. The total burlaps coming in at 23.92.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is prepared to stand by the rates in this paragraph on the lower grade of linoleum?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Then I will not offer any amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

287. Bands, bandings, belts, beltings, bindings, cords, ribbons, tapes, webs and webbings, all the foregoing composed wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of flax, hemp, or ramie and india rubber, and not otherwise specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem; wearing apparel composed wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, or ramie, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 72, line 20, after the word "ramie," insert the words "or of flax or ramie and india rubber."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer this amendment without discussion. It is an amendment to paragraph 286.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to return to paragraph 286 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 72, line 13, after the word "linen," strike out "30 per cent ad valorem" and insert the following: "40 cents per dozen pieces and 20 per cent ad valorem."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

288. Plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns, by whatever name known, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, while I shall refrain from offering an amendment to section 288 of this bill—as all amendments offered by gentlemen on this side are promptly rejected—I wish to state that it is manifestly unfair that a duty should be placed on burlap, which is included in this item. Not one yard of burlap is made in this country, most of it being imported from England, and it is the foundation of floor oilcloth, which is the poor man's carpet. Now, to decrease the duty on floor oilcloth and retain the duty on burlap works an injustice to manufacturer and consumer alike, and this is one of the many inequalities in the bill now under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

290. Bags or sacks made from plain woven fabrics, of single jute yarns, not dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or bleached, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment. On page 73, paragraph 290, after the word "bleached," in line 5, strike out "25 per cent ad valorem" and add "be transferred to the free list."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 73, line 5, after the word "bleached," strike out "25 per cent ad valorem" and insert "free of duty."

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman he offer the motion to strike out the paragraph 295 with the statement that if that prevails he will offer to put it on the free list when it is reached. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will accept that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as suggested.

There was no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, this particular bagging, made of single-thread jute fiber or jute yarn, is used altogether, as far as I know, for covering or sacking agricultural products. All of the wool of this country that is sent to market is sacked in this kind of material. You have placed wool on the free list. Oats and wheat from the Pacific coast are shipped largely in this kind of bag. Millions of these bags are used for transporting grain to Liverpool around the Horn. That staple of the Southland, cotton, is also wrapped in this class of material. You have seen fit in this bill to place the covering for cotton made of this same material on the free list. Now, I submit to you this question: Would it not be fair and somewhat compensatory to your wool and grain raisers of the North and West if you would give them the same privilege that you give to your cotton raisers and give them a covering for their wool and grain free of duty, the same that you are giving to the cotton raisers of the South?

The same might be said of the sack that covers potatoes and mill products—bran, shorts, and feed stuffs. Mill stuffs that you have placed on the free list are largely sacked with this same material, and it looks to me like it would be only fair that you place bags of this character on the free list, as you have the covering for your cotton raisers. I hope this amendment may prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 73, line 3, strike out paragraph 290 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"290. Bags or sacks made from plain woven fabrics, of single jute yarns, not dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or bleached, and not exceeding 30 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, seven-eighths of 1 cent per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE K—WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF.

295. Combed wool or tops and roving or roping made wholly or in part of wool or camel's hair, and on other wool and hair which have been advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

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 of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, May 3, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 4578) amending section 808 of the Criminal Code of the District of Columbia, providing punishment for rape, etc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 4579) making appropriation for the completion of jetties at the entrance to Humboldt Bay, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4580) to authorize a survey of Bolinas Channel, Marin County, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 4581) providing for the sale of certain remnant lands in the Kiowa-Comanche and Apache ceded reservation in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. L'ENGLE: A bill (H. R. 4582) to levy and collect an internal-revenue tax from manufacturers of tariff-protected articles who do not pay living wages and maintain certain labor conditions in their factories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4583) to furnish bronze medals of honor to surviving soldiers who responded to President's Lincoln's first call for troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 4584) to protect our national food supply by the extermination of certain enemies of food fishes of the Atlantic coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4585) to amend paragraph 1, section 24, of 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. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 4606) to provide for 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4607) regulating trials by jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4608) declaring that persons, firms, or corporations in any manner engaged in interstate-commerce business who shall become engaged or concerned in the fixing of prices of any foodstuffs contrary to the rules of competition shall be guilty of a felony, and providing for their punishment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: Resolution (H. Res. 85) authorizing the chairman of the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers to appoint a messenger to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 86) authorizing the chairman of the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers to appoint a clerk to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOLLAND: Resolution (H. Res. 87) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay to Mary C. Adams the sum of \$60; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. AINEY: A bill (H. R. 4586) granting a pension to Lent B. Gage; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4587) granting a pension to Margaret A. Seeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4588) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Tiffany; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4589) granting an increase of pension to William Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4590) granting an increase of pension to Hebron B. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4591) granting a pension to Ann Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 4592) granting an increase of pension to Lloyd G. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4593) granting an increase of pension to A. A. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 4594) granting a pension to Albert Pringnitz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 4595) granting a pension to W. S. Richey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4596) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Pryor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4597) granting an increase of pension to Richard Van Dusen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 4598) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 4599) granting an increase of pension to James M. Dilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4600) for the relief of Mrs. Thomas S. Ferral; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 4601) granting a pension to Francella Frost; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4602) granting an increase of pension to David Foley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 4603) for the relief of A. R. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4604) to amend an act entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Blaisdell," approved May, 24, 1900; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 4605) granting a pension to Zella Ruby Kilmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 4609) granting a pension to Rosa Drumm Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4610) granting a pension to Ellen Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) granting a pension to Henry Fleig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 4612) granting a pension to Sarah Whidden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4613) granting a pension to Mary S. Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4614) granting a pension to Luvinia Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of sundry citizens of New York City and of the State of Missouri, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of the council of the city of Toledo, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for the Government to acquire ownership and control of all telephone and telegraph systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petitions of Miles Dorsey and Abbert Kaselow, of Missouri, against mutual life insurance companies in income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AINEY: Petition of sundry citizens of the fourteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Joseph Ringleins, against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of J. E. Foster, Coshocton; Henry G. Crew, New Philadelphia; C. M. Gilmore, Alexandria; Harry Swisher, Newark; and J. A. Cree, Utica, all in the State of Ohio, protesting against the nonexemption of insurance-policy holders in the income-tax section of House bill 10; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of M. M. Stephens and Dr. C. B. Vonnahme, of East St. Louis, Ill., and J. C. Jarvis, of Centerville Station, Ill., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTHOLODT: Petition of W. B. Biddle, of the St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co., and 155 other citizens, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lewis-Zukoski Mercantile Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the legislation prohibiting the importation of the feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the St. Louis Top Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the proposed reduction of the duty on rice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Oats Co. and the D'Arvy Advertising Co., St. Louis, Mo., asking that the manufactured products of oats be put on an exact parity with the raw material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John L. Messmore and 70 other citizens, of St. Louis, Mo.; the Home Life Insurance Co., St. Louis, Mo.; and other citizens of Missouri, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Henry Heil Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the proposed reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Prufrock-Litton Furniture Co., St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the removal of goat hides from the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of cigar manufacturers and Cigar Makers' Union No. 315, of the twentieth congressional

district of Pennsylvania, against free tobacco and cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 14 citizens of the twentieth congressional district of Pennsylvania, against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of cigar manufacturers of York and McSherrytown, Pa., against free cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of E. M. Harris, M. D., of Russellville, Ala., against mutual life insurance companies in the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of F. R. Schmidt and 40 citizens of Portage, John W. Limla and 16 citizens of Washington County, Edward Johnne and 4 other citizens of Sheboygan, and Louis Detz and 14 other citizens of Hericon, all in the State of Wisconsin, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., against mutual life insurance in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Public Museum of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the clause in the tariff bill prohibiting importation of skins and plumage of wild birds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the insular government of Porto Rico, against reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the G. G. Bollworth Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to the tariff on horticultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Federal Rubber Manufacturing Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., against the reduction of duties on bicycles, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of the Florida State Horticultural Society of the State of Florida, favoring the retention of the present duty on citrus fruits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Central Federated Union of New York City, against the proposed revision of the tariff in relation to cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. F. Taylor, of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the method of solving the Philippine question; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, 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, petition of sundry citizens of New York, N. Y., protesting against the removal of the duty on Philippine tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of the National Bank of Commerce, of St. Louis, Mo., and other banks and citizens of Missouri, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of 21 citizens of New Jersey, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the mayor and the board of council of the town of West New York, protesting against the reduction of the tariff on laces and embroideries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the New York Life Insurance Co., of New York, N. Y., against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of sundry North Carolina monazite miners, against a further reduction in the duty on monazite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., relative to the proposed tariff changes affecting the flour-milling, live-stock, and packing industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of George E. Hoey, Henry H. Wardle, C. B. Blivell, Katherine McKone, Thomas Brook, Charles W. Littlefield, Alfred K. Petter, William G. Smythe, Edward E. Rice, R. G. Hazard, W. S. Redfields, Maurice H. Stearns, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., John Bennett, Alfred Green, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Charles Matteson, Archibald C. Matteson, William J. Brown, John Champlin, J. H. Hambly, and Archibald W. Couper, all in the State of Rhode Island, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Nicholson File Co., of Providence, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on files, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of B. A. Ballow & Co., of Providence, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Alice Hall Walter, of Providence R. I., and Flora Jarver, of Kingston Hill, R. I., favoring the clause prohibiting importation of wild-bird plumage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the W. J. Feeley Co., of Providence, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on ecclesiastical goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the International Braid Co., of Providence, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on cotton small wares; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 94, of Pawtucket and Providence, R. I., against the importation of cigars from the Philippines free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Regina Manufacturing Co., of East Greenwich, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on tracing cloth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pawtucket Woolen Mills, of Westerly, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on woollens and wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Quindick Windham Manufacturing Co., of Providence, R. I., the Lebanon Mill Co. and the Dexter Yarn Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., against the sections of the tariff bill relating to the textile industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Blodgett & Orswell Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., against the reduction of the tariff on cotton yarns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the United States Bobbin & Shuttle Co. and the Providence Mill Supply Co., of Warwick Mills, against the reduction of the tariff on cotton and woollens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, against putting Philippine cigars on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of George G. Meade Post, No. 1, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Philadelphia, Pa., against mutual life insurance in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., against the clause in sundry civil bill forbidding the use of money for prosecution of labor and farmers' organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. HINDS: Petition of the Yarmouth Board of Trade, of Yarmouth, Me., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petition of Oscar Schmidt (Inc.), of Jersey City, N. J., against the duty on grain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Petition of the City Council of Portland, Oreg., favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephones; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEVY: Petitions of sundry citizens and the Central Federated Union of New York, against free cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Estey Piano Co. and F. Radle & Bjur Bros. Co., of New York, against the duty on ivory tusks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the John Ogden Co., of New York, against the duty on metal sashes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Cloak & Suit Co., of New York, against assessment of fee in relation to filing protest against assessment of duties by collector of customs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. Clara Huyler, of New York, against placing Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Uda Biggs & Stewart Hess Co., of New York City, against the clause prohibiting importation of wild-bird plumage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of John W. Borden and Benjamin Bronstein, of New York, against mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of J. T. Lampman & Co., Claverack, N. Y., asking that the same consideration as to the

duty be given to rye and buckwheat as to wheat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Consumers' Albany Brewing Co., Albany, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation to remove the duty on barley and malt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petition of Androscoggin Local, No. 15, I. B. of P. M., Lisbon Falls, Me., protesting against the removal of the duty on imported paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the Central Federated Union of Greater New York, against change in the tariff on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rocky Mountain lead-ore producers, against the reduction of the duty on lead ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of St. Regis Local, No. 45, of Deferiet, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Utah Chapter of the American Mining Congress, against the reduction of the duty on lead ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Linnæan Society of New York City, favoring the feather proviso in Schedule N of the tariff act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local No. 144, International Brotherhood of Paper Workers, of Blood River, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, N. Y., protesting against the removal of the duty on Philippine tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Lieberguth, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the removal of the duty on stained and painted glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph Hyman, Bernard Frankfelder, G. Kimpel, and Harry Glemly, of New York City, protesting against Schedule N, affecting the importation of human hair; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles H. Doringe and Herman Friedlander, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the income tax on life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Margaret O'Grady and Nora Sweeney, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and E. K. Stewart, of New York City, protesting against the passage of legislation preventing the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Angora Specialty Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of New Haven, Wallingford, Meriden, and Hartford, Conn., protesting against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of the Columbia and Snake River Association, Pendleton, Oreg., protesting against the repeal of the free-tolls section of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Joseph Dixon Crucible Co. and the Hawaiian Fertilizer Co. of San Francisco, Cal., against placing sugar on free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Brownstein-Louis Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., against the duty on indigo; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against submitting the Panama Canal controversy to the arbitration court; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Lewis-Simas-Jones Co., San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petition of Local Union No. 305, Cigar Makers' International Union of America, of Monmouth, Ill., against free cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, against the removal of the tariff on cigars made in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the thirtieth district of New York, against the inclusion of life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Central Federated Union of New York City, against the proposed revision of the tariff in relation to cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Linnæan Society of New York, favoring the feather proviso in Schedule N of the tariff act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.