HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *May 3, 1913.*

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

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

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, that down deep in the hearts of men is an earnest, insistent desire for all that is best physically, intellectually, morally, spiritually; that the trend of humanity is upward, not downward; forward, not backward; toward the ideals of life; that faith is stronger than doubt, hope than despair, peace than war, love than hate, justice than injustice, mercy than revenge; which promises victory to every man under the divine leadership of the Son of God, the captain of our salvation. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by former Senator Chauncey M. Depew, of New York.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has that right already.

Mr. MANN. This is a little different proposition, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. What is it? The Chair supposed it was an ordinary extension of a tariff speech.

Mr. POWERS. I want to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech by ex-Senator Depew at a dinner given in New York and recently published.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] objects.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the first paragraph of the wool schedule was read last night. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that I want to offer as a substitute a complete wool schedule. I would like to move to strike out the paragraphs in relation to wool in the old schedule and leave this as a substitute, as it will appear more logical, although not strictly in accordance with the rules in that way. Otherwise I shall move to strike out this paragraph and submit a substitute for it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When the time comes there will be no objection to the gentleman from New York making his proposition. I have no desire not to allow the gentleman to present his amendment in the way he desires.

Mr. PAYNE. And it will not make any difference in the result, I may say. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No.

Mr. MANN. Let us see if we can arrange an understanding about the amendment and the debate. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] will offer an amendment covering the entire wool schedule, an amendment which is the same as the bill introduced in the last Congress on this side, and substantially the same which was offered in the motion to recommit, I believe, when the last wool bill passed Congress. Whether any other gentleman desires to offer any other amendment I do not know, but perhaps we can ascertain now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will be glad if the gentleman can ascertain.

Mr. MURDOCK. I know of none.

Mr. SINNOTT. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. To what paragraph?

Mr. SINNOTT. To paragraph 300.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it wise to offer any amendments, but I would like to have some time.

Mr. MANN. We will try to arrange that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, I undersand that one gentleman on that side desires to offer a separate amendment to paragraph 300, and outside of that the only amendment your side desires to offer is Mr. PAYNE's substitute.

Mr. MANN. If we can get an agreement as to time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If we can get an agreement as to time I would suggest, as part of that agreement, that we read the bill through now, in order that the committee may perfect the schedule with one or two technical amendments that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] wants to suggest at the end of that time.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to a paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What is it about?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It is on the subject of the duty on raw wool.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That makes two amendments.

I suggest that after the bill is read through we go back and allow the two gentlemen who desire to offer individual amendments to dispose of them with 10 minutes' debate on each amendment, and then if we can reach an agreement about time at the close of general debate we will have a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. MANN. I think that is satisfactory, but I think we want two hours on this side for general debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope the gentleman will not insist on that.

Mr. MANN. That is cutting it to the quick.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will take an hour and a half, I will limit this side to one hour.

Mr. MANN. Can not the gentleman give us two hours? This is our live subject, and we will not take up so much time in that way as we would to read the schedule through in the ordinary way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will agree to this if for the balance of the day we can cut out political debate. I know the gentleman can not control Members on his side and I can not on this, but if for the balance of the day we can cut out political speeches and discuss the schedule I will agree to two hours if the gentleman will aid me in endeavoring to keep his side from indulging in purely political debate. We have reached the point in the bill where we have discussed the whole political aspect of it.

Mr. MADDEN. Who is going to decide whether the debate is political or not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This House can always be depended upon, if it makes an agreement, to live up to the spirit of it. A man who does not live up to the spirit of an agreement is condemned by his fellow Members.

Mr. MURDOCK. If this agreement carries, I suppose the gentleman from Illinois will see that I have some time.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman wants two hours, I will ask for an hour and a half on this side. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the schedule may be read through by paragraphs immediately without debate; that when the two paragraphs are reached where gentlemen desire to offer amendments they may offer the amendments and that debate on the amendments be limited to 10 minutes, 5 on that side and 5 on this. At the conclusion of the reading of the schedule the gentleman from New York shall offer his substitute for the entire schedule, and on that there shall be three hours and a half general debate, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois and an hour and a half by myself. At the conclusion of the general debate, whenever it may occur, because I may not use the entire hour and a half, there shall be a vote on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that Schedule K be now read through entirely without debate, except that when Paragraph 295 is read and Paragraph 300 the gentleman from South Dakota shall have opportunity to offer an amendment to Paragraph 295, and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] shall have an opportunity to offer an amendment to Paragraph 300; that there shall be 10 minutes' debate on each paragraph and amendments thereto, to be divided equally between the two sides of the House; that at the end of the reading of the schedule the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] shall be permitted to offer a substitute for the entire schedule; that debate upon that shall continue for three and a half hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and an hour and a half by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and at the end of that debate a vote shall be taken on the substitute and the schedule concluded. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the arrangement as proposed is extremely fair from my point

of view, but it leaves the disposition of the time on this side of the House in the hands of those who are entirely in favor of the substitute. As one of the representatives of a city in which woolen manufacture is the most important industry, I would like to understand if I shall have some time in general debate?

Mr. FORDNEY. I think the gentleman need not worry about that.

Mr. MANN. I think, Mr. Chairman, that I shall be as fair as I was when I nominated the gentleman from Pennsylvania to go on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to have at least 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Paragraph 295 has already been read, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. During the reading of the bill at some time I shall offer as a separate paragraph an amendment placing a duty upon raw wool; but I will do so during the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

296. Yarns made wholly or in chief value of wool, 20 per cent ad valorem.

297. Cloths, knit fabrics, felts not woven, and all manufactures of every description made, by any process, wholly or in chief value of wool, not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem.

298. Blankets and flannels, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, 25 per cent ad valorem; flannels composed wholly or in chief value of wool, valued at above 50 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem.

299. Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, and goods of similar description and character, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, and not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem.

300. Clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including shawls whether knitted or woven, and knitted articles of every description made up or manufactured wholly or in part, and not specially provided for in this section, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, 35 per cent ad valorem.

301. Webbings, suspenders, braces, bandings, belting, bindings, cords, cords and tassels, and ribbons; any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool or wool and india rubber are the component materials of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem.

302. Aubusson, Axminister, moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 35 per cent ad valorem.

303. Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 30 per cent ad valorem.

304. Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 25 per cent ad valorem.

305. Velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 30 per cent ad valorem.

306. Tapestry Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, 20 per cent ad valorem.

307. Treble ingrain, 3-ply, and all-chain Venetian carpets, 20 per cent ad valorem.

308. Wool Dutch and 2-ply ingrain carpets, 20 per cent ad valorem.

309. Carpets of every description, woven whole for rooms, and Oriental, Berlin, Aubusson, Axminster, and similar rugs, 50 per cent ad valorem.

310. Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, 20 per cent ad valorem.

311. Carpets and carpeting of wool, flax, or cotton, or composed in part of any of them, not specially provided for in this section, and on mats, matting, and rugs of cotton, 20 per cent ad valorem.

312. Mats, rugs for floors, screens, covers, hassocks, bed sides, art squares, and other portions of carpets or carpeting, made wholly or in part of wool, and not specially provided for in this section, shall be subjected to the rate of duty herein imposed on carpets or carpeting of like character or description.

313. Whenever in this section the word "wool" is used in connection with a manufactured article of which it is a component material, it shall be held to include wool or hair of the sheep, camel, or other like animals, whether manufactured by the woolen, worsted, felt, or any other process.

314. Hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and all hair on the skin of such animals, 20 per cent ad valorem.

315. Tops made from the hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, 25 per cent ad valorem.

316. Yarns made of the hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, 30 per cent ad valorem.

317. Cloth and all manufactures of every description made of the hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, not specially provided for in this section, 40 per cent ad valorem.

318. Plushes, velvets, and all other pile fabrics, cut or uncut, woven or knit, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface, made wholly or partly of the hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and articles made wholly or in chief value of such plushes or velvets, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose the other amendments come in first, but I am not particular. I suppose the original text should be perfected first, but I will offer my amendment and have it pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] has advised the Chair that he does not care to offer the amendment that he indicated he would offer, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized to offer his amendment if he desires.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to offer it and have it pending a little later. This proceeding was arranged so speedily that I have not had quite time to finish the preparation of it.

Mr. PAYNE. I have no objection to offering mine and having it pending.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it does not delay the procedure.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It will not delay the procedure at all.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the gentleman from South Dakota will be permitted to offer his amendment later. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] offers an amendment by way of a substitute for the schedule which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Striking out all of the paragraphs of Schedule K of section 1 of said act, from 360 to 395, inclusive of both, and also paragraphs 653 and 654 on page 129, and inserting in place thereof the following:

"1. All wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals shall be divided, for the purpose of fixing the duties to be charged thereon, into the two following classes:

"2. Class 1, that is to say, merino, mestiza, metz, or metis wools, or other wools of merino blood, immediate or remote, Down clothing wools, and wools of like character with any of the preceding, including Bagdad wool, China lamb's wool, Castel Branco, Adrianople skin wool or butcher's wool, and such as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Buenos Aires, New Zealand, Australia, Cape of Good Hope, Russia, Great Britain, Canada, Egypt, Morocco, and elsewhere, and Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down combing wools, Canada long wools, or other like combing wools of English blood, and usually known by the terms herein used, and all wools not hereinafter included in class two, and also the hair of the camel, Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals.

"3. Class 2, that is to say, Donskoi, native South American, Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, Russian camel's hair, and all such wools of like character as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Turkey, Greece, Syria, and elsewhere, excepting improved wools hereinafter provided for.

"4. The standard samples of all wools, which are now or may be hereafter deposited in the principal customhouses of the United States, under the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be the standards for the classification of wools under this act, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to renew these standards and to make such additions to them from time to time as may be required, and he shall cause to be deposited like standards in other customhouses of the United States when they may be needed.

"5. Whenever wools of class 2 shall have been improved by the admixture of merino or English blood, from their present character, as represented by the standard samples now or hereafter to be deposited in the principal customhouses of the United States, such improved wools shall be classified for duty as class 1.

"6. If any bale or package of wool or hair specified in this act, invoiced or entered as of class 2, or claimed by the importer to be dutiable as of class 2, shall contain any wool or hair subject to the rate of duty of class 1, the whole bale or package shall be subject to the rate of duty chargeable on wool of class 1; and if any bale or package be claimed by the importer to be shoddy, mungo, flocks, wool, hair, or other material of any class specified in this act, and such bale contain any admixture of any one or more of said materials, or of any other material, the whole bale or package shall be subject to duty at the highest rate imposed upon any article in said bale or package.

"7. The duty on all wools and hair of class 1, if imported in the grease, shall be laid upon the basis of its clean content. The clean content shall be determined by scouring tests which shall be made according to regulations which the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. The duty on all wools and hair of class 1 imported in the grease shall be 18 cents per pound on the clean content, as defined above. If imported scoured, the duty shall be 19 cents per pound.

"8. The duty on all wools of class 2, including camel's hair of class 2, imported in their natural condition, shall be 7 cents per pound. If scoured, 19 cents per pound: *Provided*, That on consumption of wools of class 2, including camel's hair, in the manufacture of carpets, druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, mats, rugs for floors, screens, covers, hassocks, bedsides, art squares, and portions of carpets or carpeting hereafter manufactured or produced in the United States in whole or in part from wools of class 2, including camel's hair, upon which duties have been paid, there shall be allowed to the manufacturer or producer of such articles a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid less 1 per cent of such duties on the amount of the wools of class 2, including camel's hair of class 2, contained therein; such drawback shall be paid under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

"9. The duty on wools on the skin shall be 2 cents less per pound than is imposed upon the clean content as provided for wools of class 1, and 1 cent less per pound than is imposed upon wools of class 2 imported in their natural condition, the quantity to be ascertained under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

"10. Top waste and slubbing waste, 18 cents per pound.

"11. Roving waste and ring waste, 14 cents per pound.

"12. Noils, carbonized, 14 cents per pound.

"13. Noils, not carbonized, 11 cents per pound.

"14. Garnetted waste, 11 cents per pound.

"15. Thread waste, yarn waste, and wool wastes not specified, 9½ cents per pound.

"16. Shoddy, mungo, and wool extract, 8 cents per pound.

"17. Woolen rags and flocks, 2 cents per pound.

"18. Combed wool or tops, made wholly or in part of wool, or camel's hair, 20 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 10 per cent ad valorem.

"19. Wool and hair which have been advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, but less advanced than yarn, not specially provided for in this section, 20 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 10 per cent ad valorem.

"20. On yarns, made wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, the duty shall be 21½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 10 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 30 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, 21½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 15 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 50 cents and not more than 80 cents per pound, 21½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 20 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 80 cents per pound, 21½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem.

"21. On cloths, knit fabrics, flannels, felts, and all fabrics of every description made wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty shall be 25 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 60 cents per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 60 cents and not more than 80 cents per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 80 cents and not more than $1 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 45 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than $1 and not more than $1.50 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 50 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than $1.50 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 55 per cent ad valorem.

"22. On blankets and flannels for underwear composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty shall be 23½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 20 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, 23½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 50 cents per pound, 23½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem.

"*Provided*, That on blankets over 3 yards in length the same duties shall be paid as on cloths.

"23. On ready-made clothing and articles of wearing apparel, knitted or woven, of every description, made up or manufactured wholly or in part and composed wholly or in part of wool, the rate of duty shall be as follows:

"If valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty shall be 25 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem.

"If valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 60 cents per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem.

"If valued at more than 60 cents and not more than 80 cents per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 45 per cent ad valorem.

"If valued at more than 80 cents and not more than $1 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 50 per cent ad valorem.

"If valued at more than $1 and not more than $1.50 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 55 per cent ad valorem.

"If valued at more than $1.50 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 60 per cent ad valorem.

"24. On all manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 50 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That if the component material of chief value in such manufactures is wood, paper, rubber, or any of the baser metals, the duty shall be 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem, and if the component material of chief value in such manufactures is silk, fur, precious or semiprecious stones, or gold, silver, or platinum, the duty shall be 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 55 per cent ad valorem.

"25. On handmade Aubusson, Axminster, oriental, and similar carpets and rugs, made wholly or in part of wool, the rate of duty shall be 50 per cent ad valorem; on all other carpets of every description, druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, mats, rugs for floors, screens, covers, hassocks, bedsides, art squares, and portions of carpets or carpeting, made wholly or in part of wool, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"26. Whenever, in any schedule of this act, the word 'wool' is used in connection with a manufactured article of which it is a component material, it shall be held to include wool or hair of the sheep, camel, goat, alpaca, or other animal, whether manufactured by the woolen, worsted, felt, or any other process."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, under the agreement there would be the privilege of offering two amendments from this side. I ask unanimous consent to modify the agreement so that the only amendment to be offered shall be the one offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] as a substitute, and that the 10 minutes that were allowed be added to my time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And the same on this side.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the agreement heretofore made be so modified that there shall be but one amendment, that offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] as a substitute for the schedule, and that 10 minutes additional time be granted either side.

Mr. MANN. With no time on amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. With no time on amendments. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to receive, without any very great wrenching of conscience, the vote of every gentleman in this Chamber who was a Member of the last Congress, on that side of the House. You have a record of voting first for a 20 per cent duty on wool. You carried that bill in this House and sent it to the Senate. It came back here, I believe, by the nearly unanimous vote of the Senate with a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem, which is just about the equivalent of the duties in my amendment.

That amendment was rejected in the House, went to a committee of conference, and the bill came back here by an agreement of the majority conferees carrying a duty of 29 per cent upon all wools. That conference report was agreed to by the affirmative vote, I think, of every gentleman on that side of the Chamber—substantially all of them. So that, unless your principles are changed overnight on this question, there should not be any serious objection on your side of the Chamber to adopting a rational duty on wool at about the figure that you voted only a year ago. The history of this amendment is, briefly, this: When we were considering the tariff question on wool four years ago it occurred to me that the sensible solution of the question was the pound duty on the actual wool content, whether it was wool in the grease, scoured wool, or wool in the cloth, and I took means to ascertain and get the evidence that this could be determined in whatever form the wool appeared by an analysis, and that it could be ascertained within 1 per cent, which, of course, would make no material difference. When the Tariff Board went to work upon this question I addressed them an open letter, calling attention to this suggestion of mine before the committee, and asked them to make an examination of that subject and report upon it. They did make the examination and they did report upon it, and the report showed a method of ascertaining exactly, as near as mathematics and science can ascertain anything, the quantity of wool not only in the grease but in scoured wool, and the amount of wool it took—clean content—to produce the scoured wool—that is, a pound of it—something of waste being lost in the operation, and so on to yarn and cloths and tops and manufactured articles of clothing, making a careful investigation and study and showing clearly in their report the facts on which these could be determined. Of course, in making tops there is a slight waste, and we took into consideration the amount of the waste and the value of the waste in comparison with a pound of wool, and so on all through the operation. In making clothing the waste of the manufactured cloth and the value of that waste, when resolved again into wool as it could be done, was considered. So there was the basis for a mathematical demonstration of the duty compensatory, after you had fixed the basic duty on the wool content in the grease—the duty compensatory rendered necessary because of the duty on the wool.

The great criticism made of Schedule K is that because in the arbitrary rates of compensatory duties that have been introduced into the tariff from time to time the duty on the wool in the cloth is much higher than it ought to be in order to compensate for the duty on the wool in the grease. These are not equally distributed, and so the schedule is inequitable, and there has grown up to be what has been called a concealed rate for the manufacturer, a concealed additional protection to the manufacturer when you come to put two, three, three and a half, and four times the rate for wool in the grease on the weight of the manufactured article, getting up to clothing as the final analysis. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does away with all these inequalities and puts a pound rate upon the wool in any form in which it appears. Then the question came as to what should be the rate on the wool, and, by the way, when we were making the McKinley bill we introduced the skirting clause, because it appeared before that committee that there was in various countries a custom of cutting off the tag, so to speak, and the wool on the leg and on the neck and on the head—trimming the fleece, skirting it, as it was called. In doing so they saved the freight rate on a great deal of dirt. These trimmings were afterwards scoured and brought into Great Britain in that shape. They saved money.

The skirting clause had the result of reducing the rate of duties on some wools and keeping it up on others, and so this inequality and this complaint arose about the skirting clause. Of course, the importers improved on the skirting business. Hence it came to pass that there was a lower protective duty on wool in the grease than the 11 cents a pound on first-class wools. This schedule will remove that difficulty and open up the wool markets of the world to the importers of wool in the United States and at the same time afford an equitable protective tariff, an equitable competitive rate, on the wools introduced into the United States. The board having reported this, in collaboration with my friend, Mr. Hill, of Connecticut, I went to work with the Tariff Board and had some sessions with them in order to determine several questions, some of which were questions of

difference between the gentleman and myself. The gentleman from Connecticut, as is very well known, has been in favor of an ad valorem rate on wool, if there was any. I was in favor of a protective duty. I was as much opposed to an ad valorem rate on wool, which could be determined accurately by the pound in specific duty, as I was to all ad valorem rates wherever a specific duty was practicable, and we had to fight that out. The gentleman from Connecticut thought that 15 cents a pound would be a sufficient protective duty on wool content all through the schedule, making proper allowances for the wool wasted in manufacture.

After a careful study of the Tariff Board report I came to the conclusion that 18 cents a pound on the wool schedule would be not only a fair measure of protection, but would be just the measure of protection, as near as we could calculate it, necessary on the wool content in order to make up the difference in the cost of production here and in the countries abroad. I am not saying that made up the exact difference in every case, no; but made up the difference in the very great proportion of the wool imported into the United States, and was a fair and equitable adjustment of the rate. Well, in the forming of the bill I got my way on this proposition both as to the duty on the wool content specific at 18 cents a pound instead of 15 cents a pound. The matter of figuring out the difference in the pound rate on wool, tops, wool in the cloth, and wool in the garment was a matter of figuring from the facts found in the Tariff Board's report. Those figures we asked the Tariff Board experts to sit down with their calculating machines and figure out, and after that had been done, even while it was being done, the gentleman from Connecticut, who works more hours in a day than I do—I need six or seven hours a day sleep every day, not like the President, who says he needs nine—I can get along very well with six or seven, and sometimes I thought the gentleman from Connecticut never slept; if he did, he must have slept with the experts of the Tariff Board—and he figured on all these propositions with them. We went over the figures very carefully after they were made, and I think that the figures in this proposed amendment are as nearly accurate on all of these different forms in which wool appears as they can be made. Now, in putting the duty on wool content there is one thing that stood out prominently in the present tariff on wool. The present tariff makes no difference whether the garment is made with 25 per cent of wool and 75 per cent of cotton or whether it is all wool and a yard wide. The rate of duty per pound of cloth is the same, and that is carried up into the garment and that creates a great inequality and a greater rate of protection on this class of goods, and that fact is responsible for the enormous equivalent ad valorem rate that we find in the Government report that you have been so free in exploiting to the people about the poor man's garment or the poor woman's garment. This proposed schedule strikes out all that protection on cotton found in the garment and leaves only the protection on the clean wool that is found in the manufactured article. I found it was a very easy process to burn out by acids any vegetable fiber that appeared, carbonizing the vegetable content and easily getting at the amount of clean wool content and the weight of it. That was easily found. When I found the proper weight for the proper duty per pound on the 18-cent basis, why, the problem was solved, and so easily—not easily, there was a good deal of work—we arranged the rate according to the Tariff Board's report, and we found ample warrant in the report of the Tariff Board to make up this schedule of duty on wool content in everything that should be covered by the protection of a tariff duty on the articles in Schedule K.

Having done that the question then was, What duty was necessary to make up the difference in the cost of conversion of wool into the manufactured article all along the line? There was no more question then of an inequitable rate on wool; it was a question of what duty was necessary on the manufacturing of wool to make up the difference in the cost here and abroad, and that was most carefully figured on the statements found in the report of the Tariff Board, and they are represented here in this amendment. Now, I want to say—because some of you gentlemen may not discover it—that in the original schedule as introduced two years ago the duty on tops was 20 cents a pound for the wool used in making tops, as there was a waste of 10 per cent that was to be accounted for. Twenty cents a pound on tops and 5 per cent for the conversion cost. I thought that was sufficient at that time. I have changed my mind 5 per cent from an examination of the subject. I find that the 5 per cent would be sufficient for tops at 70 cents per pound. I find it would not be sufficient for tops at 40 cents a pound.

The differential of 5 per cent was not enough. It does not make up the difference in the cost of the conversion on the lower price of tops, and so it is changed in this bill, and instead of 5 per cent it is 10 per cent, which does make up the difference in the cost of conversion. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] put a higher duty on tops, and, of course, making wool free, there is no necessity of any compensatory duty and that is left out. But the duty on conversion of wool into tops he fixed at 15 per cent instead of 10, 50 per cent higher than in this amendment offered by me. I believe, and I have studied the subject of tops a good deal since my attention was called to it, that the 10 per cent duty is a fair, equitable provision for making up the difference in the cost of making tops.

The next change, and the only other change made in the bill since it was presented two years or a year ago, is that in paragraph 19, as it is numbered in the amendment—of course, we will change these numbers when you put this schedule into the bill—is that the duty on yarn of that class is 8 per cent. We raised it to 10 per cent to make it correspond to the duty on wool tops, or combed wool. Otherwise the amendment is exactly as it was when I offered it in the House before. Now, if you go through these various items in this bill you will find that the duties for the conversion of articles vary from the Underwood bill. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, the duty is 21½ cents per pound, the exact duty on the contents required in making the pound of yarn compensatory, and then 10 per cent——

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I can not unless I can be allowed more time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like the gentleman to state what tax he has put on washed wool? I do not find any tax in his bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York five minutes more.

Mr. PAYNE. Class 2, in washed wool——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The same pound tax is on wool in the grease. I do not find it in the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. All wool, until you get up to scoured wool, is wool in the grease, and bears 18 cents per pound.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The bill does not read that way.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is mistaken. I can not devote my five minutes to something that the gentleman will find when he reads the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will tell you about it when I come to that.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course you will make mistakes in regard to it and repeat some that you have been making.

In this amendment the conversion duty on yarn in the lower numbers is 10 per cent on those not over 30 cents a pound against his 20 per cent; is 15 per cent on those between 30 and 50 cents in value against his 20; 20 per cent on those from 50 to 80, the same as in the Underwood bill; and there is an increase in my amendment from 20 to 25 per cent on higher-priced yarns. And all along through this schedule you will find we have taken care of the poor people's yarn, the poor people's clothing, by reducing the duties. We need not have done it. We might have gone through with a small basket duty on the whole business, as did the chairman, but we were trying to separate and deal carefully with the cheaper goods, whether they were bought by poor or rich anywhere in the United States. But when they go up in the higher-priced cloths or higher-priced clothing, our duty on the cost of conversion was greater than offered in the bill of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. And so it runs all the way through.

Why, we make as fine cloths in this country as they do anywhere in the world, and we make as fine clothing in this country as they do anywhere in the world. Whatever condemnation may have been meted out to Schedule K in its present form, and I have indulged in my share of it, this can be said of it, that under it the wool industry, notwithstanding the conditions have changed so much, has been keeping on a footing in this country, and the woolen manufacturing industry has gone forward with rapid strides, until we are making as good goods as they do anywhere in the civilized world. Clothing we make a little better.

Now, I have not the time to go into these details, which other gentlemen, perhaps, want to state. My simple object was to explain the bill. But there is another item to which I must refer. There has been a duty on wool that is made into carpets. We prescribe a duty of 7 cents a pound, which was the old rate. It was put there because some of these carpet wools were combed. Some of them were used in making the coarser grades,

and they had, to put on a duty so as to preserve the duty on other forms and classes of wool.

We have relieved that situation, and provided that whenever any manufacturer of carpets has proven to the Treasury Department that he has used the third class of wool he has imported in the manufacture of carpets he can get a rebate of 99 per cent of the duty he has paid. In other words, under this substitute schedule carpet wools are free of duty to the carpet manufacturers of the United States.

I have not the time to go into it fully in the limited allotment given to me, but if you will take time, gentlemen, to compare the difference in rates in the manufacture of carpets all through this substitute bill, you will find that the rates in this bill are only equal to the Underwood rates on the very highest grades of carpets, while on the other grades they are as low as those of the Underwood bill or many of them lower.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield to me for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. For a question.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] yield to me time for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] state whether this substitute of his for Schedule K has been prepared in conformity with the Tariff Board's report?

Mr. PAYNE. Absolutely, as near as human brains can do it, under the condition that the brains belong to the gentleman from Connecticut and myself; absolutely, as near as we could get it. If I had more time I could go into that more fully.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is extended three minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, the ad valorems on carpets, on the cheaper grades, run in this substitute from 15 to 20 per cent. In the Underwood bill they are 30 per cent. On the cheaper grades of blankets our duty is 20 per cent as against his 25 per cent. On the less expensive garments we propose a duty of 25 per cent instead of a duty of 30 per cent.

Now, I want to say, in conclusion, that in my judgment the principles of this substitute bill will yet be written into a tariff law. [Applause on the Republican side.] A sensible, reasonable duty on wool, on the wool content, will be a feature of the next protective bill that is made up and put on the statute books. It is so reasonable and so sensible that if you gentlemen on that side ever again revise the tariff and come to the rescue of the sheep as well as the goats of the country [laughter], you will put it there. You will, instead of giving 20 per cent on goat hair—which is wool—give a duty of 18 cents a pound upon goat hair, as is provided for in this substitute.

Why, gentlemen, extend your horizon so that it will take in something besides 3,000,000 goats, so that it will include 50,000,000 sheep in this country, and then, instead of a duty of 20 per cent, put a duty of 18 cents a pound on it, and when you go to bed and sleep over it you will pat yourselves on the back because of the fact that, notwithstanding the idea originated on this side of the House, you have solved the question of a wool tariff in this country and have got the proper basis, which, carried out, gives no more duty on wool content per pound in the wool in the manufactured article than it does on wool in the grease.

Confident that this will go into a tariff bill in the near future, I am reconciled to whatever you do in the Underwood bill on any subject. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it was my purpose to have offered an amendment directed to the question of raw wool, providing for a duty upon wool in conformity with the provisions of that item in the new Payne wool bill which is to be offered as a substitute for Schedule K in the Underwood bill. I desired to do that to bring into sharp issue the proposition that direct protection should be given to the producer in the field and on the farm as well as to all other producers of the country. I am, however, more than satisfied to bring that question in issue in connection with the support of Schedule K as now prepared and introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], with which I am in full accord. That represents the first concrete example of a revision of the tariff upon scientific principles based upon an impartial gathering of the facts involved in the schedule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has uttered in what to me is prophetic vision the statement that the future tariffs of this country will be made in accordance with the adoption of that principle. Indeed, so firmly do I believe in that statement that I would be willing to suggest to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that if he will change this bill upon the sugar schedule so as to provide that the free provision shall not take effect until four years from the adoption of the measure instead of three I am willing to stake my political future upon the assertion that sugar would not be put upon the free list.

There are certain conditions in our industrial situation which all thoughtful and patriotic citizens regret. We have an era of very great and universal prosperity, high prices, and good times, but the real difficulty is in an inequitable division of the profits of industry, whether it be the industry of the farm or of the factory, whether it be the industry that brings forth the product of the brain or of labor. What this country most needs, in my humble judgment, is a revision of the middleman downward. There are too many hangers-on, too many leeches upon industry, too great overhead charges, too much watered stock, purely fictitious capitalization, upon which dividends are exacted.

The actual producer is not receiving too much for his products. This schedule that we are now considering affords one of the very best possible illustrations of this great truth. It is complained that prices are high upon food products. Prices are high upon the other necessaries of life. What proportion of what the consumer pays for food products ever filters through to the original producer of those products? Not over 50 per cent of every dollar that is paid for the products of the farm by the consumer ever reaches to the original producer, the farmer.

And not to exceed 20 per cent of the 50 per cent, or 10 per cent of the whole, is profit to the farmer. Our Democratic friends would cure the high cost of the farmers' products to the consumer by taking off this 10 per cent that the industrious farmer now gets as profit. Take this wool schedule, K. How much that a man pays for an average suit of clothes goes to the producer of those clothes? Among the other valuable facts which our Tariff Board collected they cited the average or representative suit of clothes to be retailed at $23. How much profit is there in that production, and where did it go? The cost to grow the wool was shown to be $1.55. The farmer was paid therefor $2.23, or a profit to the farmer of 68 cents. The profit to the man who made the cloth, without going into the items entering into it, is 23 cents. The profit to the manufacturer of the garments is $1.07. Or, in other words, the total profit that goes to the men who really produce the wool and the cloth and the garment is $1.98, less than $2. You follow it along, and the wholesaler gets $1.11 and the retailer $6.50, making up the $23 in connection with the items of labor entering into the various stages of production. We should all concede, if we study this question, that the producer, whether he be the farmer who grows the wool and makes the profit of 68 cents, or whether it be the man who makes the cloth, who has a profit of 23 cents, or the man who manufactures the cloth, with a profit of $1.07, is not unreasonably paid for his important services. The middleman comes in between and absorbs all the rest of the profit.

Now, the remedy of our Democratic brethren for the unequal distribution of the profits of industry is to cut down prices. That is the whole argument; that is the whole basis for this revision—cut down prices. What are prices? Why, prices are synonymous with profits, or they go parallel with profits. You can not cut down the prices a man receives for his labor or for his article of production without cutting down his profit. The Democratic proposition is to cut down the profit, while the Republican proposition is to maintain the profit and undertake in a statesmanlike way the solution of the great problems of how to enforce an equitable division of profits, how to do away with the overhead charges, which are unreasonable; how to prevent watered stocks and paying dividends upon them. In this era of marvelous prosperity—and it is the greatest we have ever had, and I do not speak in purely political language—we produced last year upon the farms and in the factories the greatest production ever in the history of the country. We exported our

greatest export trade in 1912. We had a liberal exchange with other countries, and imported the largest imports ever in the history of the country. But the balance of our foreign trade was upon the right side—$551,000,000 to our advantage—and being in our favor, we have been able to maintain our gold balances in our business relations with other nations. As a result we have reached a high-water mark of gold accumulations in the Treasury. The gold deposits in the United States Treasury at the present moment—I inquired a few days ago—is $1,255,000,000; and the balance of this trade with foreign countries in our favor is one element which makes certain we can maintain this large gold reserve in our favor.

For a condition of unfair division of the profits of industry, there being trouble over a proper division of the golden eggs, the Democratic remedy is to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. If there are no profits to divide, we will have no dispute over the division of profits.

I concede that it is a difficult task to apportion tariff duties even when you are guided by sound principles. Protective duties are designed primarily for infant industries, but as industries become strong the avarice and selfishness of men constrain them to contend for higher, if not for prohibitive, rates. They invent ingenious distinctions as a basis for favoring their particular industry at the expense of others. The manufacturer's stock argument is that he must have his raw material free. This argument is raw enough to entitle it to go on the free list. The truth is that raw material is purely a relative term. There is no such thing in the abstract as raw material, except material in its natural form, untouched by the hand of man. The moment you apply to it American labor, that moment it enters into some form of industry, and under our protective system is entitled to consideration in connection with a protective-tariff measure. That which is the finished product of one producer becomes the raw material of the next. Hay, corn, the steer, meat, the hide, leather, shoes, saddles, and harness each in turn is the raw material and the finished product of the farmer, the packer, the tanner, and the manufacturer of leather goods. No one is more entitled to direct protective consideration than the other.

The New England manufacturer has worked this artificial distinction between finished products and raw materials into an exact science. Apparently, raw material is whatever New England has to buy and finished product whatever New England has to sell. When the raw-material argument is not persuasive it is suggested that the desired materials are by-products, and for that reason should have no share of protection. When the Payne Act was being framed it was claimed by boot and shoe manufacturers that hides were a by-product of steers and for that reason should go on the free list. It costs American labor and capital to produce the hide as well as the meat of a steer. It does not appear why one should be favored and the other disfavored. The tariff hog has developed as a by-product of the protective system. He has done more harm to the cause of rational protection than all its enemies.

Under a scientific revision of the tariff American products should be protected to the extent of the difference in cost of production here and in foreign countries, and this measure of protection must be apportioned to all American industries with an absolutely even hand. The Payne Act, with the exception of two or three schedules, was a substantial downward revision of rates and is a much better tariff act than the majority of the people have yet discovered.

Now, in conclusion, I want again to say that, in my humble judgment, the people of this country—and it is a protective country, and always will be—will not be satisfied with this present crazy-quilt revision, made upon no principle, perfectly blind as to the cost of production at home or abroad, or any difference between them, measuring a little sop to an industry here and to another there, shutting off the farmer on his product of wool but placing a protection upon the farmer who produces Angora goats. Why, this sort of a revision is a farce, and all with the avowed purpose of cutting down profits upon industry. Low prices have always been synonymous with hard times; high prices have always been associated with good times. You can not cut down prices and profits without destroying the very basis of our industries.

And so we are quite content in this schedule to put forth in concrete form our belief as to what is the proper way to revise the tariff, with a proper regard for the difference in the cost of production here and elsewhere, and measuring out to every industry, whether it is on the farm or whether it is in the factory, a direct protection against the cheap labor and cheaper producing conditions in other countries, maintaining a higher market for Americans, maintaining a profit for all men who labor with their hands and brain to produce greater wealth for the entire country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, whatever reported differences there may be between the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and myself with regard to the amendment that he has offered were fully discussed in the Republican conference, and, like my distinguished friend, the political soldier from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I will be as good a man in the ranks as he is and not discuss the matter here for the benefit of our Democratic friends.

I am pleased that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] has opened up the question of the difference in cost between the producer and the consumer. He has also told us something about the middleman. That gives me an opportunity to say one thing that is very seldom said in this debate, and is never understood apparently, on the other side in the discusion of the tariff question. It relates to the price of clothing. Some time ago I secured the raw material for a suit of clothes, the cost of which in cloth was $7.87½. The cloth was made in the United States in a woolen mill in Rhode Island. All the tariff for which the Payne bill was responsible was in that $7.87½. The woolgrower had received the benefit of 33 cents per pound on the scoured wool, and the sorter of the wool had been protected by a compensatory rate against the cheaper sorter wages in foreign countries. The man who scoured the wool had been protected against the cheap scouring wages abroad, and the man who carded the wool, and who combed the wool, and who changed the wool into yarn, and who dyed it and wove the cloth, and every one of the particular stages in the process of turning the wool into cloth, had been protected under the Payne bill by what are here denounced as compensatory duties. That is to say, in each stage of the development of the raw wool up to the cloth stage the separate occupations had been provided for, and there had been a measure of protection afforded to the workmen in the United States, or even to the manufacturers, if you please, against the cheaper foreign competition. Now, all that under the Payne bill had been provided for, covered, and put behind in the cost of the cloth, which was $7.87½.

I took that cloth to a merchant tailor, who told me it was too good to have been made in the United States, and who insisted that it must have been an imported article. I disabused his mind of that and told him to make that piece of cloth into a suit and send me the bill. His bill for making up that $7.87½ worth of cloth was $30, and when I asked him to analyze the bill he gave me these details: The wages paid to pieceworkers on coat, vest, and trousers was $12.50. This first labor cost therefore was more than the original cost of the cloth, which covered every one of the "iniquitous features" of the Payne tariff law. The wages paid to weekly and yearly workers was $6.50—all beyond the duties of the Payne tariff law. Paid for material, trimmings, and so forth, $4.50. There may have been some little duty upon those trimmings, which, of course, were separate from the 3½ yards of cloth. The gross profit to the merchant tailor was $6.50—a total of $30 for making up $7.87½ worth of cloth. All "the crime" of the Payne bill was in the $7.87½ and the middlemen, from the woolgrower, who is covered in the $7.87½, to Mr. Moore, who bought that suit of clothes and paid for it, was absorbed by the labor cost employed in the making of that suit—seamstresses and cutters and others—and the profit to the merchant tailor was $6.50, and I assume that a large proportion of the $6.50 of profit had gone into rent of store, had gone into advertising in the newspapers, had gone into delivery service, and light, and furnishings, and the other incidentals of conducting a merchant-tailoring establishment. I have described the processes not understood or considered by those who tirade against the so-called compensatory duties, and I have chided my distinguished friend from Texas for protecting "the special interests" in his State, the Angora goat, because whether he now speaks in the interests of the great public or whether he still speaks in behalf of "the special interests," it does appear in the Underwood bill that these "offensive" Payne methods, from production to consumption, have been followed literally and absolutely by him.

"Hair of the Angora goat," and so forth, is made dutiable at 20 per cent ad valorem. First, let us consider the hair of the Angora goat in the raw, as it comes from the farm. The first step is to protect the raisers of the Angora goat to the extent of 20 per cent ad valorem.

The second step in this compensatory process in the Underwood tariff bill is 25 per cent ad valorem on "tops made from the hair of the Angora goat." Put 20 per cent ad valorem with 25 per cent ad valorem, and you have got 45 per cent ad valorem up to the stage of the tops that come from the hair of the Angora goat.

"Yarns made of the hair of the Angora goat," 30 per cent ad valorem. That is the third stage. Add that to the 45 per cent ad valorem, and you have got 75 per cent ad valorem as you proceed in your stages of production and manufacture.

"Cloth and all manufactures of every description made of the hair of the Angora goat," fourth stage. Take your 40 per cent protection compensatory on "Cloth and all manufactures of every description made of the hair of the Angora goat," and add that to the 75 per cent ad valorem, and you have got 115 per cent protection thus far to the Angora goat.

And, lastly, on "Plushes, velvets, and all other pile fabrics * * * made wholly or partly of the hair of the Angora goat," 50 per cent ad valorem is the duty imposed by the Underwood bill. Add that to the 115 per cent already indicated, and you have got 165 per cent protection in all to the Angora goat of Texas, while you take off all protection from the wool of sheep and other products of the great industries of the North. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, no schedule in this bill has been so unjustly and so cruelly and so brutally treated as this Schedule K. No schedule has been so misrepresented or used as a vehicle of abuse and opposition as has this schedule. I do not care whether we may differ slightly on this side among ourselves—whether we conform literally to the Tariff Board or not—I still believe that we have a right to insist that we have full information as to what we are doing before we plunge one billion and a half of capital into a condition of chaos, before we turn out of employment half a million operatives engaged in the woolen mills of this country.

President Taft himself, who made a speech at Winona, Minn.—and that was a sweet morsel in the mouths of third-party Representatives and Democratic Representatives alike—was led to say, in the veto message sending back the Underwood-La Follette bill, that it was too dangerous a proposition to overthhrow the vast industries and unsettle conditions, as it would.

I realize how futile it would be to undertake to amend the schedule as brought in by the Committee on Ways and Means. I have been in consultation with some of the practical men in the business, who know something about the business. I have asked them whether it would be wise to undertake to amend this bill. I have spoken with some of them who are in consultation with their colleagues, who are greatly concerned throughout this whole country over the question, and their answer has been, "No; it would be useless to attempt to amend that bill. To amend a single paragraph would be ineffectual."

"No single amendment to the wool schedule would avert disaster and conserve the industry," says one of the best informed men on this question, one of the men who knows best what he is talking about. And the only suggestion he and his friends make is that it would help the industry, with the stock it now has on hand, if the fatal day for the passage of the bill, or at least the making of it effective, would be postponed until December 1.

Gentlemen think sometimes it is a horribly unfair proposition for one to stand on this floor representing the man who has the industry and the courage to start great enterprises. When he does that he becomes the spokesman of the "special interests." I have in my hand now a letter which comes from my city——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. MOORE. I have in my hand a letter from a gentleman of my city who came up from Virginia not long ago, ambitious to start in an enterprise. He did start a woolen mill, which is now fairly under way. He writes:

SHEPPERD MANUFACTURING CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 30, 1913.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: I should be most pleased if you would send us a copy of section "K" of the pending tariff bill. My understanding of the matter is that this tariff bill will take effect from its passage. The bill in itself is bad enough, but to have the bill take effect immediately will put the American manufacturers in a most awkward position.

We have bought raw material at the existing prices, and, as you are aware, the demands for labor have increased 10 to 15 per cent in the last six months. We are forced to sell our goods on the basis of present prices, and when the tariff bill takes effect, reducing the prices of merchandise, we will be forced to sacrifice the merchandise, as the tariff bill will not give us an opportunity to dispose of the merchandise on hand. If the date for this bill to become effective should be postponed until such time as would enable the American manufacturer to dispose of the merchandise he has on hand, he could at least make an effort to adjust matters to meet the future conditions. To show you the ill effect of the bill now pending, we are in receipt of a letter from a large customer, to whom we sold 3,000 yards of dress goods, in which he demands that unless we will guarantee to protect him against any reduction in the cost of merchandise by reason of the passage of the tariff bill that we could cancel his order. These goods are all made and are in the stockroom ready to be shipped June 15. The cancellation of a large number of orders on hand will put the American manufacturers in a very bad position financially.

The small manufacturer, like ourselves, having a total output of only one-half a million yards a year, will find himself up against a desperate proposition. I am sorry to add to your already heavy burden by writing you as above.

With sincere thanks for your efforts in behalf of the American manufacturer, and with very best wishes, I am,

Very truly, yours,

SHEPPERD MANUFACTURING CO.,
GWYNN T. SHEPPERD, *President.*

I have a letter here from an importer. Ordinarily I look upon letters from importers with a slight degree of suspicion. They may be regarded as the middle men, concerning whom complaint is made. But here is one who tells me that this morning he received a telegram from one of his Turkish correspondents in which he quotes a standard grade of wool for 27 cents. This is 3¾ cents per pound advance, or more than one-half of the duty. I read:

PHILADELPHIA, *April 25, 1913.*

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: It may interest you to know how free wool is being received by the foreigner.

This morning we received a cablegram from one of our Turkish correspondents in which he quotes for a certain standard grade of wool 27 cents. The price we paid him last year at this time was 23¼ cents. This is 3¾ cents per pound advance, or more than one-half of the duty.

Yesterday we received advices from another correspondent, and the minimum price he named for the new season's wool is 15 per cent higher than last year, or 4 cents per pound advance.

You will see already who is going to get the benefit of the abolition of the duty. These are only two instances; there are many others that could be given.

Recently Mr. Wilson is reported to have said that the prices of American wools and foreign wools were already on a level. Of course they are. The foreigner is going to grab at least one-half, if not two-thirds, of the duty, and the American woolgrower is going to lose the rest, if not more. But we do not see how this tends to diminish the cost of living.

Yours, faithfully,

TATTERSFIELD CO.,
B. TATTERSFIELD, *President.*

This importer sees where the duty will go. It will go to the foreign raiser of wool, and the American raiser of wool will be the loser.

Last night my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], in answer to my question, would not declare that there was a trust in the cotton trade. When I asked him about the wool trade he said he had not made the declaration that there was a trust in the wool trade, but he had heard of a wool trust. I am no spokesman for any wool trust nor for any special interest in the woolen industry, but I have in my hand a statement which illustrates just how far our friends on the other side are accurate as to their information. It is said there is a woolen trust; that it is known as the American Woolen Co. The total number of woolen and worsted mills in the United States, by the census of 1909, is 913. Of these only 36 are controlled by the American Woolen Co.

The total capitalization employed in the industry is $415,465,000, while the capitalization of the American Woolen Co. is $60,000,000. The annual value of the products of the mills of the United States is $419,826,000, and the total annual value of the products of the American Woolen Co. is $51,000,000. This incubus, this octopus, this American Woolen Co., therefore controls only one-eighth part of the wool industry of the United States. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] could not answer last night except affirmatively that there is such competition in the wool trade in the United States, and there is such competition in the cotton trade, that the prices are kept down, and that they are to-day as low to the consumer as they will ever be.

Mr. Chairman, just one word about this report. Schedule K is perhaps the greatest piece of guesswork in the Underwood bill. It is patchwork from beginning to end, unscientific, unpatriotic, calculated to destroy a great industry.

As to raw wool, I have some statistics here which I think are of great value in the consideration of this question. Raw wool is the farmers' proposition. It is not the manufacturers' proposition. I assume it would not hurt the manufacturer if raw wool were made free; but I have been consistent for a duty

on raw wool, because I want a duty on finished articles, and I want to provide true protection all along the line, and have voted so to do, even to the extent that I did not vote for the reciprocity bill, and thus differed from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], in that I differed with my President. Take the record as it is set forth in the schedules and as it appears in the Democratic tariff handbook. Do they propose to raise revenue by reducing duties? Let us see. Let us understand their process of reasoning.

Under the Payne bill the imports of raw wool in 1910 were $47,687,293; in 1911, $29,572,259, a fluctuation of nearly one-half. Yet we are changing from specific to ad valorem duties and still expect to raise a specific amount of income. In 1912 the importations of raw wool were $33,141,408, a vast difference from 1910, showing the difficulty of estimating revenue on the ad valorem basis. But under ad valorem rates we are going to get what we are going to get. Now, how does the committee adjust this in its report?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. MOORE. The original Underwood bill had a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on raw wool. It estimated imports of the value of $66,991,000 upon which to collect the duty. The bill that was vetoed by the President—the so-called Underwood-La Follette bill—increased the duty to 29 per cent ad valorem; but still the committee expected to bring in $60,000,000 worth of goods. In your original committee bill—the one that was rejected by President Wilson—the committee proposed, as a sop to the farmers, to give them 15 per cent, a vast reduction from the two former bills, but it was still estimated that imports would amount to $60,000,000. A variety of duties but no change in imports. And when the committee came to give to the common people the "great boon" of free wool, regardless of the rights, interest, and welfare of the farmer and of the producers of the country, when they brought in the last bill—the one we are now discussing—then, with free wool, by some process of scientific or mental reasoning which I can not comprehend, with this great inducement to the foreigners to bring in their wool free of duty, they reduced the value of expected imports from $66,000,000, which they estimated under the 20 per cent ad valorem basis, to $33,000,000 free. How they are going to accomplish this the Lord only knows. I leave it to some of their statisticians to divine. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I append these interesting facts in tabular form so that those who wish to solve the riddle may do so:

Raw wool imports and effect of the various Democratic rates on imported raw wool.

Raw wool.	Rate of duty.	Value of imports.
Actual imports, years ending June 30:	*Per ct.*	
1910		$47,687,293
1911		29,572,259
1912		33,141,408
Democratic rates and estimates for a 12-months period:		
House bill (62d Congress)	20	66,991,000
Vetoed bill (62d Congress)	29	60,000,000
Committee bill (63d Congress)	15	60,000,000
Reported bill (63d Congress)	Free.	33,309,000

NOTE.—The above estimates are obtained from the Democratic reports and Tariff Handbook of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will ask to be notified when I have consumed 15 minutes. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, Schedule K has been the storm center of tariff revision. The people of our country are aware to-day that the schedule of wool and woolens contains the most extraordinary multiplication of duties of any one of the schedules of the existing law. They are aware that Schedule K imposes a greater hardship upon the consuming public of our country than any one of the 14 schedules of the tariff. Schedule K has been the Jonah of the Republican Party. If they had been able to cast it overboard four years ago it is just possible that their ship of state might be still afloat riding right side up, but they failed to revise Schedule K and that duty was immediately intrusted by the people of the United States to the Democratic Party.

Now, our bill has taken all duty off raw wool and has reduced the duty on woolen goods from an average ad valorem of 94 per cent which, in effect, really was often from 150 to 200 per cent, down to a reasonable basis of 35 per cent ad valorem.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the distinguished former chairman of the committee, has twitted us with the fact that in the last Congress our revision of Schedule K carried a 20 per cent duty upon raw wool, and that our bill to-day places raw wool on the free list. But I maintain that there is no inconsistency in this, and that the record of the Democratic Party upon the subject of a tax upon raw wool is absolutely consistent and clear for decades in the past. For example, the Mills bill of 1888 placed raw wool on the free list. The Springer bill of 1892 did likewise. The Wilson law of 1894 placed raw wool on the free list, and when we came to the Underwood bill in the last Congress we were confronted by a totally different situation. Then we were proceeding to revise the tariff schedule by schedule, and our friends over on the other side of the aisle here were just waiting for us to bring in a schedule showing a grave loss of revenue in order to charge us with incapacity to manage the affairs of the Government. So when we reported our bill in the last Congress to the caucus, carrying 20 per cent on raw wool, that bill was adopted by the caucus after an ardent debate, but concurrently with the adoption of the bill came the adoption of a resolution by the caucus stating that Republican extravagance in the management of the Government required us to raise revenue even on the necessaries of life like raw wool, and so our 20 per cent rate on that commodity at that time was no abandonment of Democratic principles. [Applause on the Democrtaic side.]

So my friends will see that our record is absolutely straight and consistent from beginning to end in relation to raw wool.

Now, I consider that the placing of raw wool on the free list as the greatest achievement of this Democratic revision of the tariff. I do so for two reasons—one economic, and the other political.

As to the economic necessity for free raw wool, every other civilized country of the world, except Russia and our own, admits wool free of duty. To anybody who has studied the intricacies of the wool and woolen duties in the Payne law it will at once become clear that a tax laid on the raw material at 45 per cent ad valorem, as it is in the present law, may be twice the original amount of 45 per cent ad valorem when that tax reaches back to the consumer. That is so because in the processes of manufacture of raw wool into tops and tops into yarn and yarn into cloth and cloth into woolen clothing, each successive manufacturer makes an addition to the amount originally paid in duties on the raw wool to represent his profit and his rate of interest upon his increased capital. So that when the tax falls upon the back of the unhappy consumer it is out of all proportion greater than the tax which was originally laid on the raw wool itself.

As to the sheep-raising industry, of course I come from a city district and my opponents may maintain that I am not qualified to speak about the farmer's end of this argument. But I have given several years' study to the question of wool duties and their supposed effect on the sheep-raising industry, and I have come to the conclusion that no amount of tariff protection is ever going to save sheep farming for wool as an industry in the United States.

A century ago the green hills of Massachusetts were covered with sheep, and the pleasant valleys in my own State of New York had great flocks of sheep; but little by little sheep raising has been crowded away from the more thickly settled States until it has mostly taken refuge in the semiarid lands of the Rocky Mountains. Higher forms of agriculture are everywhere making the land more valuable and making it impossible to raise sheep at a profit. The consequence is that this frontier industry, in order to maintain its existence in our country during any considerable period of time, will have to erect around the grazing lands where the sheep are fed, a wall to keep out all settlers and all improvements and all advances in agriculture.

It so happens to-day as a matter of practical interest, when the farmers are complaining that we are going to hurt them by reducing the duties upon the wool, that there is a great shortage in wool all over the European countries, and there has been such a competition in the purchase of wool in those countries that wool is selling for as high a price abroad as it is in the United States at the present moment. A curious result of that is that within the last few weeks we have actually exported some 150 bales of Ohio wool to Bradford, England, to be used in the woolen mills there. Of course, supposed protection to wool has created a demand for that protection among

the farmers, and if gentlemen upon this floor who represent States in which wool is produced desire to go back and scare the farmers in those States by inducing them to believe that sheep raising will be unprofitable when wool goes on the free list, it may create some temporary depression of the wool market. In that way they may succeed in frightening some unthinking farmers; but the farmers—wool producers—who have studied the question to-day realize what I think all of us in this Chamber must realize, that the sheep raising of the future in our country is going to be and is to-day increasingly profitable for the mutton end of the business, and that woolgrowing is to become increasingly profitable only as a by-product of sheep raising in the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Just a few words, Mr. Chairman, about the political aspects of this matter. I regard the doctrine of free wool as the trumpet call in the battle against protection. Those who have ever studied our tariff history are aware that the greatest force for keeping a protective tariff on the statute books has been the alliance between the woolgrowers and the woolen manufacturers. This alliance, established 40 years ago, has, with one brief interval, to this very day kept upon our statute books rates of duty running up to 150 and even 200 per cent upon woolen clothing. The way they were able to do that was because the woolen manufacturing States of the East by allying themselves in Congress with the woolgrowing States of the West were able to secure from the gentlemen representing the sheep-growing districts votes enough to establish and maintain upon our statute books the sky-high rates upon woolens. That is the alliance with which we have been doing battle. That is the alliance which, according to the statement of the last President of the United States, was too strong for the Republican Party. President Taft himself was in favor of revising downward Schedule K, and I have no doubt that my esteemed and distinguished colleague, the former chairman of this committee [Mr. PAYNE] was also in favor of a downward revision of Schedule K, just as I believe a number of gentlemen on that side of the House were. But it was of no avail. The President in his Winona speech admitted the iniquities of Schedule K, and solemnly said that this historical alliance between the woolgrowers and the woolen makers was too strong for the Republican Party and was able to prevent them from revising downward Schedule K. This alliance exists to-day. It is not powerful in Democratic councils, because our bill shows what we think of it. They have sent their lobbyists down here to Congress week in and week out, and they have gone home convinced at last that the representatives of the people, instead of the representatives of the interests were now writing a tariff bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The woolen manufacturers, who would unquestionably be benefited by free wool, have not asked us to give them free wool. There is not a single one of them in the record of the hearings before the committee who came and asked us for that which no doubt they most ardently desired. The reason why they did not was because this alliance still exists to-day, and it is the duty of the Democratic Party to break that alliance, and to do that we must put wool on the free list.

Mr. Chairman, just a few words, in conclusion, about the benefit of free wool to the consumer. Our friends on the other side like to make fun of the amount of duties upon wool that is transmuted into cloth. I have already endeavored to show them that the amount which the man who buys the cloth has to pay by reason of the wool duties is far in excess of the nominal amount of those duties. Of course with free wool a man who buys a custom-made suit of clothes for $45 or $50 is not going to get his clothes appreciably cheaper, because tailoring is one of the chief expenses in that style of garment. He may get better clothes, he may get Scotch or Saxony cloths, which are now sometimes beyond his reach; but the man who buys the cheap suit of clothes, where the amount paid for the raw wool is proportionately more important, is going to get his suit under our 35 per cent duty appreciably cheaper. He not only is going to get his suit of clothes cheaper, but he is going to get a suit made out of real wool instead of a suit made out of shoddy or cotton substitute. He is going to feel the difference by the beneficial effect of placing raw wool upon the free list.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I can not. After this when a man buys an $8 or a $10 suit of clothes in our country he will be sure that that suit has real wool in it and that the first time he goes out in the rain the suit will not wilt and later stiffen up like a piece of old stovepipe. The people of our country have been absolutely excluded from the use of cheap real woolen clothes, from the use of cheap real woolen blankets, from the use of good cheap woolen fabrics and cheap women's dress goods by the law that is now on the statute books, and absolute relief from that situation is what the placing upon the free list of raw wool means to the consuming public of the United States. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have listened with considerable interest to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has said about wool. In reply to him as to the rate of duty being excessive and the consumer paying that excessive duty in this country, and so on—that is the substance of his argument—I want to refer to the Tariff Board report. I rely upon that as being correct, or practically so. The Tariff Board, after an exhaustive report upon the cost of the production of wool in this country and abroad, says that in South America the cost of the production of wool is from 4 to 5 cents per pound, after crediting up to the flock all the moneys received from the sale of lambs, for mutton, and otherwise, so that when South American wool comes on the market of the United States it comes here at a cost to the South American woolgrower of from 4 to 5 cents per pound for production.

Adding to that the freight, the cost of freight is about a cent a pound from South America to the New England States. That report shows when going to Australia, where an exhaustive report was made, that the average wool coming from Australia, the wool coming from the most favorably situated ranches in Australia, after crediting up to the flock moneys received from the sale of sheep and lambs, there is no cost against the wool at all, except from some of the most remote ranches in Australia there is a cost against the wool, but after an exhaustive investigation in the United States, where the experts called upon 12,000 farmers situated in 173 counties in 19 States of the Union, they show there is a cost levied against wool of the first class of 12 cents a pound after crediting up to the flock the moneys received from the sale of sheep and lambs for mutton; and on all wool from the whole United States, wools of the first class and of the second class and third class, 9½ cents per pound and as high as 19 cents a pound for Ohio wool. Now, by placing wool upon the free list when the western farmer from the mountain States comes on the market to the woolen mills of this country (the only market he has in the world for his wool), he goes there with a charge of 12 cents a pound, against no cost at all from the Australian wool, where the heft of our importations of wool to this country come from. The Tariff Board report has pointed out the fact that the freight on wool from the mountain States is 1½ to 2 cents a pound to the woolen mills of this country.

So that when the Australian and the western farmer go with their wool to the markets of the United States, the farmer of the United States goes there with the charge of 14 cents, including freight, with only 2 cents against Australian wool. The duty on that class of wool to-day is 11 cents per pound. Explain to me, then, how you are not going to injure a legitimate industry, if the growing of wool in this country is a legitimate industry, by removing all their protection, this 11 cents per pound.

Let me refer to the clothing report for a minute. The Tariff Board purchased in England 16 samples of cloth, the duty on which was $76 and some cents; they paid $41 and some cents for those 16 samples in England, so that when those goods were brought to this country, duty paid, they cost $118 and some cents. They looked around to find whether or not those goods were being made in this country. That rate of duty, $76 on the $41 of foreign value, is 183 per cent ad valorem, so the board reports. But what is the consumer paying in this country, they ask? Because of that excessively high rate of duty on those grades of goods, that industry has been stimulated in the United States, and we are not only producing all that class of goods here, but we are making some for export to nonmanufacturing countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would ask the gentleman to give me a few minutes more.

And the board shows also the report that the conversion cost abroad is not more than one-half of what the conversion cost is in this country. In other words, it costs us 100 to 150 per cent more to produce those goods in this country than abroad. What is the consumer paying for the goods of which they brought here samples of? Instead of $118, they say $69.75, not the difference between the foreign cost and 100 per cent in cost of conversion, but much less. And the ad valorem is the

difference between the foreign cost and the price that the consumers pay in this country, which is 74 per cent and not 183 per cent. I wish I only had the time to go all along down the line. But here is another most interesting industry, and that is mohair.

There is a firm located over here at Greystone, R. I.—Joseph Benn & Sons Co. (Inc.)—and a member of that firm, I believe, is in the city of Washington right now, and perhaps in the gallery, Mr. Harrison Benn. That firm has a factory in Bradford, England, and this is what Mr. Benn tells me with his own mouth. They have from one to two million dollars invested in their plant at Greystone, R. I., but because of the duty maintained on raw mohair, which is an article they consume, and the low rates of duty on the finished product, they are obliged to close their factory in the United States and go back to Bradford, England, and supply the United States market from there. I got those words from the lips of the gentleman this morning. Here is the difference in wages paid in his factory in Bradford, England, and his factory in Greystone: With 10 per cent of his employees, in wool sorting the wages in Bradford, England, are $5.40 a week, at Greystone, R. I., $11.63 a week; for drawing-room employees, $3.31 in Bradford, $7.83 in Greystone; spinning, $2.74 a week in Bradford, England, $6.94 at Greystone, R. I.; for pickers, 73 cents a day at Bradford, an average of $2.25 at Greystone. And on the larger portion of that class—28 per cent of his employees—the wages are 98 cents a day in England, $3.01 at Greystone, R. I.—an average per week of $6.12 as against $13.77. And the total average of all the employees in the factory, as I have figured it up here, is in Bradford, England, $4.39 a week as against $10.73 a week at Greystone, R. I.

You, in your great desire to protect the Angora goat, from which the finished product of this firm is made, have made it impossible, so this gentleman says, to continue his industry in Greystone, R. I. Is that a thing that you want? Do you want to transfer the industry to Bradford, England, now by keeping a duty on the raw material and fixing the duty on the finished product so low that American labor can not compete with English labor?

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FORDNEY. If you will be brief.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will. If they close that mill, will it not help the business of the importers of New York City?

Mr. FORDNEY. Why, the importers of New York City came before the committee in great numbers appealing for lower rates of duty, or free trade, and no other soul on God's green earth did come asking for free trade.

Mr. AUSTIN. Have you heard of an importer that complains of this bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; but I have heard a great many favorable comments from them.

Let me say, gentlemen, there is no other market in the world for the wool of all grades grown in this country but the woolen mills of the United States. Away back in 1894 or 1895 there was a gentleman whose name is Osborne, who was a candidate for the office of governor of Wyoming; a great Democrat, and in favor of free wool. He told in a joking way afterwards, "I came within 3 cents a pound of getting it—free wool," because that was all he could get for his wool. [Laughter.] He was a very extensive woolgrower in Wyoming, and just at that time there appeared a higher price abroad for wool than was paid in the United States. He accordingly shipped his wool to London, England, and before his wool had arrived there the price went down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Just one minute more, if the Chair please. He kept his wool in a warehouse over there and paid the rent and storage upon it in England until the Republican Party once more got back into power and put wool on the protected list, and then he brought that wool back to the United States and sold it here.

That is what the Democrats helped you to do at that time. That is what a Democrat will get this time, gentlemen. I saw sheep sold in the State in which I live, in my home town, dressed carcasses, brought into town in the winter of 1895 and 1896 in sleighloads and hayracks, with signs on them offering to sell them throughout the town, "Your choice for 75 cents a carcass." I saw 100 lambs 8 months old sold in October last year in a little town near my home; they brought the farmer $5.86 a head. A gentleman stepped up and said, "My friend Matthews, I brought year-old wethers to this town in 1895, 21 in number, and took home to my father's house for them $21."

Gentlemen, that is the difference between free trade in wool and protection to the wool industry. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I append the following as a part of my remarks:

Comparative list of wages paid by us in Bradford, England, and United States of America on March 1, 1913.

We are combers, spinners, and manufacturers of mohair and alpaca, and make identically the same classes of goods on the same classes of machinery, running at the same speed in both countries. The hours of labor in England are 55½ and in the United States of America 56 per week. We have taken one-half penny to equal 1 cent:

	Bradford wages.	Greystone wages.	Approximate percentage of persons employed in each department.
			Per cent.
Wool-sorting room: Sorters	$2.40	$4.37	3½
Combing room:			
Combers and carders—			
Males	4.68	8.60	
Females	3.36	7.50	10
Fixers	8.16	18.25–19.35	
Drawing room:			
Drawers, females	3.00	7.50	
Twisters, females	2.92	7.50	7½
Warpers, females	3.48	8.60	
Spinning room:			
Spinners—			
Short spools, 160 spindles	2.28	5.35	
Long spools, 160 spindles	2.40	6.45	
Short spools, 240 spindles	2.76	6.45	
Long spools, 240 spindles	2.88	7.50	25½
Short spools, 320 spindles	3.24	7.50	
Long spools, 320 spindles	3.36	8.60	
Doffers	2.28	5.35	
Weaving room:			
50 picks per inch in cloth	.48	1.49	
60 picks per inch in cloth	.58	1.81	
70 picks per inch in cloth	.68	2.11	
80 picks per inch in cloth	.78	2.41	28
90 picks per inch in cloth	.88	2.71	
100 picks per inch in cloth	.98	3.01	
Loom fixers	8.64	17.20	
Perchers	6.24	13.00	5
Menders	3.84	10.75–11.30	
Power plant:			
Firemen	6.00	12.50	
Watchmen	6.00	15.00	
Engine tenders	6.72	13.50–15.60	
Greasers	5.04	12.50	
Elevator attendants	3.84–4.32	9.65	7½
Mechanics	7.92–8.40	16.10–17.20	
Blacksmith	7.92	17.20	
Carpenters	6.72–8.16	16.10–17.20	
Yarn scouring, beaming, etc	4.56	10.00	5½
Apprentices:			
First year	1.92	6.50	.....
Second year	2.40	7.50	.....
Third year	2.88	9.00	.....
Fourth year	3.36	10.50	.....

GREYSTONE, R. I., *April 23, 1913.*

Comparative costs of mohair and alpaca cloths manufactured in United States and in England.

	Qualities.					
	1	3	31	33	84	93
Cost per yard of cloth made in United States under the new Underwood bill of 20 per cent ad valorem duty on raw mohair and alpaca.....cents..	28.0	32.5	36.5	42.7	69.2	46.9
Cost of imported cloths under the new Underwood bill paying a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem.....cents..	24.5	28.3	32.3	37.4	59.9	41.1
Advantage to importer over United States manufacturer.....per cent..	12.5	12.9	11.5	12.4	13.4	12.2
Cost of cloths made in United States under free raw mohair and alpaca.....cents..	27.0	31.1	35.5	41.0	65.9	45.5
Cost of imported cloths paying 35 per cent duty ad valorem, as per new Underwood bill.....cents..	23.7	27.3	31.2	36.1	57.8	39.7
Advantage to importer over United States manufacturer.....per cent..	12.2	12.2	12.1	12.0	12.3	12.7
Cost of imported cloths paying 50 per cent duty ad valorem.....cents..	26.2	30.2	34.6	40.0	64.1	44.0
Cost of imported cloths paying 55 per cent duty ad valorem.....cents..	27.0	31.2	35.7	41.3	66.2	45.4
Cost of imported cloths paying 60 per cent duty ad valorem.....cents..	27.9	32.2	36.8	42.6	68.3	46.9
Percentage of duties paid on imported cloths under the Payne-Aldrich bill.....per cent..	99.0	87.3	83.3	79.6	86.5	103.0

Comparative costs of mohair and alpaca cloths manufactured in United States and in England—Continued.

	Qualities.						
	97	386	488	545	549	879	880
Cost per yard of cloth made in United States under the new Underwood bill of 20 per cent ad valorem duty on raw mohair and alpaca....cents..	78.2	37.0	33.7	39.0	45.0	31.2	39.7
Cost of imported cloths under the new Underwood bill paying a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem.....cents..	69.0	31.6	29.4	34.1	40.2	27.3	35.5
Advantage to importer over United States manufacturer.....per cent..	11.8	14.6	12.8	12.6	10.7	12.5	10.6
Cost of cloths made in United States under free raw mohair and alpaca, cents.....	74.8	35.3	31.6	37.5	42.8	30.0	37.1
Cost of imported cloths paying 35 per cent duty ad valorem as per new Underwood bill.....cents..	66.6	30.5	28.4	33.0	38.8	26.4	34.3
Advantage to importer over United States manufacturer.....per cent..	11.0	13.6	10.1	12.0	9.3	12.0	7.5
Cost of imported cloths paying 50 per cent duty ad valorem.....cents..	73.9	33.9	31.4	36.5	43.0	29.2	38.0
Cost of imported cloths paying 55 per cent duty ad valorem.....cents..	76.3	34.9	32.5	37.7	44.4	30.1	39.2
Cost of imported cloths paying 60 per cent duty ad valorem.....cents..	78.7	36.0	33.4	38.9	45.8	31.0	40.5
Percentage of duties paid on imported cloths under the Payne-Aldrich bill, per cent.....	83.2	83.8	91.1	93.1	77.8	88.8	80.0

GREYSTONE, R. I., *April 23, 1913.*

JOSEPH BENN & SONS (INC.),
By HARRISON BENN.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. I. NOLAN.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. J. I. NOLAN] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, the night before last I submitted to the House a petition, containing 409 letters from citizens of California, protesting against the reduction of the rate on sugar. It was not my intention to have those letters printed in the RECORD. Through a mistake the petition was handed to the RECORD clerk instead of being dropped into the petition basket.

Previously I had filed a similar petition containing 1,941 names, and they covered only 10 lines in the RECORD. I have a facsimile of the petition that I filed with these 409 letters. I intended to take up in the RECORD only the same number of lines and not to have printed the 409 letters in full.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not want to burden the RECORD of this House with letters that are not necessary to facilitate the business pending before the House. I do not want to prove burdensome, and I do not want to prove expensive. And when the time comes I want to ask permission of the House to have the mistake corrected and all these letters stricken out of the permanent RECORD of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, the woolen industry, now under consideration, has forcefully demonstrated the insufficiency and injustice of a protective tariff. The manufactured woolen goods are now protected by a high tariff, averaging about 90 per cent ad valorem. The prices of woolen goods are high, yet the employees of the woolen manufacturers are among the lowest paid workmen in all the industries in this country.

The Tariff Board of 1911 investigated the wages of 30,454 workmen, other than weavers, in woolen mills in the United States and reported that of these wage earners 3,482, or 11.4 per cent of the total number, were paid less than 10 cents an hour; 6,153, or 20.2 per cent, were paid from 10 to 11.99 cents an hour; and 6,007, or 19.7 per cent, were paid from 12 to 13 cents an hour, showing that more than one-half of that total number of workmen were paid not more than 13 cents an hour, while many of them received less than 10 cents an hour. The board also reported that in the investigation of the wages of 3,182 weavers weaving woolen and worsted goods in the United States it was found that these weavers were paid from 10 to 35 cents an hour. Of that total number of weavers only 42 were paid more than 30 cents an hour, and more than one-half of them were paid from 10 to 20 cents an hour. The same board's report as to the country of birth of the employees working in woolen and worsted mills in this country states that—

In the establishments investigated, 12,799, or 36.5 per cent of the total number of persons employed, were born in the United States and 22,230, or 63.5 per cent, were foreign born. Of the 22,230 foreign born, 12,297 persons, or 35.1 per cent of all of the employees in the mills, were natives of Italy and the countries of eastern and southeastern Europe.

The testimony given before the committee of the House of Representatives in March, 1912, at the investigation of the strike at the mills of the American Woolen Co., at Lawrence, Mass., disclosed a shocking condition of the laborers in that highly protected industry. It was shown that that company paid $6 to $10 a week to its weavers; paid on an average only about $6 a week to more than 20,000 laborers; and paid as low as $3 to $4 a week to children employees 15 and 16 years of age and charged them for the water which they drank at the mills.

Miss Margaret Sanger, a trained nurse, testified before the committee that during the strike in February, 1912, she took some of the children of the families of the strikers to New York to be cared for there, 119 one day and 92 a week later. She said:

The condition of those children was the most horrible that I have ever seen.

Out of the 119 children 4 of them had underwear on, and it was the most bitter weather; we had to run all the way from the hall to the station in order to keep warm—and only 4 had underwear.

Mr. Foster asked her—

How about the outer clothing?

Miss Sanger replied:

It was about in rags; their coats were eaten off as though they were simply worn to shreds.

She also said:

They were very much emaciated; every child there showed the effects of malnutrition.

The report of the investigating committee that shows this pauperized condition of the wage earners of the American Woolen Co. also shows that that company made a profit of 12 per cent on a capital of $1,744,169,234 in 1905.

Certainly no man will contend that these employees of the American Woolen Co. received a share of the protection which was given that company on the goods manufactured by it. No one can gainsay that that company has kept down wages by employing foreign-born laborers. It appears that 65 per cent of all its employees were foreign born.

Much has been said in the debates here during the last few days about protection for the benefit of the laborers of this country. Some gentlemen on the other side of this House still seem to contend that protective-tariff laws insure prosperity to our wage earners. The investigations which I have mentioned, as well as other investigations, have fully shown the fallacy of such argument.

A protective tariff protects the favored manufacturer, but does not protect the laborer who toils in the factory. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The laborer is left to sell his labor in the open market and meet the competition of the laborers of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] By a protective-tariff law the Government empowers and permits the manufacturers to collect large sums of money from the consumers to augment the private fortunes of such manufacturers and trusts them to be generous and just to the laborers they employ. Under such laws the manufacturers obtain for themselves all they can get and pay to their laborers as little as conditions will permit. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When these beneficiaries are asking for a continuation of a high protective tariff upon their product they display great concern about maintaining a high standard of wages for American wage earners, but when they employ their workmen they almost invariably employ them at the lowest wages for which they can get them regardless of whether they be Americans or foreigners.

I speak of foreigners not disparagingly, but to show that the manufacturers employ them because they can get them more cheaply than American laborers. And why? The foreigners come here often with but little money, and they must take the first employment that they can get.

Further, I do not want to be understood as being opposed to the foreigners. To a foreigner who is an agreeable person I say, welcome to our shores; but I do object to the manufacturers of this country obtaining protection for the benefit of labor and then not giving the full benefit or share to the laborers of this country, but encourage foreigners to come here to work at a low rate of wages. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The employees of the cotton mills of this country also receive very low wages. The census of manufactures for 1905 shows that 310,458 cotton-mill operatives earned $94,377,696, an average of $304 a year, or less than $6 a week for each person.

The wage earners in these and other highly protected industries receive lower wages than are paid to the wage earners in the unprotected industries of this country.

The Senate committee on wages and prices gives the wages per hour paid in 1910 in building trades in the principal cities of the United States and in other unprotected industries, as follows:

	Highest.	Lowest.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
Bricklayers	87½	60
Stonemasons	87½	45
Structural-iron setters	65	35
Ornamental-iron setters	62½	40
Plasterers	87½	50
Tile setters	69	50
Plumbers	81¼	43¾
Steam fitters	81¼	37½
Carpenters	62½	42½
Painters	60	37½
Sheet-metal workers	68¾	37½
Electricians	68¾	37½

The Department of Commerce and Labor gives the following wages per hour in the United States, in 1907, for males:

PRINTING NEWSPAPERS.	
Compositors	$0.5206
Linotype operators	.5791
Pressmen	.4558
Stereotypers	.4905
SHIPBUILDING.	
Blacksmiths	.3063
Boiler makers	.2956
Calkers, wood	.3656
Fitters	.2814
Riggers	.2458
Riveters	.3072

The labor organizations have done more to maintain and increase the wages of the American workingmen and to improve their conditions than have the protective-tariff laws.

Mr. Taft, when he was a candidate for President in 1908, in a speech at East Liverpool, Ohio, said:

I sympathize with the men that by manual labor are building up this country, and to say that I am opposed to their organizations and trades-unions is to say what is utterly false, for I have studied the question. I have had to study it as a judge. I have had to study it as an executive officer discharging duties affecting labor and labor organizations, and I am strongly in favor of them. I believe they have done a great service to labor in elevating its wages, in enabling them to meet capital on a level and secure justice for them, in enabling them to apply to Congress and State legislatures and secure legislation in their behalf, and I think it would be a sorry day for this country if labor organizations were not encouraged.

The protective-tariff laws not only fail to insure good wages for the wage earners, but impose unjust burdens upon the consuming masses. Such laws are unjust because they discriminate between different classes of citizens. Many are required to pay a tariff tax without receiving any benefits whatever under the tariff laws.

Under the laws now in force the farmers of my State are required to pay a tariff tax on nearly everything they purchase and sell their produce at prices fixed in the open markets of the world, without receiving any benefit from the tariff. These farmers must pay a tariff tax on their clothing, their household goods, the lumber for their houses, the wire for their fences, their carriages, wagons, and all their farming implements. When they market their crops of wheat and corn they must sell them for prices fixed in the open market, because millions of bushels of wheat and corn are exported yearly from this country.

The bill now pending before the House, if enacted, will reduce the tariff taxes to a just revenue basis, and relieve the farmers and other consumers of the tax burden which has been placed upon them by the existing laws.

This bill places on the free list agricultural implements—plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, wagons, and carts, and all other agricultural implements, and raw wool; and reduces yarn, from 79.44 per cent to 20 per cent; blankets, from 72.69 per cent to 25 per cent; flannels, from 93.29 per cent to 25 and 35 per cent, according to value; dress goods, from 99.70 per cent to 35 per cent; clothing, from 79.56 per cent to 35 per cent; webbings, and so forth, from 82.07 per cent to 35 per cent; and carpets from rates ranging from 50 per cent to 88 per cent to rates ranging from 20 per cent to 50 per cent, and makes material reductions on other necessaries of life.

I fully approve the principle of the Democratic Party that the Government has no right to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purposes of revenue to pay the necessary expenses of the Government. I agree that much of the revenue needed by the Government should be collected by tariff duties upon imports.

It is surprising to hear gentlemen on the other side of this House speak of the pending bill as a free-trade measure, when the bill provides for an average duty of 29 per cent ad valorem. The Democratic Party does not favor free trade, but stands for a low tariff, properly adjusted upon a revenue basis. This country prospered under low-tariff laws before the Civil War. The duties were raised and lowered at different times, but at no time did the Democratic Party or any other party attempt to put the country on a free-trade basis.

The Walker tariff of 1846, with an average duty of about 24½ per cent ad valorem, continued in force to the satisfaction of the people for a period of 11 years, a longer period than any other tariff law has remained in force without agitation for a change.

Hon. James G. Blaine, in his book Twenty Years of Congress, said:

The principles embodied in the tariff of 1846 seemed for the time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased, not only among the people but among the protective economists, and even among the manufacturers to a large extent. So general was this acquiescence that in 1856 a protective tariff was not suggested or even hinted by any one of the three parties which presented presidential candidates.

The needs for revenue during the Civil War caused the duties on imports to be raised. Since then various changes have been made in our tariff laws, but the duties have been kept high. For several years the people have been demanding a reduction in the tariff. The Republicans failed to comply with that demand. Last fall the people elected the Democrats to reduce the tariff and make other reforms. By the enactment of the pending bill the tariff will be properly reduced, the consuming masses will be relieved of the unjust tax burden now imposed upon them, and business will be placed upon a natural and permanent basis. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, it is a most important and significant fact that in the course of this long debate no man has appeared here to represent the interests of the wool manufacturer or the great American Woolen Co. They say they oppose tariff reduction because it will injure the laboring man. The plea of defending others is a subterfuge as old as history, used to divert attention from that which can not be openly defended. Every man who has enslaved another man has enslaved him under the claim that it was for the benefit of the enslaved. Every nation that has conquered and subjugated a defenseless people has conquered them under the claim that it was to better the condition of the subjugated. Every burden that has been heaped upon the masses of the people for the benefit of the few has been heaped upon them under the claim that it was for the benefit of the many. This plea of defending labor is only a repetition in history—the defense of monopoly, extortion, and the invasion of human rights.

Mr. Chairman, there is and can be no justification for the policy of high protection, especially so far as the same affects the vital necessaries of life. There is and can be no justification for increasing the cost of necessaries, and rendering them more difficult for the people to obtain, for private benefit. There is and can be no justification for taxing the necessaries of life consumed by one man for the special benefit of another man. There is and can be no justification for taxing the vital necessaries of life to make a so-called reasonable profit, or to make any profit, other than the fair and reasonable cost of their production, because necessaries are a part of the earth which man takes along with the right of habitation, and you have no more right to restrict their use to the people than you have to set a limit upon the right of man to live. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There was a time when the individual man was more independent for the necessaries of life than he is to-day. There was a time when every man produced with his own hand, or under his own roof, or within his own control a supply of all or the greater part of his needs. But the increasing population of the earth and industrial change have compelled him to specialize, to cease general production for himself, and either to produce along one single line and depend upon others for a part of his necessaries, or to work for wages and depend upon others for all of his necessaries. This absolute dependency of one man upon another man for the vital necessaries of life has brought a new problem before society, and has enjoined a new duty upon government—the duty of protecting necessaries from private monopoly and of holding them free from increasing cost for the use of all the people. The right to live is not more vital than the right to enjoy the necessaries of life. The fruits and products of the earth are as essential to man as the right of existence itself. To suffer the hands of private monopoly upon necessaries, under the shelter of a high protective tariff, to increase their cost and render them more

difficult for the people to obtain is not only a restraint upon human welfare, but it is a restriction upon the very right to live.

The common articles of food, and clothing and fuel, and materials for shelter are among such necessaries. They are the natural inheritance of man, and the people are entitled to enjoy their use and comforts free from the burdens of private monopoly, and at the least cost consistent with production.

I deny the principle of high protection, as the same affects the vital necessaries of life. I deny the right to increase the cost of necessaries and render them more difficult to obtain for private benefit. I deny the right to tax the necessaries consumed by one man for the special benefit of another man. [Applause.] I deny the right to tax the vital necessaries of life to make so-called reasonable profits for the benefit of any individual or any private interest; I deny that governments are instituted among men to extort profits from the necessaries required for human existence. I deny the right to maintain a system of tariff taxation under which the cost of the vital necessaries of life have been raised so high to the laboring man that he can no longer with his own hands and his labor support a family, but must drive his children out of the cradle into the factories and into the sweatshops to earn their own living and burden society with the curse of child labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERGUSSON].

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Chairman, I am in the category of some other Democratic Members of this Congress who worked and voted in the Democratic caucus for a tariff on wool. I represent a large woolgrowing State, and I have labored for a tariff on wool for two reasons.

In the first place, the revenue necessary to run this Government, which must be raised by the Democrats now that they are charged with the duty of carrying on the Government, is very large, something like one thousand million dollars a year, and this vast sum will never be less, but will increase year by year, and it must be raised mainly by a tariff on imports, according to the traditional Democratic policy. Wool has always been a large revenue producer and always will be, as it is a world commodity and universally in demand. In the second place, I believe that the tariff for revenue should be equitably adjusted with reference to all revenue-producing commodities, and also with reference to all sections of our country, so that any incidental benefit that may flow from such revenue tariff may be fairly distributed. New Mexico, being a large producer of wool, and many of my constituents fearing that the placing of wool on the free list may injure this industry of our State, I know it is my duty to represent their interests in this matter. But, notwithstanding my belief that in this first reduction of the tariff it would have been better for the industry in my State and more in accordance with the wishes of my constituents to leave a tariff of 20 per cent ad valorem on wool, I am going to vote for this bill, which places wool on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The reasons which compel me to so vote I shall now briefly state.

The tariff is being revised this year, not as last year by a separate bill for each schedule, but by a single bill, including all schedules or subjects in one bill, and therefore to vote against the bill would be to vote against the cherished political principles of a lifetime. It would be to vote against the graduated income-tax measure in this bill, the fairest and most just tax ever invented, by which the heaviest burden of taxation shall be borne by the greatest beneficiaries of our heretofore partial Government, under which enormous fortunes have been accumulated in private hands, and which great fortunes will be protected by our Government for the future, no matter how unjustly acquired, under the unquestioned constitutional provision that sacredly guards the rights of property as well as of person. Those without wealth have borne the burden of taxation heretofore; hereafter let those who have escaped taxation, who have even got the lion's share of taxes extorted from the poor, ostensibly for revenue purposes, pay the taxes in proportion to the wealth they hold but have not earned. Further, to vote against this tariff bill is to vote to continue in force the infamous Payne-Aldrich tariff, which Democrats and Progressives alike are pledged to wipe off the statute books; for the repeal of which the Democrats and Progressives cast, in round numbers, 7,000,000 out of a total of 10,000,000 votes in the last election.

To vote against this bill is to vote to continue the rule of this country by private monopoly—by those "malefactors of great wealth" who have by the insidious power of wealth, of wealth unpatriotic, insatiable, and cruel, perverted our beneficent system of representative government into a government representative only of their private interests and desires.

To vote against this bill is to vote against the interests of my own State in this: It is to vote to continue undestroyed, even unimpeded in the exercise of its selfish power, the wool monopoly, which has destroyed the effect of the existing tariff of 11 cents per pound on raw wool. This is proven by the undisputed fact that since the tariff of 11 cents per pound on wool was enacted wool has sold at about the same price in the London market, in free-trade England, as in protected United States. This pregnant, most instructive fact can be accounted for in no other way than that the Wool Trust (and remember that there is no other object in forming a trust than to create a monopoly) has the power, since it is the sole purchaser of wool in this country, to beat down the price of its raw material for its own advantage; and since it is the only seller of manufactured woolen goods in this country, protected by a high tariff, it also has the power to demand extortionate prices for its woolen goods. This artificial system has destroyed the effectiveness of the tariff of 11 cents on raw wool, and every woolgrower is interested in destroying the Wool Trust.

I have the hope, almost amounting to absolute belief, that free wool will be better for my State and for woolgrowers everywhere in our country than present conditions under the sway of the private monopoly in wool. Remember the case of hides. The cattle industry was alarmed some years ago when the tariff on hides was removed. But since hides were placed on the free list they have sold at a higher price than when they were "protected." Hides and leather are a world commodity, subject to the world demand, because they are a world-wide necessity. Wool is also a world commodity and a necessity to all of mankind, and in universal and constantly growing demand. It is at least probable that wool, like hides, unshackled from the artificial manipulation of the wool monopoly, itself shielded by an outrageous tariff wall, will sell even higher than it has heretofore sold under artificial restrictions. The conditions can be no worse for the wool-raising industry than they now are under conditions which have caused it to be selling no higher here than in free-trade England. Stripped of extraneous causes, if the theory of protection is sound, wool should now be selling for 11 cents per pound more than in England. Free wool can not be any worse than that, whatever the cause. Furthermore, I am in accord with this bill because all of my life I have been fighting by the side of those Democrats who believe it is wrong to maintain by law special privileges in this free Government. Under the sway of the trusts we have seen such anomalies as this: While Mr. Carnegie was making his $500,000,000 in a short lifetime, we have seen his workingmen almost shot down in strikes in an effort to get a part of the loot of protection. We have seen in a later day the inhumanity that caused the strike at Lawrence. I attended the hearings about that strike. Here in free America, a trust magnate in charge of those mills at Lawrence, reputed, I have heard some say, to be worth $100,000,000—nobody denying that he is worth tens of millions of dollars, the head of the Wool Trust—we have seen little boys and girls working in those mills because the father, with five or six children, gets such meager wages that he is compelled to take his 10 or 12 year old son or daughter out of school and put them to work. They conducted that strike under awful conditions. They said to this magnate that the price of their meat and bread and necessary clothing had doubled under the sway of the special interests. They went humbly and asked for a raise of wages and they were denied, and the strike came.

Mr. CAMPBELL rose.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield. I do not want to be discourteous, but I have something to say and only a short time. The whole movement that has united the Democratic Party all over this country, which has split the Republican Party in half—and from my standpoint the best half of it is now disputing with the Democrats for a stand on the platform for the people—compels me to vote for this bill. Not to vote for it I should have to deny all of the teachings of my youth and my whole study of public questions since I became a man and all that I have been trying to do in a humble way since I have been in public life. I shall therefore vote for this bill not, as it is flippantly charged on the other side, because I am gagged by a caucus. I shall not vote for it for that reason. I vote for it as a free man, untrammeled, because I believe it will be no worse under free wool for the growers of wool in my State than it is when the benefit of 11 cents a pound on wool is denied them through the power and domination of a monopoly. I vote for it, also, upon the broad ground that the great movement of the people, the great rebellion in this country, using that term in a political sense, against the cruel domination of special interests is such that I would belie every impulse of my nature if I did not do so. Being in accord with

this new Democratic administration, which represents not only the Democratic Party, but also half of the Republican Party, and, to my mind, the patriotic half of it, I would be recreant to every sense of right if I did not vote for the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I have agreed to yield five minutes to a gentleman who is not now in the Chamber. If he comes in I will yield to him, but if he does not there will be but one other speech upon this side of the House.

Mr. MANN. I yield six minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING].

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I am receiving a great number of protests from manufacturers of my district and State against the passage of this bill. They fear its results, and, in my opinion, there is just cause for this fear. In my home city of Camden, N. J., we have several manufacturers of worsted and woolen yarns, and I am in receipt of a letter from one of the largest of these concerns advising me of the activities of English manufacturers who are watching the progress of this tariff bill, and inclosing a letter which they have received from a firm of brokers in Bradford, England. My correspondent says this letters speaks for itself, and that it is very clear as to the effect the Underwood bill will have upon the sale of merchandise by American manufacturers. I wish to place in the RECORD the contents of this English firm's letter in full:

BRADFORD, *April 22, 1913.*

Messrs. B. F. BOYER & Co., *Camden, N. J.*

GENTLEMEN: In view of impending modifications of the present American tariff for wools, etc., we take the liberty of submitting to you samples of a few of our regular makes of noils, etc., which we recommend to your kind consideration.

Naturally, we are aware that the revised tariff is not yet an accomplished fact, but we wish to be prepared for any eventuality, and in the event of our anticipation being realized we trust to be favored with your esteemed commands.

Meanwhile we should be glad if you would carefully keep our offers before you, as we propose to keep you regularly posted with revised price lists.

Our yarn department would be pleased to attend to any yarn inquiries.

We are, gentlemen,
Yours, very respectfully, JOHNSTON & FARIE.

Accompanying this letter is the following price list:

	Pence per pound.
3752. Brown (code word) botany noils, regular make	17¼
3753. Bean (code word) botany noils, regular make	17½
3754. Bold (code word) botany noils, regular make	17¾
3755. Bowl (code word) botany noils, regular make	18⅛
3756. Bright (code word) botany noils, regular make	19
3757. Build (code word) carbonized burrs, regular make	14½
3758. Brake (code word) camel hair noils, regular make	29½
3759. Britch (code word) camel hair noils, regular make	29½

F. o. b. Liverpool. 1¼ per cent discount 30 days date of bill of lading. In presspacked bales, about 5/600 pounds per bale. Weights as per conditioning-house certificate.

Mr. Chairman, I desire also to call the attention of the House to a statement made to me about one year ago, when the wool schedule was being considered. Mr. Boyer said, "Mr. BROWNING, I wish you people would pass whatever tariff bill is to be passed, so that we may adjust our business thereto;" he added, "and we can adjust our business to any tariff you may make." I asked him how this could be done, and his reply was, "If you reduce the tariff on wool and wool products and we are compelled to compete with the foreign manufacturer, our employees will have to accept the foreign wage or else we shall be compelled to close our mill." He then added, "Why, Mr. BROWNING, do you know that we made more money during the Cleveland hard times than we ever made in our lives?" I was much surprised at this statement, as I knew their mill was closed during that period, and I asked him how he made the money, and he said, "Why, we bought the finished product from abroad and sold it here." He said further, "Our mill was closed and I did not have between four and five hundred working for me, as I have at the present time."

I also hold in my hand a letter from Eavenson & Levering, a firm of wool scourers, carbonizers, and combers, of Camden, N. J., and as this communication is quite lengthy I shall not attempt to publish all of it in the RECORD, but will quote two paragraphs:

We have carefully considered the portion of the bill relating to our industry, and look upon its passage with very great fear.

We carbonize a considerable proportion of all the noils produced in this country, and while we find the Underwood bill recognizes the comber, the spinner, the weaver, and so on, it distinctly discriminates against the carbonizer by placing carbonized wool and noils on the free list. On this basis we are surely in for it.

Mr. Chairman, I think further comments are unnecessary. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID].

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I do not see the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], my esteemed friend, in the House, for I feel that I would like to shake hands with him cordially upon his proposition that the sheep is as good as the goat—concerning which the provisions of the schedule raise a doubt—and that while a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee formulating the bill he was individually consistent in that he favored an equivalent duty on wool to that accorded to goat hair. It was the committee as a whole that so discriminated. But I do contend that the benefits of protection should be equally distributed, equitably divided between our productions. Certainly the sheep should not be displaced by the goat. I favor both. I do not gainsay the consistency or the propriety of the gentleman in standing up for the industries of his own district. If a Member will not look out for the interests of the district which he has the honor to represent who will or should do so?

Mr. Chairman, on the wool schedule, which has been ably discussed, I desire to say I am not an expert. I appreciate it is one of the most intricate of any of the schedules contained in the bill, and I have not risen for the express purpose of expressing myself in regard to the schedule. Speaking generally or broadsides with reference to the whole Underwood revision, I am for what emanates from the side of protection rather than from the Democratic side, because I favor the policy of protection. I believe firmly in its virtues, and that is one reason that I am here to represent my district.

I favor Republican revision, Mr. Chairman, rather than Democratic revision, because Republican revision is intended to conserve the beneficence of the policy of protection. Democratic revision does not pretend to conserve the policy of protection, but it is avowedly against and antagonistic to it. How can you expect the enemies to the policy of protection to conserve the policy? Protectionists seek to regulate rates, adjust rates in accordance with the changes in conditions which are constantly going on, while conserving the policy of protection. Now, I grant that the Democratic Party is perfectly consistent and logical in opposing a tariff board. For what use or utility is a tariff board without tariff? There can be no necessity for a tariff board when free trade is the goal.

Mr. Chairman, I do not contend that this bill as a whole provides for free trade. We all know it is very much of a mixture; but the policy and purpose evinced by its provisions, considered in connection with party declarations, show free trade to be the ultimate.

Mr. Chairman, what of the new proposition of the majority party for competitive tariff? Competition, fair and legitimate, is what protectionists seek, and it is what the policy of protection scientifically regulated secures. It was protection adopted by our young Republic that produced defensive competition in our home markets against monopolistic prices placed on foreign manufactures. With further development it successfully resisted the "dumping policy" of British manufacturers intended to destroy our home industries. With yet further development it has secured domestic competition.

Mr. Chairman, what sort of competition does free trade bring? It strikes me the Democratic Party in its legislative aspirations has become too big for our home country. It would seem that the party has become very altruistic and aspires to extend the benefits of its legislation to foreign countries upon equal or better terms than are to be enjoyed by our home producers in our home market.

Who of its advocates pretends that free trade is for the benefit of the home producer? Not one will so contend. On the contrary, it is avowedly against the prices of home products, claimed to be too high. The admitted purpose of free trade is to permit unrestricted competition of foreign products in our own markets, to the end that prices to consumers be reduced, to the benefit of foreign production, with a corresponding loss to home producers.

Mr. Chairman, protectionists stand for the home producer as well as for the consumer; the policy favors the people who do things as well as the consuming public. I am frank to say, however, that I regard a distinct classification of producers and consumers as wholly impracticable. My judgment is that in our industrious country it is only a small percentage of adults that are not producers.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that the competition brought by unrestricted trade of foreigners in our home market is one-sided and illegitimate. It is perfectly clear that to permit the productions of foreign countries to come into free competition in our home market with home productions gives to foreign countries the advantage; it gives the foreign producer the advantage because of the much smaller cost of production in his than in our country. Therefore American producers, with

free trade, are not allowed to participate in their own home markets on equal terms with the foreign producer.

Mr. Chairman, it essentially follows that the Democratic Party regards the difference of the cost in production abroad and at home as an immaterial consideration. Instead of making advantages equal merely, they would make them unequal by abolishing tariff, the equalizer, and thus give the productions of cheap-labor countries the advantage in our home market. Protectionists would by rates of duties imposed make up the difference in the cost of production and thereby secure equal advantage, at least to the home producer, and thus preserve the higher standards of wages and living at home than abroad. Free trade, on the other hand, would reduce our standards of wages and living to the impoverishing low level prevalent with some of our foreign competitors.

Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for advocating, if it may be so called, "artificial" means, by the imposition of duties on foreign products for the preservation of our higher standards of wages and living. I regard this as the province of constructive and patriotic statesmanship. And what is free trade? It is a mere negative. It is not a constructive device. It is against constructiveness. As applied by this bill, its effect, in some instances, must be to wholly destroy domestic competition in the home market with foreign productions, resulting in monopoly for the foreign producer.

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

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it would seem the Democratic Party has forsaken the fireside adage, "Charity should begin at home." I avow my belief in the doctrine of the Scripture that "He who does not provide for his own household is worse than an infidel," and I would have this apply to the Nation the same as to the family. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER].

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, the Members on this side are admonished by the gentleman from New York after the passage of this bill not to go back to their home districts and attempt to scare the farmer. I desire to assure him that no one on this side of the House has any such intention, and I am satisfied that if my Democratic colleagues from the wool districts of the State of Ohio should vote for this bill that they will soon afterwards become so scared and afraid that they will not want to go back to Ohio. [Applause on the Republican side.] I did not rise to engage in the discussion of the woolen schedule except as to one feature. The discussion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania during the general debate and his detailed explanation of the working of that protective piece of legislation known as the dumping clause left within me the hope that when I went back home after this bill was passed that the shoe manufacturers of my district would at least have some protection and that the woolgrowers of my district would have some protection. But, subsequently, I have had an interpretation of this dumping clause given from a good Democrat upon the other side, the able gentleman from the State of Georgia, who, in order to avoid the force and the great weight of the argument of the gentleman from Michigan to show that taking the duty off sugar would not make it any cheaper to the consumers, said this day before yesterday. This is from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]:

> The antidumping clause will have no effect whatever on the sugar situation, for the simple reason that if the gentleman will read the dumping clause carefully he will find that it applies only to a commodity upon which a duty is established, and it applies to no commodity that is on the free list, and so far as free sugar is concerned it could have no effect.

That is the sticking point, gentlemen. Why have you undertaken to add further protection to these unconstitutional and tax-sustained industries? Many of these industries could not operate except for the tax you have in this bill, and now you propose to aid them further by this additional protection, but the shoe industry in my district, boots and shoes are put on the free list. Where does the woolgrower come in if this is the correct interpretation of the law? When I first looked at the act I did not think it warranted such a construction, but the more I read it the more I am satisfied that the gentleman from Georgia is right. Now, it seems to me that if you want to treat these people right, in all fairness you ought to have prepared another dumping clause which would cover the shoe industry, the woolen industry, the potato industry, and the products of the agriculturists of this country. Wool, potatoes, and shoes are on the free list, and according to the construction placed on the "dumping-clause" section by the gentleman from Georgia, they are not afforded any protection thereunder.

Why, just take it in the case of the woolen industry. You have taken from the woolgrower of my district the protection on his wool, and you have given it to the manufacturer of the East, affording him that additional protection, and now you propose to aid him further with this dumping clause. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You further protect the cotton factories of North Carolina, but you afford no protection to the shoe factory in my district, because shoes are on the free list.

You further protect rice by this "dumping clause," because rice is a tax-sustained industry; but wool, which will be made a legitimate industry by the pending measure, if enacted into law, by being left untaxed, will have no protection.

The "dumping clause" of your act only protects articles on the dutiable list, and, according to Democratic interpretation, it affords no relief to the makers of shoes and growers of wool and many other agricultural products carried on the free list. It matters not to the framers of the pending measure how many million bushels of potatoes may be dumped into the American markets from Nova Scotia or Germany, at a price much lower than that in the market of the country from which they are exported, and in this unfair way rob our potato raisers of their home market.

It matters not to these gentlemen how much wool or how many shoes may be dumped into our country at a price below that prevailing in the country from which they are exported, but when it comes to cotton fabrics and woolen goods and the larger part of the products of the factory, many of which are already protected by the duties carried in the dutiable list, we find them additionally protected by this "dumping clause" which prevents the foreigner unloading large quantities of these articles onto us at a price lower than the prevailing price in the country from which they come. I do not believe this is fair to our shoe manufacturers, our woolgrowers, and farmers, and at the proper time I will offer an amendment providing a "dumping clause" for the protection of their industries.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] five minutes.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, in the amendment which I had prepared I inserted a clause requiring all woolen manufactures to be put on the free list. My object in doing that was to accentuate the comparative favoritism shown to the woolen manufacturers in the Underwood bill; not that I am willing to strike down in retaliation the woolen manufacturer because the wool raiser is put upon the free list, but in order to focus the attention of the Nation and the people of my district upon the fact that the woolen manufacturer in the Underwood bill is favored to the disadvantage of the wool raiser.

Mr. Chairman, representatives of the woolen manufacturers appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means urging free wool. On the other hand, they claim that they will be satisfied with the 50 per cent ad valorem duty upon the manufactured article. You have given them by this bill within 15 per cent of what they demanded. Yet you have absolutely rejected the claims of wool raisers for protection. You have inferentially said that the woolen manufacturer is only 15 per cent illegitimate and the wool raiser is 100 per cent illegitimate.

Mr. Chairman, the State which I represent, the State of Oregon, has been generous with the Democratic Party under the Oregon system. I would like to have time to say something about that system and the fidelity of the Republicans in my State to their pledges on statement No. 1—that they would vote for the popular choice for United States Senator. Because these Republicans kept their pledges you now have two Democrats in the United States Senate from the State of Oregon, an overwhelming Republican State. [Applause.]

These two gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, in the last campaign canvassed the great sheep-raising districts of eastern Oregon. They placated and allayed the fears and the apprehensions of the wool raiser with iteration and reiteration of that plank in your platform that no legitimate industry would be injured. Oh, what a sweet-sounding phrase that then was on the great sheep ranges of eastern Oregon! And now what has it become? It was then plain and unambiguous, but now it is so abstruse, so recondite, a veritable Delphic oracle of double meaning when interpreted and expounded in the light of the Punic faith of the philologists of the Ways and Means Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SINNOTT. May I have just another minute?

Mr. MANN. I yield one more minute.

Mr. SINNOTT. If you gentlemen desire to return these gentlemen from Oregon to the other side of the Capitol, do not send them back to Oregon with that subterfuge, that excuse, "that the great sheep industry of the State of Oregon is not a legitimate industry." Do not force them to tell the people of Oregon that the caucus has compelled you to strike down the sheep industry. Mr. Chairman, a dispensation coming from the

casuists of the caucus will absolve no one from breaking party pledges under the Oregon system. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We hear something about the soldiers in this caucus, about what a gallant, heroic fight those gentlemen put up for their interests. Their story reminds me of old Jack Falstaff telling the story of the battle at Gads Hill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, not only in the State of the gentleman who has spoken but throughout the country our Democratic friends in the last campaign held out hope to the people that legitimate industries need not fear any result of the election of a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President.

The signing of a note carries with it the implication that some time the note must be paid. The making of an obligation by an individual or by a party carries with it a suggestion that some time the party must be called upon to say whether or not it will meet the obligation in the terms in which it was made. You are now confronted with meeting the obligation that you assumed only a few months ago, when you urged upon the people of this country that no legitimate industry need fear the result of your action upon the tariff question.

Already, to-day, some of our Democratic friends are apologizing for the action which they know they must take, under the mandate of the Democratic caucus, within a few days. Others, with more candor and with more frankness, appear to admit that the wool industry—and I take it that that includes all the industries that are correlated with it—is an industry that is not legitimate, and therefore ought to suffer at the hands of the party that is now in control.

You have already heard presented to you this afternoon some comparisons touching the cost of labor in the manufacturing industries in this country and abroad, as they will be affected by the wool schedule. I want very briefly to call attention to some of the comparisons that may be made on the part of those who are engaged in the growing of wool in this country as contrasted with those who grow wool in foreign countries.

Take my own State as an illustration—a State that ranks third in the production of wool in the United States. There the wages paid by the growers of wool are something like from $35 to $5 and more per month to the individual sheep herders. Not only that, but an expense for maintenance of something like $12.50 to $16 per month must be added. Compare that, if you please, with the wages paid for similar lines of work in other countries.

In Great Britain, near to the great mills there, the wages that are received by those who care for the sheep are something like from $5.25 to $5.50 per week, and they are required to "keep" themselves.

In Australia the wages that are paid to the tenders or drivers, as they are called in Australia, instead of being from $35 to $50 per month, as in my State, range from something like $5 per week to $7.50 and $10 for the more experienced, or not much more than 50 per cent of the wages paid in the State of Idaho.

In South America the difference is even worse than in Australia. The wages paid in South America represent something like one-third of the wages paid for the same service in the United States.

Go, then, if you please, to continental Europe. Go to that section of Europe which is to-day in the throes of war, where the people are trying to throw off a bondage that is worse than slavery, and you will find people, competing with the American woolgrower, receiving from 25 cents to 50 cents per week in addition to their keep, who, upon the passage of this bill, will be put into competition with the laborers working for the American producer of wool.

Now, that is not all. The conditions which our people have to meet in the West are different from the conditions in foreign countries in other respects. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] seemed to eliminate from consideration the production of wool by the farmers of Ohio and the other Eastern States, taking it for granted in his remarks that the sections of country that have the wide expanse of desert lands will be the only sections within the United States that can or ought to produce wool. Therefore, if the conditions are hard and will be intolerable in those States, how much more intolerable, according to his own argument, must they be in sections of the country where sheep are produced upon lands that are incapable of intensive cultivation.

But I do not intend to dwell upon comparison in cost of production within the various States within our own country.

If the producer of the West has some advangtage over the producers of States like Michigan and Ohio from the standpoint of range, the producer of these older States has an advantage possible from the quality of the wool that he may be able to sell. These advantages or disadvantages must necessarily be taken care of by the ordinary laws of competition in the markets of our country.

I said, however, that there were disadvantages with which the producer in our own country is compelled to contend that are not met with by the producers of wool in some of the chief competing foreign countries.

Take, for instance, the number of sheep that may be handled by a sheep herder within our own country and compare the conditions with the conditions surrounding those who care for the sheep in South America or in Australia.

In our western country a band of sheep is made up of less than 2,000 head, or something like 1,700 sheep. In Australia a rider, as the tender is called in that country, will take charge, not of 1,700 or 2,000 head of sheep, but of several thousand head, and, as I said a little while ago, he receives something like one-half the compensation that he receives for doing a similar kind of work within the United States.

Much of the lands of the West that are now available as pasture lands are included within vast reservations belonging to the Government and are leased to the growers of sheep at from 7 cents to 9 cents per acre, which by comparison is about 400 per cent as much as is charged in Australia for the leasing of land by the Government for grazing of sheep.

We should also consider the question of freight rate. It costs, of course, something to the man who has wool to sell in Australia or South America to get his wool clip from the place of production to the port from which it may be shipped to the markets of the world.

It also costs something to the woolgrower of the West to haul his wool clip to the station from which shipment may be made to our eastern markets. In all probability this comparison would be in favor of the American producer, but compare with that the cost of shipping the wool either from Australia or South America to Boston with the cost of shipping wool from the stations in Idaho to such wool markets as Philadelphia, New York, or Boston.

It costs the woolgrower of Australia something like from 1¼ to 1½ cents per pound to ship his wool by steamer from Sydney to Boston, and if he were willing to take a little longer time and use a sailing vessel instead, he may ship it for something like one-eighth of a cent per pound cheaper still.

On the other hand, it costs the woolgrower of Idaho from 1¾ to 2½ cents per pound to ship his wool to the same markets.

The comparison made with respect to the cost of shipping wool from Australia is no more unfavorable than when compared with the cost of shipping wool from South America to the wool centers and the cost of shipping wool from our own sections of production to these same centers.

Hence I say here is a practical illustration of the necessity of this Government maintaining a duty to protect the producers of our own land from the competition of lands where wool can be produced at so much cheaper a price than it can be produced at home.

The woolgrower is not the only one benefited by the maintenance of the industry. There are something like three-quarters of a million producers throughout the United States engaged in the production of wool. This does not represent, however, the vast body of people who are dependent almost directly upon the wool industry.

In Australia and South America the seasons are so open that little feeding is needed during the winter months. In many of our States that produce wool it is necessary to buy forage for the use of the flocks during the winter season, and this entails not only a cost upon the sheep raiser but also constitutes an industry in which thousands of people engage who do not own sheep themselves.

We are at this time engaged in reclaiming large areas of hitherto desert land in our great West. It takes years of time to bring land of this character into a productive state if orcharding alone is depended upon. Distance from markets renders the land less valuable for the production of still other crops.

The maintenance of the sheep business in or near the regions that are reclaimed furnishes a market at once for one of the easiest crops that can be produced after lands have been reclaimed from their desert condition. We raise thousands of tons of alfalfa upon these desert lands, and this constitutes a commodity that in the nature of things should find a ready mar-

ket at home, for it has such bulk that it can not be shipped any considerable distance else the freight charges will consume the profit.

To strike down the wool industry, to strike down the sheep business, means as well to strike a blow at this industry, which has been one of the most productive of ready money to the thousands of people throughout the West engaged in the development of our arid lands.

Finally, then, this whole question again emphasizes the importance of tariff modification upon the basis of an intelligent report of a tariff commission. The Tariff Board reported upon the woolen schedule about one year ago. We have facts touching production in foreign countries and at home that are practically up to date.

The wise thing, the patriotic thing for us to do at this time is to accept an amendment similar to that which has been proposed by the gentleman from New York, which constitutes a schedule based upon the reports of the Tariff Commission, a schedule that would do equity and justice at once to the producer upon the one hand and to the masses of consumers upon the other.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, every given commodity that is offered for sale is worth just what it will fetch, no more and no less. In making the price the cost of the labor that is involved in making the commodity is all important.

It has been stated during this debate that it will take between 9 and 10 pounds of wool to make a suit of clothes; that the cost of the wool in the raw is anywhere from $2 to $2.50; and yet a fine worsted suit of clothes will cost anywhere from $30 to $60.

Now, that is due almost entirely to the cost of the labor that has gone into that suit of clothes. The great wool-manufacturing section of England, which country would increase, in my judgment, its export of woolen goods to the United States enormously if the Underwood bill goes through, is Yorkshire.

I have in my hand a copy of the Yorkshire Observer of Monday, December 30, 1912, which contains a résumé of the activities in the industries of that county for the preceding 12 months. In an article headed "Wool and Wool Textiles in America," the writer says:

> The weakness of the American Woolen Co., broadly speaking, lies in its manufacture of the finer woolen fabrics where, with the high labor cost, protection is badly needed. The tariff question ultimately comes down to this labor-cost item, for as this wage cost percentage rises, so does the need of protection and the danger from crude reductions through unscientific tariff legislation.

That states the case in a nutshell. What is the difference in the labor cost in the production of manufactured woolen cloths in Yorkshire as compared to the cost in this country? The Providence Journal, which is one of the leading free-trade newspapers in this country, on April 18, 1913, published an interview with Mr. Harrison Benn, a leading wool manufacturer of the State of Rhode Island, whose company also owns a mill in Bradford, Yorkshire. In that interview the gentleman states clearly what he has to pay in his mill in the United States and in the mill which he also owns in Bradford, England. He says:

> In the Bradford plant we pay a weaver 48 cents for weaving a cut of cloth, and for the same thing here we pay $1.49; for goods that cost us 78 cents there we pay $2.41 here; and for goods that cost 98 cents there we pay $3.01 here. In the spinning room the prices range from $2.23 to $2.88 per week there, and here for the same kind of work on the same machines we pay from $5.35 to $7.50 per week. Another difference is in the pay which we have to give our apprentices. They are obliged to serve four years, and in the Bradford plant they receive for those four years $1.92, $2.40 $2.88, and $3.36 per week. In the Graystone plant they receive for the four years $6.50, $7.50, $9, and $10.50.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Small wonder, therefore, that the Yorkshire Observer, in its article on the "Huddersfield fine worsted trade," makes this comment:

> The United States trade, although still comparatively small, has improved during the year, and the proposed revision of the tariff, which is looked forward to with some confidence, is expected to result in a considerable accession of business.

Of course the English manufacturers of fine worsteds look forward to a large increase of business when the Wilson-Underwood bill is enacted into law. They have learned by past experience that so soon as our own factories close down, by reason of their inability to compete with the cheaper labor of England, the business of the English manufacturer increases considerably. But you on that side of the aisle are properly designated Bourbons. You learn nothing from past experiences. It is almost idle to discuss the provisions of this bill with you. You are deaf to all arguments.

You have the votes to put your bill through without any amendments whatever so long as you have control of Congress. I am glad that you have majorities in the Senate and the House that will enable you to assume full responsibility for this measure. You will not be able to charge any of its shortcomings to the Republican Party, and you will have to take all the consequences of the injuries you will have inflicted on legitimate business in this country as a result of this legislation. I feel confident that the near future will once again demonstrate your inability to frame constructive legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to this article from the New York Sun of May 2, 1913, which clearly explains the attitude of the American manufacturer in his opposition to this bill:

OUR MANUFACTURED EXPORTS—SECRETARY REDFIELD'S FIGURES UPSET BY HIS OWN DEPARTMENT'S STATISTICS.

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN.

SIR: On April 21 you published an interview with Secretary of Commerce Redfield under the head "Redfield sees big boom ahead." I, in common with all other good citizens, would like to believe the Secretary is correct in his prophecy.

His statements, however, regarding the tariff and business seem to be based upon hope rather than facts. At the outset, he is quoted as saying: "American manufactured goods are going abroad all over the world, and in many different lines of production, to the annual extent of something like $1,500,000,000, or, say, at the rate of $5,000,000 a day for the ordinary working year." This sounds good, but it isn't the fact. The only authority upon the subject of exports is the Department of Commerce, over which Mr. Redfield presides. In the Annual Review of the Foreign Commerce of the United States for the year ended June 30, 1912, in Table VI, pages 66 and 67, it is stated that in the fiscal year 1912 we exported of "manufactures for further use in manufacturing" $348,149,524 and of "manufactures ready for consumption" $672,268,163, or a total of all kinds of partly and completely manufactured articles of $1,020,417,687. This total is nearly $500,000,000 less than the Secretary stated it to be, and to get even this total we must include all partly manufactured articles. If Secretary Redfield makes such a startling error in his figures, it is apparent at once that he has not investigated the matter very carefully, and yet he is said to be "the acknowledged tariff expert in the Cabinet."

Secretary Redfield says the manufacturers must develop greater efficiency. We are all striving for that. In all the industries the competition among the domestic manufacturers has been so severe that each manufacturer has been compelled to maintain his plant at the highest efficiency. This has led to a marvelous development in machine tools and special machinery of high speed. Our factories are now the best equipped in the world, and it is simply ridiculous for anyone to say that we are behind in efficiency. It can not be proved. No one even attempts to prove it. Such a statement is mere words. As rapidly as we develop efficiency our methods are copied in European factories.

The real difficulty our domestic manufacturers have in meeting foreign competition is in the great difference in labor cost. Here we pay our skilled mechanics an average of 37 cents an hour, against the average in Europe for the same class of labor of 17 cents an hour. This is the handicap of our manufacturers, who do not need a tariff to protect their profits, but do need a sufficient rate of duty to cover this wide difference in wages. This is not an academic statement. It is a question of pay rolls which must be met each week. The first move our manufacturers must make to meet the foreign competition is to reduce the rate of wages paid. This will be very difficult and the country does not desire it. But desire alone can not prevent the inevitable.

Here is the whole problem in a nutshell: A and B have similar factories manufacturing the same machine, the factory cost of which is one-half labor and one-half material. The material costs the same to both A and B, but A pays twice the wages that B pays. Who will get the business? Of course B will get it unless A can reduce his wage rate to meet B's.

The sure result of the proposed tariff bill will be to reduce the wages of the American mechanic to the level of his European brothers, and a plain statement of facts is:

Our shops are modern in every particular; so are those of Europe.

Our men can not produce more work than can the European workmen.

Our wages run from 25 cents to 55 cents an hour for skilled mechanics; their wages run from 10 cents to 17 cents an hour for the same class of labor on the same work.

Our costs can not be reduced unless we can reduce wages, and knowing our condition here as to unions you are aware that this can not be done without a great industrial war.

Secretary Redfield and his followers are determined to give their theories a test even at the expense of the whole manufacturing interests of this country, but inasmuch as the figures which they quote are so far from correct, I am led to believe that their theories will prove equally wrong and misleading.

J. E. B.

NEW YORK, *May 1.*

Mr. MANN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 57,000,000 sheep in the United States, and these beautiful spring days, when this Democratic House is coolly proposing to sacrifice them on the altar of the cruel god of free trade, they, returning good for evil, are enlivening the ranges and the pastures of all the Nation with the cheerful bleating of millions of newborn lambs. [Applause on the Republican side.] These spring days they are yielding their golden fleeces by the million for the comfort of the Nation and the profit of our people. They are enriching the pastures, adding to the contentment and contributing largely to the incomes of over a million American farms and ranches. They are consuming herbage which otherwise largely would go to waste, adding but slightly to the farm labors, and on the western ranges providing an industry the

place of which none other can fully occupy. They afford us on the hillsides, in the meadows, and by the still waters the most perfect of all pictures of peace and plenty. They furnish us with the juiciest, the sweetest, and the cheapest of all meats, and their golden fleeces assure us in peace, comfort; in war, an element of defense as essential to the maintenance of the national honor as steel-belted fortresses afloat or shotted guns ashore. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have read and studied this Democratic tariff bill carefully and prayerfully, because my people own four and a half or five million sheep; and I have attentively listened to this debate, thinking that at some time I might hear or discover some logical reason from any viewpoint for the placing of wool on the free list. I have waited and read in vain. You can find no such reason in your party history, for the financial disaster that followed the placing of wool on the free list in the Wilson bill brought you a political disaster that kept you wandering in the wilderness, unfed of manna, unguided by pillar of cloud by day or fire by night, for 16 long and weary years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You can not justify free wool from the standpoint of free trade. You separate the sheep from the goats, and reversing the scriptural parable you say to the goats, "Come, ye blessed, to the green pastures of protection established since the foundation of the Government," and to the sheep, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the everlasting fires of Democratic free trade prepared for those industries we doom to destruction." [Applause on the Republican side.] While you deprive the flockmaster and the farmer of the benefits of protection, you do protect the great Woolen Trust, a creature of your discovery, and in this bill the beneficiary of your abundant favor. You can not defend what you have done from the standpoint of a revenue tariff, for wool has been one of our greatest revenue producers, yielding from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 of revenue annually. You can not claim that you have applied the principles of the Underwood copyrighted competitive tariff to wool, for there has been vast import and intense competition.

You will not be allowed to plead as offset to the losses free wool will bring a claim of benefits conferred, for from the oil and lampblack which marks the newborn lamb to the shears that clip the fleece, the string that ties, and the sack which receives it, all that contributes to the industry is taxed under this bill.

You surely can not exclude this ancient and honorable industry from the category of legitimate enterprise solemnly guaranteed from harm by presidential promise. You can not excuse this shameless abandonment on plea of recent pledge or promise, for less than a year ago you voted for a tariff rate of 29 per cent on wool.

You can not plead ignorance of the fact that free trade in wool will bring depression to all the industry and destruction to the most valuable part of it, for history will not excuse you; the uncontroverted facts developed through exhaustive investigation by the Tariff Board are before you, and your own admissions convict you of knowledge of the destructive character of this legislation.

You can not fool the people by giving as an excuse for your action the plea in confession and avoidance that you have sacrificed this great industry for the general good, for the people are intelligent enough to know that under no possible circumstances or conditions can the general good be served by the sacrifice of a nation-wide industry whose destruction or serious injury will leave us poorer in food and clothing in peace, and in war naked in the face of our enemies.

In the light of all this evidence, direct and circumstantial, can anyone escape the conclusion or avoid the conviction that the placing of wool on the free list is an act of cool calculating sacrifice of a great industry, essential to the very existence of the Nation, on the altar of political expediency?

The old condemned Democratic craft pumped out, patched up, painted over, setting out on the high seas of political responsibility, without propeller of principle or rudder of reliability, is found so overburdened with conflicting promises impossible of fulfillment, so hampered with rotten tackle of ancient error, so bulging with internal discord that in despair of ever reaching harbor thus laden her captains have deliberately agreed to throw overboard so much of the cargo she bears as they think can be jettisoned without danger of political bankruptcy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. MONDELL. Wool has walked the plank and sugar follows, together with a vast and varied assortment and variety of the people's industries, the extent and character of which only the labors of the wrecking crew will disclose. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Well, the captains are in control, the once turbulent crew is in the irons of discipline and being forcibly fed on the unpalatable pap of patronage promises. Under such conditions any act of piracy on your part is possible. But I warn you of the day when the American people, owners of the precious cargo of their industries and opportunities temporarily in your keeping, shall call you to an accounting for your stewardship. Beware of that day. It will come soon. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THACHER].

Mr. THACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to this discussion. It is hard for me to keep out of this fight, for I thoroughly believe in free wool. I was for 25 years engaged in the wool business. I shall talk to you upon the question of free wool, not as an orator but as a business man who knows whereof he speaks. I shall not, therefore, dwell upon "the golden fleece of the American people" and the "babbling brooks," which the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has just described. I shall try and give some concrete facts rather than flowery figures of speech.

Now, what are the facts regarding the tariff on wool found in the first part of Schedule K, the very schedule of the Payne-Aldrich bill which President Taft, in his famous speech at Winona, pronounced indefensible? For half a century, with the exception of a brief interval, we have maintained this extreme duty. During all this time the advocates of this duty have claimed as they do now that to put wool on the free list would utterly annihilate the American sheep, and we should have to go out of business and import all our mutton from England and elsewhere, and our wool from the Argentine and Australia. Let us examine the facts.

I well remember that some 20 years ago two prominent advocates of a high duty upon wool, Judge Lawrence and Columbus Delano, both from the State of Ohio, were the leaders in this fight. These men, honest no doubt in their belief, were skillful politicians, and they used to head meetings and conventions of "woolgrowers," invariably asking the tariff legislators at Washington to maintain increased duties on wool, but they never asked the same legislators to "temper the wind to the shorn lamb," the consumer.

If I am not mistaken, one of those gentlemen took part in the famous conference at Syracuse between the manufacturers and woolgrowers just before the wool tariff of 1867 was enacted. This class of advocates of a high duty on wool claimed that if Congress would only maintain a duty on wool sufficiently high we might raise all the clothing wool consumed in this country. Furthermore, it was even predicted, if my memory is correct, that with a proper duty on carpet wool we might in time produce the bulk of the carpet wool used here.

In an article in the American Wool and Cotton Reporter of October 29, 1896, entitled: "An appeal to the woolgrowers," by Hon. William Lawrence, A. M., LL. D., president of the National Wool Growers' Association, Judge Lawrence states:

> At a meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers held at Chicago, January 21–23, 1896, Thomas Dolan, an eminent wool manufacturer, president of the association, said: "We are certain of our ability to feed ourselves and to procure at home all the primary substances from which fabrics are made."

Judge Lawrence, referring as to "What the full development of sheep husbandry would do for this country," stated:

> Ample protection for our wool industry would soon increase our flocks from less than 40,000,000 to 110,000,000.

Mark these words. At that time the Wilson bill with free wool was in force. Judge Lawrence predicted that "ample protection for our wool industry would soon increase our flocks from less than 40,000,000 to 110,000,000." Within nine months the Dingley bill, containing one of the highest wool tariffs which our country has ever seen, substantially the tariff in force today, was enacted. Did the prediction which Judge Lawrence made so confidently, that our sheep would increase 70,000,000 in numbers come true? Let us see. If we turn to the Statistical Abstract of the United States, we find that the highest number of sheep reported in this country in any one year since 1896 was in the year 1903, viz, 63,964,876; but on the other hand the number of sheep in this country in the year 1912 was only 52,362,000, showing a loss of over 11,000,000 sheep, and nearly 60,000,000 less in number than Judge Lawrence predicted, in spite of this high protection maintained ever since 1897.

It is somewhat remarkable that in the three States of California, Texas, and Ohio, which formerly produced wool in large quantities, that the census report shows a marked decrease in the number of sheep in the past 30 years. I quote figures from

page 4130 of the tariff hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, 1913.

Number of sheep of shearable age.

	1880	1910
California	5,727,000	1,456,000
Texas	3,652,000	1,440,000
Ohio	4,903,000	2,898,000

California had in 1910 but one-fourth of the sheep contained there in 1880; Texas, about 40 per cent, and Ohio a little over one-half. The reason for this decrease is because the land has become too valuable. The farmers find that they can make more money producing other crops, and our merino wool is now produced mainly in the Rocky Mountain section of our country.

Now, what is the case of carpet wool? This, as we all know, is the coarsest wool grown anywhere, and we have not raised a pound of carpet wool in this country since 25 or 30 years ago, when we used to get a little Navaho wool from Arizona and New Mexico. The fact is, we consume in this country between 500,000,000 and 550,000,000 pounds of wool per annum, of which something over 300,000,000 pounds is domestic wool, while the remainder is imported, of which something over 100,000,000 pounds is carpet wool coming from countries like Mongolia, East Indies, Turkey, Persia, and the steppes of Russia and other countries where the sheep have not been improved. The rest is clothing wool. Our own land is too valuable to raise carpet wool when we can raise other things to better advantage. In short, not only do we raise no carpet wool, but in spite of this high protection on wool the American sheep have not increased but diminished, and we are obliged to import about 45 per cent of our annual consumption.

Furthermore, it might appear to a man who had never studied this question, from the clamor which one hears about the wool clip and the protests against putting wool on the free list, that this is one of our principal agricultural products. Let us see how it compares with some other farm products. In 1909 the total value of the wool clip of the United States amounted to $65,472,328; the potato crop was worth $166,423,910; the egg product $306,688,960, the hay crop $824,004,077, and the corn crop $1,438,553,919, so that the wool clip is of small proportions compared with other farm products.

Mr. Chairman, there are many objections to a duty on wool. I will mention a few. My experience in business and study have taught me that—

(1) Under high protection our sheep have not increased, but have decreased in recent years.

(2) The tax is a hardship to the consumer.

(3) The manufacturer is handicapped by being unable to have free access to wool of all grades in the markets of the world. The present wool schedule has discriminated in favor of certain industries, prticularly the worsted mills. Many mills have gone out of business.

(4) Our sheep growers have given more attention to the raising of merino sheep than to mutton sheep.

(5) Both the methods used by our manufacturers and our wool growers, taken as a whole, have not been as modern and businesslike in all respects as those employed by their rivals abroad.

Before I take up these points specifically, I would say that the objections to a duty on wool have been well expressed in Taussig's Tariff History of the United States. Here the writer distinctly shows that the statement so often repeated that the number of pounds of wool required to make a suit of clothes is so small that the consumer pays very little increased cost on account of this tax on wool is entirely incorrect. The following statement is found on page 240 in the publication above referred to:

> Little can be said in favor of the duty on wool, and even on strictly protectionist grounds much can be said against it. Notwithstanding the cumbrous machinery of compensating duties, it undoubtedly has a hampering influence on the wool manufacture, and has been one factor, though perhaps not the most important, in confining this industry to the limited range that is so often complained of. As a tax on raw materials, it tends to bear with heavier weight than would be the case with the same duty on a finished product, since it is advanced again and again by the wool dealer, the manufacturer, the cloth dealer, the tailor, each of whom must have a greater profit in proportion to the greater amount of capital which the wool duty and the higher price of wool make it necessary for him to employ. So strong and so clear are the objections to duties of this kind that hardly another civilized country, whatever its general policy, attempts to protect wool.

Let us now consider the objections which I have named:

(1) I have already shown that under a high duty on wool, our domestic clip has failed to furnish us the supply needed.

(2) That the tax on wool is a burden upon the ultimate consumer has been shown in the article just quoted.

(3) While the average rate of duty paid on our importations in recent years is about 45 per cent, yet to get at the real extent of the present duty on wool one must consider the wools which are excluded by reason of the specific tax of 11 cents per pound upon wool in the grease, which shuts out all heavy shrinking wool of all kinds. The amount of Australian wool available for an American to buy under the present tariff is extremely limited. I am told by buyers of Australian wool that only about 10 per cent of the Australian clip is available, and that on the remainder the American buyer has his hands tied. On many wools the duty will run up to 200 per cent or even 300 per cent ad valorem. The duty to-day on Bagdad wool previously used here largely up to the Dingley tariff of 1897, which practically prohibited its entry, is 200 per cent to 300 per cent. I know this from experience. A buyer from America at the auctions in London, Antwerp, or Melbourne has only a limited selection on which he can bid. These wools, therefore, by reason of this competition, realize high prices, while the other grades are bought by German and English competitors at less prices, who thus have a great advantage over the American manufacturer.

The woolen manufacturers abroad are not handicapped like the American manufacturers. They can buy free of duty wools from any part of the world, to be made into goods sold in competition with the American manufacturers. They have free access to every wool market in the world, and pay no duty on their raw material. With the exception of Russia, no country in Europe levies a duty on wool. Raw wool, like raw cotton, is free of duty.

Taussig in his Tariff History of the United States, page 329, referring to the handicapped condition of the American manufacturers as compared with their foreign competitors, cites this testimony:

> Never until he had experience under free wool did the manufacturer realize the full extent of the disadvantages he suffers by reason of the wool duty, and the impossibility, by any compensating duty, of fully offsetting these disadvantages.

So much was said in a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee by the secretary of the Wool Manufacturers' Association. Bulletin of the Wool Manufacturers, March, 1897, page 84.

On the other hand, our mills, restricted by the tariff, have not in all cases been up to date in their methods. Furthermore, by the classification in the wool schedule in force since 1867, washed combing wools, used by the worsted mills, have paid but a single rate of duty—12 cents per pound—while there has been a double rate of duty—of 22 cents per pound—upon washed clothing wools used by the woolen mills.

This classification has worked in favor of the worsted mills and against the woolen mills. Moreover, when the fashion has changed from worsted to coarse woolen goods, such as cheviots, tweeds, and friezes, these same woolen mills have been prevented by a prohibitory tariff from importing cheviot and similar wool, used on account of their superior qualities by the manufacturers of Great Britain to make these same goods. For these and many other reasons the small woolen mills have, in my opinion, been very much handicapped.

We may hear before the date of the passage of this bill of certain manufacturers who say they are going to close down their mills or move their machinery abroad on account of the proposed tariff. I would like to ask how many woolen mills have gone out of business throughout this country from California to Maine and from Texas to New York since the famous Syracuse convention and the tariff of 1867? How many mills has this tariff literally put out of business? You will not find these figures in any speech made by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle.

If we turn to page 741 of the Statistical Abstract of the United States, you will find that in the year 1870 there were 3,208 establishments engaged in the manufacture of wool in the United States; in 1880 there were 2,330; while in the year 1910 there were 1,124, a decrease of about 2,000 in 40 years. Of course it would not be fair to claim that the production of wool manufactures has not increased in the last 40 years, for it has more than doubled in value. What I do claim is that the present tariff on raw wool has been a handicap to the mills, particularly to the small woolen mills, and has worked in favor of the large worsted mills. While it is true that many of the woolen manufacturers have not asked for free wool recently, for many reasons, which I will not go into now, yet this has not always been the case. In 1889 there was presented to a Republican Congress a petition signed by over 500 woolen manufacturers and a long list of other persons in favor of free wool.

These signers represented every section of this country, and it is worthy of special attention at this time that many of these manufacturers represented the class of woolen mills of which I have spoken. Among the signers was the Nye & Wait Carpet Co., of Auburn, N. Y., a well-known concern located in the same town which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] represents. I am proud to say that the wool firm of which I was a member at that time, H. C. Thacher & Co., was represented by my father's signature. I take this petition, to be found in the appendix of this article, from pages 4241–4244 of the published hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, which petition was contained in a very interesting brief by Mr. Frank P. Bennett, editor of the American Wool and Cotton Reporter, who appeared before this committee last January and advocated free wool.

(4) We now come to the consideration of the effect of the tariff upon the breed of sheep raised in this country. There is no doubt in my mind that the growers have given their main attention to the breeding of merino sheep, which produces fine wool but inferior mutton, and have neglected the growth of the crossbred sheep, which gives superior mutton but somewhat coarse wool. Now, you can not get choice mutton and choice wool from the same sheep. It is a law of nature that a merino sheep produces a large fleece of fine wool of heavy shrinkage, but yields an inferior quality of mutton. The crossbred sheep, such as the Southdown, Lincoln, and Shropshire, produce splendid mutton but a fleece of medium wool light in weight. England, for example, which produces the best mutton in the world, has no merino sheep whatever. One reason why the sheep growers have clung to merino sheep is because this sheep is the only breed which will herd closely together and can be grown in large numbers. The mutton sheep thrives best in small flocks. These crossbred sheep can be raised with profit, for choice mutton always commands good prices, and especially is this so with lambs. Mutton sheep can be grown with profit on high-priced land where merino sheep can not be grown advantageously. If we take England for example, we find that in the year 1910 Great Britain, with a total area less than New Mexico, considerably less than California, and less than one-half of the area of Texas, had 27,102,945 sheep, which yielded 141,940,000 pounds of wool. In other words, Great Britain contained in the year 1910 nearly 20 times as many sheep as either California or Texas. In spite of the fact that land in England is more valuable than in this country, the mutton-growing industry is very profitable, and English mutton is equal to any in the world. Free wool has not killed the sheep industry in England.

Mr. Thomas W. Page, a former member of the Tariff Board appointed by President Taft, has contributed a very interesting article on "Our Wool Duties" in the North American Review for April, 1913, from which I quote:

> Of all animals useful to man the merino sheep is best adapted to the waste places of the Temperate Zones. But except under unusual circumstances it is only to the waste places that it is adapted. For on land fertile enough to produce an average agricultural crop and situated so that the crop can be marketed to advantage, tillage is more profitable than pasturing merinos. The mutton from this variety of sheep is small in quantity and so inferior in quality, when uncrossed with other breeds or otherwise improved, as to make it a poor contributor to the meat supply. Except, therefore, where they are maintained for breeding purposes, the principal product sought from merions is their fleece. They yield a wool that for fineness of fiber and other qualities surpasses that of all other breeds. There is, however, a limited demand for such fabrics as require this particular wool, and this fact, of course, limits the price that can be got from it. For this reason sheep husbandry, to be profitable on land of much value, must yield mutton as well as wool.

I agree heartily with Mr. Page, and I believe that free wool, instead of destroying all the American sheep, would focus the attention of many of our farmers and woolgrowers on the growth of mutton sheep. It has only been in recent years that some of these men, finding that it was not profitable to raise wool on high-priced lands, have begun to turn their attention to mutton sheep. There are splendid opportunities in our country, not only to increase the supply of mutton where it is now grown, but also to raise mutton in other sections. Take the South for example. I believe that some day (when the question of the dogs, an enemy of the sheep, has been solved) that mutton sheep will be raised on the great range of mountains which extends from Pennsylvania to Georgia. The climate is comparatively mild, and the great markets are close at hand. Let us increase our supply of mutton in the United States. Good mutton from the right sheep is one of the best of all meats, and if we increase our supply of mutton, as I believe we can under free wool, we will thus help to reduce the high cost of living.

(5) We have now come to the consideration of the methods used by the growers in shipping their wool. It may be a surprise to you for me to say that I believe that the methods employed in the packing and shipment of our wools are, for the most part, behind those of other countries. We Americans are apt to pride ourselves on being up to date in our business methods, but our woolgrowers have certainly lagged behind in some respects as compared with their foreign competitors. For example, wools grown in Australia—which produces about 800,000,000 pounds per annum—in South America, in Africa, and even in such far-away countries as China, East India, and Persia, are, almost without exception, graded carefully and then shipped in compressed bales. In this way the wools can be readily shown when sold at auction or at private sale and can be shipped direct to the mills in compressed bales; and furthermore, the freight is much less than when shipped in loose and bulky bags not compressed, as in the case of domestic wool.

In this country the only two States, if I am not mistaken, which ship wools graded and packed in compressed bales are California and Oregon. The domestic fleece goes to the market for the most part ungraded and packed in bags, on which the freight is much heavier than if packed in compressed bales. What would be said of our cotton growers of the South should they persist in shipping all their cotton, not only to the northern mills, but also to Europe, in bags of the same kind as are used to ship wool in this country, while their competitors, the cotton growers of Egypt, were shipping their product in compressed bales, as at present? Yet this is just what our woolgrowers are doing.

When I was in the wool business with my father—and we began to do business with Texas in wool along with our business in raw cotton some 30 years ago—he at once discarded these old-fashioned methods, and all our wool which came from Texas was graded in Texas and then shipped in compressed bales to Boston. I believe that these modern methods which are employed in California and Oregon can be copied elsewhere in this country.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I would say that I began my remarks advocating free wool, and I shall keep to my text. I favor free wool because I believe it will help the American people. Free wool will benefit the manufacturer, the consumer, and will not destroy the sheep industry.

The Chatham Manufacturing Co., of Winston-Salem, N. C., filed a brief with the Ways and Means Committee, which may be found on page 4428 of the tariff hearings, in which the president, in a letter dated January 31, 1913, states:

> The present duty on wool and on blankets is entirely too high from my viewpoint as a Democrat standing on the platform and also as an American citizen. I think the country could stand free wool.

He further says:

> If nolls were made free, we could give the American people wool blankets at a price they are now paying for the best grades of cotton blankets. As I understand it, there are practically none imported now.

This manufacturer is right. Free wool means that the consumer will get better goods at a lower cost. He will buy for his wife and children better blankets and flannels, and clothing as well, which will contain more wool than those goods have to-day. There will not be so much cotton used in making clothing as at the present time. The consumer can secure for his wife and children warmer wool clothing than before, better adapted to withstand the cold winter weather. Thus clad the family will be, I believe, both healthier and happier.

Mr. Chairman, the Democrats have tried to keep faith with the people by reducing the duty upon some of the necessaries of life. They have reduced the ad valorem rate from 99.70 per cent upon women's and children's dress goods to 35 per cent; from 79.56 per cent upon ready-made woolen clothing and wearing apparel to 35 per cent; from 93.29 per cent upon flannels for underwear to 25 and 35 per cent; from 72.69 per cent upon wool blankets to 25 per cent, and so on all down the line.

In making these reductions the Democrats have kept their pledges. They have written this schedule with the purpose of removing some of the burdens from the shoulders of those who have not the money to clothe their families in linen and fine raiment, but who, out of their limited means, wish to buy good woolen fabrics at the lowest possible cost. These reductions and the other reductions made in the duties upon the necessaries of life to be found all through the bill will help to lighten the load resting on the shoulders of the consumer. Mr. Chairman, I give my most hearty support for free wool because it will benefit the great masses of the American people.

APPENDIX.

This petition, made to Congress in 1889, asking for free wool appears on pages 4241–4244 of the published hearings before the Ways and Means Committee held in January, 1913:

[Copied from the American Wool Reporter, p. 1161, issue of Dec. 19, 1889.]

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

The undersigned, being each and all of us engaged in growing, manufacturing, or dealing in wool, respectfully petition that the duties

on raw wool may now be removed or greatly reduced for the benefit of our domestic woolgrowers and woolen manufacturers alike. At a recent meeting of woolen manufacturers in Boston it was correctly stated "that the wholesale introduction into the United States of foreign wools in the form of finished fabrics, thereby displacing American wool, which would otherwise be consumed in American mills, is due to the unjust and illogical arrangement of the tariff. While the imports of clothing and combing wools have not materially increased, and the American production is materially decreasing of late years, notwithstanding the rapid growth in our population and the increasing per capita consumption of wool by this increasing population, the quantity of foreign wool introduced into this country in the shape of goods and yarns has increased to the enormous total of 141,474,144 pounds in 1888, equaling 44 per cent of our total home production of wools of all descriptions. The wholesale market value of our annual importations of manufactured wool exceeds by nearly 50 per cent the value of our annual wool clip."

As the only civilized country in the world, so far as we are informed, which levies a duty on raw wool, we ask that American industry may be relieved of this unnatural burden, and that our domestic wool interests may now be put upon the same wholesome basis as the cotton manufacturing industry, with free raw material.

Jesse Metcalf, agent Wanskuck Co.; Geo. B. Nichols, of Nichols, Dupee & Co.; Wm. J. Follett, of George Follett & Co.; M. T. Stevens, of M. T. Stevens & Sons; Robert Bleakie, of Robert Bleakie & Co.; Henry C. Weston, of Weston, Whitman & Co.; Eben Sutton, of Sutton's N. A. Mills; B. W. Evans, treasurer Blackstone Woolen Co.; Evans, Seagrave & Co.; Rowland Hazard, treasurer Peacedale Manufacturing Co.; Walter Stanton, of Converse, Stanton & Cullen; Henry Martin, of Martin, Lawrie & Co.; G. Z. Silsbee, treasurer Middlesex Co.; Noah Sagendorph, East Brookfield, Mass.; Arthur T. Lyman; Edw. W. Hooker, assistant treasurer and secretary Broad Brook Co.; T. B. Beach, secretary Beacon Falls Mill & Power Co.; John W. Croft, of Howland Croft, Sons & Co., Camden; A. Priestly & Co., Priestly Worsted Mills, Camden; Wm. M. Ayres, of Wm. Ayres & Sons, Philadelphia; Geo. W. Patton & Co., 38 North Front Street, Philadelphia; John Elliott, 1158 South Broad Street, Philadelphia; James Kitchenman, Huntingdon and Jasper Streets; S. Wood & Ward, Howard and Lehigh Avenues; Geo. W. Emlen, Third and Cumberland Streets; Z. Talbot, treasurer Holliston Mills; J. B. Little, treasurer Bay State Felt Boot & Shoe Co.; C. J. Amidon & Sons, Hinsdale, N. H.; Thos. Radcliffe, Radcliffe Bros., Birmingham, Conn.; Joseph Dews, treasurer Phoenix Woolen Co., East Greenwich; Chas. Dawson, Dawson Manufacturing Co., Holden, Mass.; Walter Aiken, Franklin, N. H.; Frank H. Colony Bros., Wilton, N. H.; Edwin Farrell, Woonsocket Worsted Mills; Geo. W. Olney, Cherry Valley, Mass.; E. D. Thayer, Worcester, Mass.; O. H. Perry, agent Middlesex Co., Lowell, Mass.; Connor Bros., Holyoke, Mass.; Ralph H. Damon, president Damon Manufacturing Co.; Salem C. Moses, treasurer Worumbo Manufacturing Co., Bath, Me.; S. E. Lee, agent Vassalboro Woolen Mills; H. Strusberg, jr., agent Germania Mills; C. Fox & Co., Stafford Springs, Conn.; Geo. H. Nye, Nye & Wait Carpet Co., Auburn, N. Y.; Wm. F. Wait, Auburn, N. Y.; D. M. Read, treasurer Read Carpet Co.; Owen Bros., agents Atlantic Mills, Providence, R. I.; Saxony Woolen Mills, Newburgh, N. Y.; Michael Collins, Collinsville, Mass.; C. L. Blanding Manufacturing Co., Providence, R. I.; Hudson River Woolen Mills, Newburgh, N. Y.; Lawrence, Webster & Co., Malone, N. Y.; F. A. Howarth, Oxford, Mass.; Chas. M. Beach, treasurer Broad Brook Co., Broad Brook, Conn.; W. E. Delabarre & Co., Conway, Mass.; Ellison Tinkham, president Carolina Mills Co., Carolina, R. I.; P. S. Peckham, jr., of P. S. Peckham & Co., Washington, R. I.; Benjamin Lucas, of B. Lucas & Co., Poquetannock, Conn.; Geo. Mabbett, agent Central Falls (R. I.) Woolen Mills; Frank E. Seagrave, treasurer Central Falls (R. I.) Woolen Mills; J. F. Phetteplace, president Central Falls (R. I.) Woolen Mills; Stephen O. Metcalf, treasurer Steere Worsted Mills; Berwick Woolen Mills, West Fitchburg, Mass.; James McTaggart, West Fitchburg, Mass.; Perseverence Worsted Co., Woonsocket, R. I.; Horace A. Kimball, Manton, R. I.; Richard Howard & Son, Apponaug, R. I.; Horatio Colony, Keene, N. H.; Weybosset Mills, Taft Weeden & Co., agents, Providence, R. I.; O. H. Hayes & Co., New York; Francis & Muller, New York; Bills & Davenport, New York; Schoff, Fairchild & Co., New York; Geneva Worsted Mills, by M. S. Ulman, treasurer, Providence; Rockfellow & Shepard, New York; John Lunn, Philadelphia; Esterheld & Co., Pekin Mills, Manayunk, Pa.; James Legg & Co., Mapleville, R. I.; W. R. Lawfer & Co., Allentown, Pa.; W. S. Woodman, Allentown, Pa.; Refnal Mills, Allentown, Pa.; J. H. Lawfer, Allentown, Pa.; H. C. Thacher, of H. C. Thacher & Co.; Franz & Pope Knitting Machine Co., Wm. Pope, president, Bucyrus, Ohio; John J. Currier, treasurer and director Bailey Hat Co., Newburyport, Mass.

And 131 others on the first list of signatures as printed in our issue of November 28. Since that time the following additional signatures have been obtained:

Swenarton & Keiser, New York; Mills & Co., New York; J. M. Valentine & Co., New York; T. B. Snow, New York; Rochester Knitting Works, Max Lowenthal, proprietor, Rochester, N. Y.; Alfred Bayliss, of Bayliss & Crandall, Utica, N. Y.; C. P. Crandall, of Bayliss & Crandall, Utica, N. Y.; Empire Scotch Cap Factory, Utica, N. Y.; S. Bradley & Sons, Allegheny City, Pa.; William Barker, jr., of S. Bradley & Sons, Allegheny City, Pa.; James A. Bradley, of S. Bradley & Sons, Allegheny City, Pa.; William H. Bradley, of S. Bradley & Sons, Allegheny City, Pa.; E. B. Smith, of Smith & Penfield, Delhi (N. Y.) woolen mills; L. J. Rossman, of Rossman Knitting Co.; B. F. Haigh, of Rossman Knitting Co.; William Oliver, secretary, treasurer, and general manager, Mississippi Mills, Weeson, Miss.; W. P. Sharp, of Home Knitting Works; C. E. Sharp, of Home Knitting Works; S. A. Sharp, of Home Knitting Works; Jefferson Woolen Mills, by Frank Stoppenbach, manager, Jefferson, Wis.; Robert A. Allison, secretary Jackson (Tenn.) Woolen Manufacturing Co.; W. T. Earnshaw, superintendent Jackson (Tenn.) Woolen Manufacturing Co.; P. J. Murray, manager oil mills, Jackson, Tenn.; N. S. White, banker, Jackson, Tenn.; John Y. Keith, wool raiser, Jackson, Tenn.; W. S. Small, farmer and sheep raiser, Jackson, Tenn.; W. P. Robertson, merchant and planter, Jackson, Tenn.; M. V. B. Exum, farmer and woolgrower, Jackson, Tenn.; John W. Theuz, banker and farmer, Jackson, Tenn.; Ashley Stonfield, sheep raiser, Jackson, Tenn.; Miles Standish, farmer, Jackson, Tenn.; Bruce Douglas, farmer, Jackson, Tenn.; Manley Armfield, planter, Jackson, Tenn.; J. C. Gooch, Jackson, Tenn.; A. C. Treadwell, Jackson, Tenn.; John Goodrich and 100 others, Jackson, Tenn.; D. Crowther & Son, Germantown, Pa.; Thomas P. Cope, jr., of Cope & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Alfred Cope, of Cope & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; F. Hazen Cope, of Cope & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Howland Croft, of Howland Croft Sons & Co.; Smith Lightbottom; George Bustle, jr.; Michael Collins, Collinsville, Mass.; Christian Hess; Isaac Reldon; John Hammond; Joseph B. Underwood; A. Helliwell; Benjamin Lobley; Joseph Lobley; L. D. Rodibaugh, New Paris, Ind.; Claud Neilson, New Paris, Ind.; W. H. Reinoehl, of W. H. Reinoehl & Co., Reading, Pa.; O. B. Wetherhold, of W. H. Reinoehl & Co., Reading, Pa.; O. R. Delsart, of W. H. Reinoehl & Co., Reading, Pa.; Montgomery Merritt, of Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; James S. Alves, woolgrower; W. S. Johnson, of Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; Paul J. Marrs, of Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; James R. Barich, of Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; Dr. B. Alors, secretary of Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; James Morning, superintendent of Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; D. W. Boone, subsuperintendent of Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; A. N. Taylor, carder boss, Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; John Gust, spinner boss, Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; B. T. Linton, loom boss, Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; Philetus Beal, finisher, Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; Edward Oberodorfer, wool dealer, Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; George Metz, wool dealer, Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; Morris Metz, wool dealer, Henderson (Ky.) Woolen Mills; Mann Bros.; Morris Baldauf, merchant; Edward Starr, clothier, Henderson, Ky.; Berry & Co., dry-goods merchants, Henderson, Ky.; Schlesinger & Geibel, dry-goods merchants, Henderson, Ky.; Thomas Soaper, Henderson, Ky.; I. W. Levan, Reading, Pa.; I. W. Levan & Son, Reading, Pa.; A. Erskine, manufacturer of blankets, shawls, etc., Third and Cumberland Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; Thomas Duston, North Salem, N. H.; W. P. Hewitt & Co., Menasha (Wis.) Woolen Mills; Shuttleworth Bros., Amsterdam, N. Y.; O. H. Nordstraw, South Side, Punxsutawney, Pa.; D. W. McAllister, overseer, Punxsutawney, Pa.; F. W. Cheney, agent Athens (Ga.) Manufacturing Co.; Kanawha Woolen Mills, Frank Woodman, proprietor, Charleston, W. Va.; A. J. Cameron & Co., of New York and Philadelphia; C. B. Robinson, for Beargrass Woolen Mills, Louisville, Ky.; Lippit Woolen Co., by C. H. Merriman, treasurer, Providence, R. I.; Reedsburg Woolen Mill Co., W. H. Frence, manager, Reedsburg, Wis.; J. Turner & Sons Manufacturing Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Joshua Turner, Cleveland, Ohio; John G. Turner, Cleveland, Ohio; A. K. Wein, Cleveland, Ohio; N. H. Turner, Cleveland, Ohio; C. F. Keatley, manager of the Keatley Hosiery Manufacturing Co., Galena, Ill.; Stewart Bro. & Co., 1219 Temple Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; James S. Cochran, Tenth Street and Columbia Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rice, Bean & Co., Manayunk, Pa.; Fitzpatrick & Holt, Manayunk, Pa.; D. Levis Moore, Moore Alpaca Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Thomas A. Pearce, Pennsylvania Hosiery Mills; D. Edwards & Sons, Ithaca, N. Y.; R. O. Edwards, Ithaca, N. Y.; D. D. Edwards, Ithaca, N. Y.; David Ellwood's Sons, Ithaca, N. Y.; C. H. Sanford, Glover, Sanford & Sons, Bridgeport, Conn.; H. B. Sanford, Glover, Sanford & Sons, Bridgeport, Conn.; E. G. Sanford, Glover, Sanford & Sons, Bridgeport, Conn.; Charles G. Sanford, Glover, Sanford & Sons, Bridgeport, Conn.; T. H. Sanford, Glover, Sanford & Sons, Bridgeport, Conn.; Glover E. Sanford, Glover, Sanford & Sons, Bridgeport, Conn.; Halfpenny, Campbell & Co. (Ltd.), Antes Fort, Pa.; H. T. Doebing, manager Davenport Woolen Mills, Davenport, Iowa; S. A. Jennings, president Davenport Woolen Mills Co.; J. M. Eldridge, stockholder in Davenport Woolen Mills; W. C. Wadsworth & Co., wholesale dry goods, Davenport, Iowa; Robert Krause, jobber of woolens, Davenport, Iowa; N. Moritz & Bro., jobber of woolens, Davenport, Iowa; M. Neidemann, jobber of woolens, Davenport, Iowa; A. B. Haipke, manufacturer of knit goods, Davenport, Iowa; August Steffin, jobber of dry goods, Davenport, Iowa; J. H. C. Petersen's Sons, dry goods, Davenport, Iowa; W. D. Petersen, Davenport, Iowa; H. F. Petersen, Davenport, Iowa; Joseph Froehlich, dealer in woolens, Davenport, Iowa; Isaac Rothchild, dealer in woolens, Davenport, Iowa; W. S. Ritcher, director Davenport (Iowa) Woolen Mills Co.; I. H. Sears, Davenport (Iowa) Woolen Mills Co.; L. M. Ficher, sheep raiser; A. Stratliek, dealer in dry goods, Davenport, Iowa; J. H. Hiner, dealer in dry goods, Davenport, Iowa; John Dutton, overseer in woolen mill, Davenport, Iowa; James W. Robertson, general manager Porter Manufacturing Co., Clarksville, Ga.; James Williamson & Co., Germantown, Pa.; William Jameson, Germantown, Pa.; C. A. Reynolds, King Philip Mills, Davisville, R. I.; William F. Perry, president Forest Mills Co., Bridgeton, Me.; J. F. Brailler, superintendent Forest Mills Co., Bridgeton, Me.; Louis Kraemer & Co., Stony Creek Mills, Reading, Pa.; W. Ward, superintendent Riverside and Oswego Mills, Providence, R. I.;

Seth Humphrey, Lower Merion, Montgomery County, Pa., owner; Charles Ohara, superintendent Mills & Co., New York; Swenarton & Kiser, New York; J. W. Dodge, president Dodge-Davis Manufacturing Co., New York; C. H. Proctor, overseer, Dodge-Davis Manufacturing Co., New York; H. C. Whipple, treasurer Dodge-Davis Manufacturing Co., New York; H. Beckman, North Ohio Blanket Mills, Cleveland, Ohio; Samuel Lea & Son, 1148 St. John Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; M. H. Heynemann, of Heynemann & Co., San Francisco, Cal.; Sig. Greenebaum, of Greenebaum & Co., San Francisco, Cal.; J. R. Manury & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; J. R. Sullivan, dry goods, Oswego Falls, N. Y.; Connell & Patterson, dry goods, Oswego Falls, N. Y.; Bennett & Stewart, dry goods, Oswego Falls, N. Y.; Farrell & Son, merchant tailors, Oswego Falls, N. Y.; H. Amdursky, clothing, Oswego Falls, N. Y.; J. C. O'Brien, dry goods, Oswego Falls, N. Y.; A. R. Nery, dry goods, Oswego Falls, N. Y.; H. Rosenbloom, dry goods and clothing, Oswego Falls, N. Y.; H. J. Peoples, clothing, Oswego Falls, N. Y.; J. H. Lee, department overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; W. R. Hamilton, department overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; J. B. Phillips, department overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; J. H. Wilson, department overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; R. Harrison, department overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; Charles B. Sheard, overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; A. F. Williams, overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; Henry Pollard, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; Wright Motham, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; Thomas G. Gill, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; Crossley Holmes, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; William Bower, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; Joseph Bower, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; John Burns, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; C. A. Van Leuvan, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; C. H. McCaffray, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; David Hartigan, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; James Winters, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; J. H. Fairguere, section overseer, Riverside and Oswego Mills; William F. Read, Victoria Mill, Philadelphia, Pa.; George Grayson & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; J. A. Buguey, superintendent Waumbeck Co., Milton Mills, N. H.; Carl Freschel, of Kalamazoo Knitting Co., Milwaukee; L. L. Tabor, of Kalamazoo Knitting Co., Milwaukee; Louis H. Elbromer, of Kalamazoo Knitting Co., Milwaukee; George G. Granger, 22 Broad Street, Boston, Mass.; E. C. Caswell, of E. C. Caswell & Co., Bloomsburg, Pa.; J. M. Staver, of E. C. Caswell & Co., Bloomsburg, Pa.; John F. Hayle, carder for E. C. Caswell & Co., Bloomsburg, Pa.; C. W. McCaslin, spinner for E. C. Caswell & Co., Bloomsburg, Pa.; E. L. Caswell, boss weaver for E. C. Caswell & Co., Bloomsburg, Pa.; George W. Yost, engineer for E. C. Caswell & Co., Bloomsburg, Pa.; Miles M. Bet, finisher for E. C. Caswell & Co., Bloomsburg, Pa.; Elias E. Shaeffer, weaver for E. C. Caswell & Co., Bloomsburg, Pa.; Joseph Ruckle, dresser for E. C. Caswell & Co., Bloomsburg, Pa.; John Custred, weaver for E. C. Caswell & Co., Bloomsburg, Pa.; Daniel L. Jones & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Concord Woolen Mills, Nicojack, Ga.; Porter Manufacturing Co., Clarksville, Ga.; Sulloway Mills, A. W. Sulloway, treasurer, Franklin, N. H.; John S. Collins, Gilsum, N. H.; L. Farr & Son, of Ogden Woolen Mills, Ogden City, Utah; Newton Farr, Ogden City, Utah; and Ezra Farr, Ogden City, Utah.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat amused at the speech of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the gentleman whose State has, I believe, 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 sheep; and, if I remember correctly, evidence has been submitted which shows that it cost 12 cents a pound to produce wool in Wyoming, while it cost less than one-twentieth of a cent per pound to produce it in the State of Washington. Does the gentleman believe that the American people ought to be taxed to continue the wool industry in Wyoming, when wool can be produced for one-twentieth of a cent a pound in Washington? What is done for the lawyer if he fails in the practice of law? He quits the practice; he goes to selling goods, teaches school, or he farms. What becomes of the blacksmith if he fails at the forge? He goes into some other business. What becomes of the banker if he fails? He must do something else. But what shall we say of the woolgrower in Wyoming, where it is said it costs 12 cents a pound to produce wool? Shall the American people be taxed, and heavily taxed, in order that the sheep may continue to graze along the babbling brooks of Wyoming? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Is that the doctrine of the Republican Party? It is, and has been all these years.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas rose.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have not the time to yield now, although I would be delighted to yield to my friend. The gentleman speaks of 57,000,000 sheep in the United States, and suggests that great injustice is about to be done these sheep.

I want to remind the gentleman that in this Republic of ours there are nearly 57,000,000 of human beings who do not own their homes. On which side are you; for your sheep that graze by the babbling brooks of Wyoming, or are you on the side of these homeless human beings that God has with His image blessed? [Applause on the Democratic side.] You stand here clamoring for protection for sheep and protection for various other things. It is dimes and dollars, dollars and dimes——

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I am sorry, but I can not yield. This side of the House pleads for human welfare; this side of the House pleads for the rights of the plain people; this side of the House has determined to cut the profits of your trust magnates and your tariff barons and to give the under man a chance in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While you are begging for protection for your sheep we ask for protection to the American boy. We pit the American boy against your Wyoming sheep, and the Democratic Party is on the side of the boy. You may stand by your sheep. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, we are told that the sheep business is dwindling and we can not afford to profitably raise them; that the business has gone out of existence because the farms can more profitably raise other products than sheep. I would like to have the gentleman who thus speaks go into the State of Ohio that produced in 1910 almost 4,000,000 of sheep upon acres of ground that are certainly worth as much in the market as the acres upon the farms of the State in which the gentleman lives. I would like to have him go through the county in which I live, that has a premium for live-stock raising that was won at St. Louis, and yet going through these counties you will see sheep upon the various farms; instead of sheep being in opposition to modern methods of farming——

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I only have five minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Ohio produces a large amount of Democrats, too.

Mr. FESS (continuing). Instead of the sheep industry being in opposition to the fertility of the soil, I assert that the sheep industry helps to fertilize the soil. If that is not true, then how does it come that in Great Britain, with a soil but 4 inches deep, you have a more fertile soil in many respects than we do in our own country, stated to be due to the sheep business there in Great Britain? The Member from New York [Mr. HARRISON] said we should not continue the sheep-raising business in this country because we can buy the sheep from Australia and from South Africa and from South America. He stated in the same breath that the demand for sheep was so great in Europe that the price of sheep in Europe was almost equal to what it is here. Let me ask him this question: If the price of sheep in the foreign markets is equal to what it is here under a protective duty, then, in the name of God, what will it be when the American sheep-growing industry is destroyed and our country subject to the monopoly of a foreign market? That is the only thing that prevents the continued rise of the price of wool. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Here is a proposition, presumably in the interest of the consumer, that proposes to displace the American woolgrower for the sake of the woolgrowers of Australia, South Africa, South America, Europe, and Asia.

The pitiable 11 cents duty for the protection of this great American industry must be removed. This woolgrower must compete with the foreign woolgrower, whose labor cost is small in comparison. The woolgrower of Australia can market his wool as entire profit from his sheep, the actual cost being met from other sources, as meat, and so forth. From his wool he realizes $1.31 per head, while the American grower has a charge of from 11 to 19 cents per pound for his wool. If woolgrowing is not a legitimate industry because, as you say, we can not compete with the foreign grower, and ought therefore to cease raising wool and employ our farms in other products, then you can not deny that the purpose of this bill is to displace woolgrowing for some other product of the farm. That means the 300,000,000 pounds annual production of the United States, the 50,000,000 pounds from the 4,000,000 sheep of Ohio—the farmers' Shropshire, known the world over not only for its fleeces but for its meats—must be lost to the American grower in order that you may satisfy an un-American theory, namely, go to other lands for your wool, and this at a time when the prices of meat are still increasing to the consumer. It goes without saying, if you make woolgrowing unprofitable by a law in favor of the foreign grower, you will not only lose the home-grown wool but the meat on which the wool grows. You, in the interest of the consumer of meat, are here proposing to decrease the meat production.

This new theory, this Democratic theory, that estimates the wealth of our country by what we are compelled to buy rather than by what we produce—in other words, the theory that

measures your wealth by what you do not have rather than by what you do have—proposes to lower the cost of living by reducing the production of the things upon which we live. And all this in the hope that free wool will mean free clothes and free sheep will mean free meat.

The small amount of wool in the make-up of any suit will make a very slight difference in the cost by virtue of the 11 cents duty. Who will get this reduction? Do you suppose for a moment the consumer will get it? You know that a suit that costs $25 now will not sell for $24.10 by virtue of 90 cents saved by the reduction of 11 cents duty on wool. In order to save the 90 cents to the consumer you are proposing to destroy this great industry.

But we are told it will not destroy it. My answer to all such statements is a simple reference to the free-wool provision of the Wilson tariff, when the price of sheep would not pay for the transportation rates from the city of Xenia to Buffalo. The woolgrowing industry has never yet recovered from the effects of that law.

Reports declare that the acreage for woolgrowing in foreign countries is not increasing, which, if true, means you will not by this measure cheapen the price of foreign wool, but, on the other hand, this bill will increase the price at the expense of the consumer. It would be wisdom for this Government to stand by the policy of encouraging sheep growing in this country, not only to clothe our people but to feed them as well. I know that an argument designed to encourage American enterprise has no place in this House in these days. This majority has in a hundred instances, both by speech and vote, declared that an appeal on behalf of the American producer for the sake of continuing the existence of the American consumer, the great laboring class of our population, is out of place here. Here in the National House of Representatives we are faced with this un-American policy that looks to the cash balances of the importer rather than to the condition of our producers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM].

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, hitherto I have succeeded in not yielding to the temptation to talk to this committee, but through all of these ramifications of talk I had hoped that there might come a lucid interval to the membership of this House on the left-hand side of this aisle in this discussion, and I want, if I can, to draw a parallel on this paragraph to a condition that has prevailed for a number of years in the State from which I come. Kentucky is the great producer, as you know, of tobacco. For over 25 years the tariff rates on imported tobacco that are carried in this bill have been in the bills that have been upon our statute books. The price in former years that the growers of tobacco were enabled to realize ranged from 3 to 6 and 7 cents a pound for their tobacco. The tariff tax on tobacco ranged from $2.45 a pound down to 25 cents a pound, and that tax rate in the law has been in the statute for 25 years, and during that time the price of tobacco has been as low as 3 cents. It now ranges as high as 15 cents a pound. If this 11-cents-a-pound tariff on wool helps the farmer one cent, answer me, some man on that side of the aisle, why it is that the farmers raising tobacco in Kentucky, with this tariff customs tax ranging from 25 cents a pound to $2.45 per pound, were only able to realize 3 cents a pound for their tobacco? Why did they not realize a price commensurate with the protective tariff rate on tobacco?

If your argument is a sound argument and an unanswerable one, that this 11 cents a pound finds it way into the pockets of the farmer, why was it that the farmers who raise tobacco could not realize some of the alleged benefits from the protective duty on tobacco? He does not and he did not do it. The tobacco raiser in Kentucky went down into the very shadow of the Valley of Death, because there was but one buyer—the Tobacco Trust. The Kentuckians went into that fight and won, as they usually do. They fought the trust, and to-day the price of that product, as I have said, ranges from 10 to 20 cents a pound. Your tariff tax on tobacco has been the same during the entire period—a fixed quantity. Through all that time not a cent of it found its way to the pockets of the tobacco raiser. Just so not a cent of the 11 cents finds its way into the pockets of the woolgrower. Why? Because of your Woolen Trust. We raise in my district the same type of wool that is raised in Ohio, and it commands the highest price, ranging from 15 to 32 cents in the last decade, more often under 20 cents than above it. But where is our enemy? Where is the enemy of the woolgrower? It is the Woolen Trust. Put this tax as high as the dome of this Capitol, if you please, and the farmer will never realize anything more for his wool than the trust is compelled to pay. He will simply pay the price at which it can be exported at a profit. The Woolen Trust gives the farmer the same kind of a deal on his wool that the Tobacco Trust gives the tobacco grower for his tobacco.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the theorists upon that side is illustrated by the remarks of the gentleman who has just spoken. I understood my friend from Kentucky to say that the farmer realizes nothing at all as the result of the tariff on wool, and I understood my friend from New York to say, openly and frankly, that if this bill went into effect he contemplated that the present woolgrowing and sheep-raising industry of the State of Ohio would practically be wiped out of existence. The best test, Mr. Chairman, of mere vapid theories is the statement of the facts. It has been said in this debate there was not any difference between the price of wool here and the price abroad. Let us see what the facts are. The actual facts are shown in the following table, setting forth the differences in prices between the London and Boston markets. The comparison is made on the basis of the price of wool in the grease and for the period from September, 1912, to February, 1913. Probably the difference would not be so great to-day, for the price of the farmers' wool has fallen very rapidly of late under the impending threat of free trade as exemplified by this bill. The table is as follows:

Grade.	Shrinkage.	London.	Boston.
	Pr. ct.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
Fine staple	67	15¾	21½=5¾
Fine clothing	67	15¾	20 =4¼
One-half blood	60	18	22 =4
Three-eighths blood	58	16¾	23¾=7
One-fourth blood	52	16½	23½=7
Braid	47	17	25 =8

The facts are that in last February a fleece of Idaho wool, a fine staple wool, sold on the London market at grease prices, at 15¾ cents a pound, and that the same fleece sold in Boston at 20½ cents a pound, a difference of 5¾ cents per pound. And yet it is said that the tariff makes no difference in the price that the farmer gets. Half-blood wool sold on the London market at 18 cents a pound; it sold on the Boston market at 22 cents a pound, a difference of 4 cents. Three-eighths blood wool sold on the London market at 16¾ cents; on the Boston market at 23¾ cents a pound, a difference of 7 cents a pound. And so on with the different grades, making an average of between 6 and 7 cents a pound.

The same thing is shown by the following table explaining the difference in prices between London and Boston markets on the basis of the grease pound. A fleece of Ohio wool was cut in two, one half being sent to the London market, the other half to the Boston market. The same thing was done with fleeces of Oregon and Wyoming wool, respectively.

The results obtained are shown in the table.

	London price.	Boston price.	Difference.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
Ohio	19½	26¾	7
Oregon	14½	20	5½
Wyoming	15¾	21	5¼

There is not any question about it, Mr. Chairman, and when gentlemen are frank they admit it.

I compliment our friends on the other side of the aisle for having been frank at least occasionally. They said in their report, when the wool bill was up before, that it was estimated that eventually wool would be put on the free list. In their report on the wool bill of 1911 the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee said, page 26:

> It is maintained by a very large number of our best economists and statesmen that the economic situation involved in our rapid progress as a Nation requires that our ports should be thrown open to the importation of wool free of duty; and this view, based on the most profound consideration of the public welfare, has found expression in Democratic legislation. It is the constant intent of the Democratic Party to make the burden of tariff taxes as light as possible for the people, and to levy tariff taxes on a revenue basis as promptly as possible, for the party recognizes no justification whatever for tariff taxes except the necessity of revenue.

In some remarks that I made then I prophesied if the Democrats had control of the Government wool would be placed on the free list. On that occasion I said:

> In other words, it is perfectly clear that there is no intention to maintain any protective duty whatever on wool. I think I am perfectly fair

in making that statement and am not misrepresenting anybody. So the woolgrowers of the country ought to understand that they are face to face with the proposition of free wool. We have torn the mask aside, and we know where our good friends, the enemy, are located on this proposition.

Various able, eloquent gentlemen on the Democratic side said: "No; that is not a doctrine of our party." Even so late as last October, the President of the United States said at Pittsburgh:

The Democratic Party does not propose free trade or anything approaching free trade.

And even when the Ways and Means Committee went into the discussion of this subject, as we learned this morning from the able and eloquent gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], the alert protector of the goat industry, the committee itself decided that there ought to be a duty on wool of 15 per cent ad valorem. Yet, though that was the judgment of the committee, when certain conferences were held, and when the pie counter was in sight with the viands distributed upon it in plain view of the hungry and assembled host, and when the brethren were given to understand that access thereto would not be easy to them and their friends unless there would be a change in this rate, these gentlemen said: "Our opinion amounts to nothing." They said: "We will abandon all we have recommended and put wool on the free list, but goat hair must still be protected 20 per cent ad valorem." The able gentleman from Alabama, who spoke a few moments ago, worries a good deal about the farmer's boy. Ah, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is not talking in favor of the farmer's boy. I am here to speak in favor of the farmer's boy of Ohio, and the gentleman from Alabama is talking in favor of the half-naked sheep herders of South Africa working for $2 per month, with whom he wants to bring our boys into competition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am speaking in favor of the small farmers of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything more upon this bill. I had already expressed at some length my views concerning it. But I did not feel that I could fulfill my duty to the people who sent me here if I should sit here silent in the face of the avowed proposition that a great industry of Ohio is to be stricken down, that the market which the American farmer has had for his product is to be taken from him, and sheep raising and woolgrowing are to be driven from the land, without any benefit to consumers or anyone else. This bill takes all the tariff off the farmers' wool, but the product of the Woolen Trust is protected. If we are to have free wool, why not free clothes? I did not feel that I could fulfill my duties if I said nothing at all, and so, Mr. Chairman, in the name of the small farmers, in the name of the farmers' boys of Ohio, in the name of American labor, in the name of 600,000 woolgrowers in the United States, I protest against the passage of this infamous, ill-considered, illogical, unfair free-trade bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 16 minutes.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] if he intends to have any more speeches on that side?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There will be only one more speech on this side.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, during the course of this debate we have heard a great deal from the Democratic side as to their keeping the pledges that they had made to the American people. Whenever some item has been discussed where they have admitted that their rates are an injustice to the producer, they have said that it was necessary because they had promised in their platform to reduce the cost of living to the American people.

And now I want to direct the attention of that side of the aisle for a moment to a consideration of this schedule and to ask whether they have kept the promises they made to the American people in the framing of it. I read from the Democratic platform of 1912:

Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products and articles of American manufacture which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home should be put upon the free list.

You promised that articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products would be put upon the free list the first time you had an opportunity to write a tariff law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, is there a Woolen Trust in this country? I do not know whether there is or not; but if there is, you promised to put their products upon the free list. I would not vote to do so if I believed there was a trust, because I would not be willing to destroy the industry for the purpose of destroying the monopoly. You said you would. Is there a Woolen Trust?

Mr. Chairman, upon that question I want to call a most convincing witness to the Democratic side, a man whose word is absolute law to them, and it is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. On the 7th day of June, 1911, Mr. UNDERWOOD used this language:

There is nobody in this country who does not know that the American Woolen Co. to-day fixes the price of woolen goods; that is a monopoly; that is a trust.

Now, have you kept your promise? Or have you repudiated the gentleman from Alabama? If you have repudiated him, it is the first time that you have done so. His word has been absolute law unto you, and the gentleman from Alabama may well say, paraphrasing the epigram credited to Louis XIV, "The Democratic majority—I am the Democratic majority."

And, Mr. Chairman, I want to direct an inquiry to the Members of the Progressive Party in the House. There have not been many of them present during the debates upon this schedule—and I am not surprised at that, because two years ago their leader, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], when we were considering this very schedule, used this language:

Believing as I do that the duty carried on worsted for men's and women's wear in this bill is indefensible, that it is an outrage upon the entire population, I am firmly convinced that if the Members of this House should come to understand the facts in the case a majority of the Members could no more be induced to put a duty on worsteds than they could be to put it on coal oil.

A little later he said:

I can not see for the life of me how anyone in the American Congress can aid the Worsted Trust by putting a tariff on worsteds, either as a frankly avowed measure of protection or under the pretense of a tariff for revenue only.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] in this debate so far has been as silent as the grave. Neither has he offered the amendment that he offered two years ago to put tops and worsted goods upon the free list. I wonder why? Have the Progressives repudiated their leader upon this proposition, or as a condition of admission to the new party was he compelled to recant this heresy upon his part? [Applause on the Republican side.] I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the latter was the case.

I want to congratulate the Democratic side upon the fact that they have broken this promise that they made to the American people, even though there be a Woolen Trust, for I do not want to see the woolen industry destroyed. Destroy the monopoly, but save the industry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a moment with reference to these two bills. The substitute bill offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is a protective measure and at the same time reduces every rate in the present Schedule K. It is consistent, and in accord with the report of the Tariff Board.

How is it with your bill? Like your cotton bill it is not consistent at any point in it. You put wool upon the free list, but so far as protection to the woolen manufacturer is concerned you have given him upon the coarse and cheap woolen cloths a greater amount of protection than this Republican bill gives to them. But how many times in the past have you upon the other side, in your well-deserved denunciation of Schedule K, said, "If you put us in the majority we will reduce the rates; we will cut the rates to the very bone upon these woolen cloths that the poorest people in the United States must buy and use." And yet in this very bill your rates upon the cheapest woolen cloths are 5 per cent higher than are the protection rates in the Republican bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is a high protectionist. He is honest; but I am glad that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] made the speech that he did, so long as he holds the views that he does with reference to Schedule K, in his defense of the present schedule. I have thought sometimes during this debate, from his much speaking and his high protective tariff views, that the country might be led to believe that a considerable number upon this side of the aisle were in accord with him. But honest as he is and industrious as he is, there are not a handful upon this side of the aisle who hold the views that he does, and in voting upon this woolen schedule we will have an opportunity of demonstrating to the country that the Republican Party is sincere in its advocacy of honest protection based upon the report of a tariff commission. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have heard upon that side of the aisle a great many times the cry that their purpose in all tariff legislation is to give equal rights to all and special privileges to

none. And yet this very bill, and your method of framing tariff bills, is more open to favoritism and discrimination and special privilege than the Republican protective position can possibly be. You put wool on the free list, but a 20 per cent duty upon the hair of the Angora goat. You put flour upon the free list, but you keep a high duty upon rice. And so I could go on picking out items of necessity to the American people where you have arbitrarily said, "Free trade upon this article, but a high tariff on another article." Can there be any worse kind of favoritism than that? The Republican position of protection, equaling the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, if it be a special privilege at all, applies to all alike, protecting them only from unfair competition from abroad, and I say there can not be such a thing as special privilege when the vast majority of the people of the country have equal benefits from the privilege, whatever it may be. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the Republicans made an appropriation under which President Taft appointed a Tariff Board, consisting of three Republicans and two Democrats, who brought in a unanimous report as to the facts involved in the production of wool and woolen goods, both in this and other countries.

We on this side of the House stand by our guns, stand by the report of the Tariff Board, and we present a woolen schedule, based upon the information ascertained by this Tariff Board. [Applause on the Republican side.]

For years the woolen schedule has been a point of controversy in the country, and for probably the first time in the history of tariff making in this country we now propose a scientific adjustment of Schedule K, and we will confidently appeal to the country in favor of tariffs based upon information rather than tariffs based upon guesswork. All through industrial life to-day people are learning the necessity of scientific information and scientific processes. Even in this legislative body we are learning it, although the learning so far has only permeated this side of the House, and has not penetrated to the Democratic majority. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I believe we will present a solid front, and I hope on this proposition we may have the support of those Republicans temporarily estranged from our party, soon to return, who now call themselves Progressives, as we call ourselves Republicans, because in the end Republicanism means progression. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], always candid and always a free trader, logically in the process of his reasoning, said that free wool meant the death knell of woolgrowing in the United States, which he declared ought to be because it was logical.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I am sure that my good friend does not wish to misrepresent——

Mr. MANN. Well, cut that part of it out; I never misrepresented anybody.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I said no such thing, but I tried to show just the contrary—that the tariff on wool does not now protect the woolgrowers.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York declared—and I know he will not change his remarks—that free wool meant the death knell of the woolgrowing industry in the United States for the purpose of growing wool. Only a few days ago the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] the former chairman of the special committee on sugar, declared that this bill meant the death knell of sugar growing in Louisiana and Texas. One by one they admit that they propose to kill the industries of the country. One kills the sugar industry to-day, another kills the woolgrowing industry to-morrow, another kills the wool manufacturing the next day. Do they think that as they kill these off one by one they are not killing them off altogether? The injury comes to the country all at once. We might do it if it was only wool; we might do it if it was only the cotton manufacture, or if it was only the woolen manufacture, or one kind of any other kind of manufacture; but when we propose at one time to do injury to the great mass of industries throughout the country, you and I will learn that that can not be done and retain the prosperity in the land, for God knows I hope prosperity will remain in spite of your legislation; and I know that in the long run the American people, with their common sense, will return to such economic policies as will make sure of the prosperity which God and nature entitle us to have. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, the distinguished leader of the Republican Party congratulates himself and his party on the fact that they are learning something. We are glad to join with them in these congratulations, but I would like to inquire which part of the Republican Party is learning something in view of the substitute you offer?

It is a well-known fact, and neither the gentleman from Illinois nor the proponent of the measure, the gentleman from New York, will deny the fact that the members of the Ways and Means Committee representing your side of the House are not united on this substitute. Why, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] this morning repudiated your bill, and there are other Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee besides the gentleman from Pennsylvania sitting before me now that you know repudiate your bill and spurn it as not Republican and not scientific.

I would like to know which of your representatives on the committee and on the floor are learning something, since they occupy two different positions in reference to the substitute the gentleman proposes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. We are all learning on this side of the House [applause on the Democratic side], which can seldom be said of the other side of the House. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is much greater unanimity among the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee on the Payne substitute than there was among the majority members on the wool proposition when it was in committee. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is where the gentleman is mistaken. The Democratic Party never has levied a duty upon raw wool for protection. In 1911 and 1912 it brought a bill before this House taxing raw wool, and then I stated to the gentleman from Illinois in answer to his question that that tax was levied for revenue. When you levy a revenue tax it is within our principles that it should be levied at a revenue rate. It is not a matter of principle as to the article on which that revenue rate shall fall, it is a matter of economy and a matter of selection.

I will say to the gentleman that when this bill was reported to this House it left the Ways and Means Committee with a unanimous vote of the majority members of the committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just a question.

Mr. MANN. Is it not, or is it, a fact, as current rumor reports, that a majority of the present Ways and Means Committee, including the gentleman from Alabama, were in favor of a tariff on raw wool, and only changed their minds at the request of the President of the United States?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that we were in favor of a tax on raw wool at one time, because we reported two bills to the last Congress containing a tax on raw wool.

Mr. MANN. My question related to this Ways and Means Committee at this session of Congress.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman candidly——

Mr. MANN. Oh, I have no desire to embarrass the gentleman and am willing to relieve him from responsibility.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is no secret. I will state it candidly. Yes; the bill when originally written had a tax of 15 per cent on raw wool. The difference between the gentleman's party and our party is that we can get together and you can not. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We got together for the benefit of the American people. The gentleman from Illinois says that that side is learning. Yes; it is learning something. It is learning that the sentiment of the American people is behind the principles of the Democratic Party, and it is learning to follow Democracy and is following it in this schedule. It was only four years ago when you reported a bill to this House and refused to revise or cut down the iniquitous tax that you had maintained on the clothes of the American people for 50 years, and it was not until we had been given control of this House that we taught you a lesson and taught you the way to go. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, you contend that you have written this substitute bill in conformity with the report of the Tariff Board. Mark you, these rates, when raw wool is eliminated from the equation, are substantially the same as those in our first bill, introduced before the Tariff Board made a report. Eliminating raw wool from the equation, they are on an equal basis. What do you do? You no longer maintain the prohibitive rates on tops and yarns and cloths and woolen goods. Of course, I recognize the

fact that you were ashamed to copy exactly our rates, but you tried to do it, and approached it in an indirect way. We levy a tax of 15 per cent on tops from which the yarn is spun. You levy a rate of 18 cents a pound on scoured wool, and you carry into the top paragraph 20 cents a pound on the wool contents and 10 per cent ad valorem. In other words, on the tops you add 2 cents per pound more than you say is the rate that should be charged on scoured wool. I recognize the fact that the Tariff Board estimated that this was the necessary compensatory duty. Instead of putting this at an ad valorem rate in your 10 per cent, you carry it in your specific rate. Do you mean to say, as the gentleman from New York said, that on tops there is a difference between the substitute and our bill of 10 and 15 per cent? When you increase the charge on scoured wool, that goes into the 2 cents per pound?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to interrupt the gentleman, but I desire to correct him. The duty on scoured wool is 19 cents a pound.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And on grease wool you have 18 cents and on scoured 19.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Nineteen cents. Of course, you can allow for the 1 cent per pound if you want to in a specific rate or in the ad valorem rate. We would allow for the compensatory duty in the ad valorem rate, while you allow for it in the specific rate, where you put it in as an equivalent for the duty on raw wool. That raise of 1 cent per pound on scoured wool approximates 2 per cent ad valorem.

And what is the result? In a comparison of the two bills on a free-wool basis the real result is that the duty amounts to about 12 per cent against our 15 per cent. Now, I say you were ashamed to come right up and accept our figures. Now, when you come down to yarns, instead of carrying 19 cents per pound on scoured wool in the yarn you increase this specific duty on yarns to 21½ cents per pound and then add an ad valorem rate varying from 10 to 25 per cent, according to value, increasing the duty for raw wool from 19 to 21½ cents per pound and again raising the ad valorem equivalent in the same way, following the old process that has marked the iniquities of the woolen schedule in the last 40 years. On cloth they do the same thing, except raising it higher and higher. They put on cloth valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 60 cents a pound 26 cents a pound on the wool content therein, although they say 19 cents is a fair tax on scoured wool, and then add 35 per cent. On cloth valued at more than 60 cents and not more than 80 cents they place 26 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem, and on those above 80 cents and not more than $1, 26 cents per pound and 45 per cent, and so on, raising the schedule as they go; and yet the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], knowing that, actually stated to the House that our bill was higher than the rates in the present law. But, of course, I know what he meant.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman means this substitute.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the gentleman know that that merely takes care of the loss in the wool?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course I do. If the gentleman had been listening for the last 15 minutes he would have heard me say that it takes care of the loss of wool, and that the Tariff Board estimated it——

Mr. LENROOT. But with free wool you do not have to do that and you would not if you had free wool——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not yield to the gentleman to make a speech. Of course, when you are comparing it on a free-wool basis, free wool loses as much in the manufacture as taxed wool. Does the gentleman think because wool comes in free at the customhouse that there is not as much waste as when it comes in taxed? Of course not. I can not yield to the gentleman to make a speech. There is no difference, except that you are trying to hide some protection in this bill that you do not want the American people to find. That is it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, you say that you have written this tax in conformity with the report of the Tariff Board. I admit that when you cut out your tax on raw wool that on tops and yarns there is very little difference in the bill. On the lower grade articles—woolen goods—you are about the same as we are, but when you go to the higher grade articles you go very much higher than we do, but you are approximating the basis that we made. You follow the way we showed you to go. But the real question involved is whether or not you should levy this tax on raw wool in conformity with the Tariff Board's report. Now, there is not a man on the floor of this House who ever read that Tariff Board report who does not know that the Tariff Board reached a Scotch verdict on raw wool. You know it and I know it. There is not one line in that report that says you should tax raw wool, or you should not, and it is an open secret that the board divided on that question as to whether or not raw wool should be taxed. Now, which side of this Tariff Board are you following? That is the question. You are writing this tariff bill, you say, in conformity with the report of the Tariff Board, a scientific Tariff Board report, but you can not say which side of it you are following.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not right now. I want to give you some information. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. I shall enjoy it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Thomas Walker Page, a distinguished member of that board, recently wrote an article in the North American Review, giving his position in reference to the question as to whether or not raw wool should be taxed. He was a member of the board, and he wrote this article as a review of his work. I will ask the Clerk to read the portion of this memorandum that I have marked.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the North American Review for April, 1913, Mr. Page says:

"To the average American sheep raiser the wool duties are only an incidental aid; to the genuine woolgrower they are of real assistance, but they are inadequate to prevent the gradual merging of this industry in that of the mutton producer. To neither, therefore, do they bring a benefit that economically justifies their retention. From the standpoint of the manufacturer these duties are undeniably an evil. They raise the price of his raw material, increase the amount of capital necessary in his business, enhance his costs of production, and make it impossible for him to compete for trade in neutral markets. More than this, they completely bar him from the use of important varieties of wool that are available abroad. South Africa, for example, exports about 125,000,000 pounds of wool as fine and, for many purposes, as useful as any that is grown, but the amount we take of it is negligible. The explanation of this is found in the fact that the duties are specific payments on a pound of wool 'in the grease'—that is, in its natural condition as it leaves the sheep's back. But in each class of grease wool there are many varieties which differ not only in length, strength, luster, and fineness, but also in the quantity of oil and other impurities they contain, so that some varieties when scoured yield much less clean fiber than do others. These variations appear not only in sheep of different breeds or from different regions, they are also found in different parts of the same fleece. Thus wool from the neck, breech, or belly shows a different shrinkage in scouring from that of wool on the rest of the body. Naturally the American buyer abroad can now take only wool of a good yield. The heavy shrinking wool is often excellent for his purposes, but when the duty is estimated on its clean content he finds that he can not afford to import it." Prof. Page charges that the reason why the duties on woolen cloth have continued so high has been the disposition of American manufacturers to profit by compensatory duties imposed for the purpose of offsetting the tariff on raw wool, but fixed at so high a point as to be much more than compensatory. Furthermore says he, "It is well known that the greater part of the woolen fabrics that enter commerce are not all wool." In summing up he uses the following strong language: "It must be admitted that there is good reason why this particular raw material should not be taxed. In all other countries with any industrial development except Russia the importation of wool is free. Our tax on it, therefore, puts our manufacturers at an insuperable disadvantage in neutral markets, and it would have the same effect in the domestic market but for the compensatory duties. The importance of properly adjusting these duties becomes evident when it is remembered that while the annual output of our wool crop is less than $60,000,000, the annual output of our wool-using industries is more than $700,000,000. As they now stand our compensatory duties are a glaring abuse in our tariff system, and are responsible for much of the popular outcry against it. It seems, however, to be impossible to adjust them fairly, and to repeal them involves the total repeal of the duties on wool. It follows from what has been said that whether they are studied with regard to their effect on the production or the manufacture of wool the wool duties are without economic justification."

Even with reference to the business side of the sheep-raising industry Mr. Page says:

"The industry as a whole would not materially suffer; it would even make a substantial gain in being freed from the necessity of playing politics and relieved of the uncertainty and anxiety that will hamper it as long as the duties are there to be defended. There would be a temporary setback owing to panic, but forces that are already at work would soon build up the industry along new lines and on a more stable foundation."

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They say that the tax on raw wool is written in conformity with the Tariff Board's report in this bill. There is a witness which I present to you, a distinguished member of the Tariff Board, who says that the duties on raw wool are without justification. And, more than that, it is a well-known fact that the chairman of the Tariff Board did not believe in levying duties on raw wool.

And yet you come before this Congress, not asking to legislate on your judgment, on your own ability, but you come here to-day and tell us that you have been taught a lesson and you want to write that lesson on the statute books, and when we call your teacher to testify he refuses to stand for a statement that you have made to the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will not yield.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course he will not. He does not dare to yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not have the gentleman taking my time. It is too valuable right now.

Mr. MONDELL. It would be embarrassing.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have a very great admiration for the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], a man of the highest character and fearless honesty when it comes to anything else but the tariff; but he has been so badly trained as to the way in which he should go on the tariff that he could not write a wool schedule, even if he tried, without putting jokers in it. [Laughter.]

Now, he has told the people of the United States that although he taxed the wool from which clothes were made he is going to give them free wool carpets. He will tax the material that keeps them warm from the winter's snow, but he will give them untaxed carpets to walk upon. He did not do it; he just told them he was going to do it. He has two classifications in this bill, first and second class wool. On second-class wool he puts the rate of 7 cents per pound, and then follows it with a proviso and says that it shall come in free if it is used for making carpets. But he also says in this bill:

Whenever wools of class 2 shall have been improved by the admixture of merino or English blood, from their present character, as represented by the standard samples now or hereafter to be deposited in the principal customhouses of the United States, such improved wools shall be classified for duty as class 1.

And that means they have to pay 19 cents per pound on scoured wool. But he goes on further and says:

If any bale or package of wool or hair specified in this act, invoiced or entered as of class 2, or claimed by the importer to be dutiable as of class 2, shall contain any wool or hair subject to the rate of duty of class 1, the whole bale or package shall be subject to the rate of duty chargeable on wool of class 1.

Now, I am informed by men who buy wool, who import wool, that it is almost impossible to-day to find wool that is all class 2, without some of the finer grades of wool being mixed with it. Why? Because everyone is trying to improve his sheep. Everyone is mixing the high-bred sheep with the low-bred sheep.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will answer it for you.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is not talking to the Democratic caucus; he is talking to the House of Representatives.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will tell it.

Mr. PAYNE. You do not tell it to anybody.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I got this information only a day or two ago, although I knew it to be a fact before, from a manufacturer of carpets in your own State.

He told me that he hoped that this distinction that you were trying to draw would not be maintained, because it was only a fraud. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He said it was only a fraud; that it was almost impossible to find a bale of second-class wool, and that carpet wool, or a large proportion of it, under this bill would be classed as wool of class 1.

Mr. PAYNE. Is that the situation in the present law?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not through with the gentleman yet.

Mr. PAYNE. You are not proving anything.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, here is the bill that I hold in my hand, the bill that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] offers as a substitute, and he says that it was prepared by the Tariff Board. My friends, I am sure that the gentleman from New York should not charge this to the Tariff Board. The Tariff Board already has enough sins to bear. You should not send it down into history, or try to do so, bearing the errors and iniquities of this substitute that you have offered to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Listen to this. Here is the way they class wools, or try to class them:

The duty on all wools of class 2, including camel's hair of class 2, imported in their natural condition, shall be 7 cents per pound. If scoured, 19 cents per pound.

Now, mark: Imported in their natural condition, the duty shall be 7 cents a pound, and if scoured, 19 cents a pound. It will be noted that there is no provision for washed wool of class 2. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may have half an hour and that I may have five minutes afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] submits a request for unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] may have half an hour and that he may have five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his courtesy, but inasmuch as the country expects us to do business I must decline to accept it and must insist on our going on.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman does not dare to do it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will insert as a part of my remarks, under the leave already given, a comparison of the rates in the Payne law with the proposed bill.

Following is the comparison referred to:

Comparison of the imports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, with the estimates for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910.

7. CLASS I,[1] WOOL ON THE SKIN, UNWASHED.

	Payne tariff, 1912.	Estimate for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910.	Rate under Underwood bill.
Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	700,192	[2] 1,000,000	
Value	$124,642.00	$170,000.00	
Average unit	$0.178	$0.17	
Duties	$70,019.00	$72,000.00	
Rate	10c. per lb.	16c. per lb. on wool content.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	56.18	42.35	

[1] Classification of 1909. [2] Shrinkage 55 per cent, p. 383, Tariff Board report.

7. WOOL, NOT ON THE SKIN, UNWASHED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	68,645,199.00	100,000,000	
Value	$15,185,794.00	$20,000,000.00	
Average unit	$0.221	$0.20	
Duties	$7,550,972.00	$8,100,000.00	
Rate	11c. per lb.	18c. per lb. (wool content).	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	49.72	40.50	

7. WOOL, ON THE SKIN, WASHED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	280	1,000	
Value	$51.00	$190.00	
Average unit	$0.182	$0.19	
Duties	$59.00	$144	
Rate	21c. per lb.	16c. per lb. (wool content).	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	115.29	75.77	

7. WOOL, NOT ON THE SKIN, WASHED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	88	[1] 25,000	
Value	$27.00	$5,500.00	
Average unit	$0.307	$0.22	
Duties	$19.00	$4,050.00	
Rate	22c. per lb.	18c. per lb. (wool content).	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	71.70	73.63	

[1] Shrinkage of 45 per cent.

7. WOOL, SCOURED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	126	15,000	
Value	$42.00	$4,800.00	
Average unit	$0.329	$0.32	
Duties	$42.00	$2,850.00	
Rate	33c. per lb.	19c. per lb.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	100.19	59.37	

7. CLASS II,[1] WOOL ON THE SKIN, WASHED AND UNWASHED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	70,812	70,000	
Value	$16,717.00	$16,800.00	
Average unit	$0.236	$0.24	
Duties	$7,789.00	$8,400.00	
Rate	11c. per lb.	16c. per lb. (wool content).	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	46.60	50.00	

[1] Classification of 1909.

Comparison of the imports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, with the estimates for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910—Continued.

7. WOOL, NOT ON THE SKIN, WASHED OR UNWASHED.

	Payne tariff, 1912.	Estimate for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910.	Rate under Underwood bill.
Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	8,787,594	[1] 9,000,000	
Value	$2,314,039.00	$2,340,000.00	
Average unit	$0.263	$0.26	
Duties	$1,054,511.00	$1,215,000.00	
Rate	12c. per lb.	18c. per lb. (wool content).	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	45.57	51.92	

[1] Shrinkage 25 per cent, Tariff Board report, pp. 399, 400.

7. WOOL, SCOURED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	40	1,000	
Value	$12.00	$320.00	
Average unit	$0.30	$0.32	
Duties	$14.00	$190.00	
Rate	36c. per lb.	19c. per lb.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	120.00	59.38	

7. CAMEL'S HAIR, WASHED OR UNWASHED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	55,911	[1] 60,000	
Value	$14,391.00	$15,000.00	
Average unit	$0.257	$0.25	
Duties	$6,709.00	$6,480.00	
Rate	12c. per lb.	18c. per lb. (wool content).	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	46.62	43.20	

[1] Shrinkage estimated at 40 per cent.

7. HAIR OF THE ANGORA GOAT, ETC., WASHED OR UNWASHED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	[1] 2,029,925	1,800,000	
Value	$632,330.00	$576,000.00	
Average unit	$0.312	$0.32	
Duties	$243,591.00	$279,000.00	
Rate	12c. per lb.	18c. per lb. (wool content).	20.00
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	38.52	48.43	

[1] Shrinkage, 14 per cent; see p. 612, Tariff Board report.

8. CLASS III,[1] WOOL ON THE SKIN, WASHED OR UNWASHED, VALUED AT 12 CENTS OR LESS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	3,206,003	[2] 5,000,000	
Value	$333,847.00	$550,000.00	
Average unit	$0.104	$0.11	
Duties	$96,180.00	$2,500.00	
Rate	3c. per lb.	[3] 0.05c. per lb.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	28.81	0.46	

[1] 1909 classification.
[2] Shrinkage 45 per cent, p. 413, Tariff Board report.
[3] When imported and manufactured into carpets.

8. WOOL NOT ON THE SKIN, VALUED AT 12 CENTS OR LESS PER POUND, WASHED OR UNWASHED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	76,353,267	[1] 90,000,000	
Value	$8,401,691.00	$9,900,000.00	
Average unit	$0.11	$0.11	
Duties	$3,054,131.00	$63,000.00	
Rate	4c. per lb.	0.07c. per lb.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	36.35	0.35	

[1] When imported and made into carpets, etc.

8. CAMEL'S HAIR, RUSSIAN, WASHED OR UNWASHED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	143,085	100,000	
Value	$15,519.00	$11,000.00	
Average unit	$0.108	$0.11	
Duties	$5,723.00	$70.00	
Rate	4c. per pound.	.07c. per lb.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	36.88	.64	

Comparison of the imports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, with the estimates for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910—Continued.

8. CAMEL'S HAIR, WASHED OR UNWASHED, NOT ON THE SKIN, VALUE EXCEEDING 12 CENTS PER POUND.

	Payne tariff, 1912.	Estimate for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910.	Rate under Underwood bill.
Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	30,084,658	45,000,000	
Value	$5,508,034.00	$8,100,000.00	
Average unit	$0.183	$0.18	
Duties	$2,105,926.00	$31,500.00	
Rate	7c. per pound.	.07c. per lb.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	38.23	.39	

8. CAMEL'S HAIR, RUSSIAN, WASHED OR UNWASHED, VALUE EXCEEDING 12 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	[1] 3,693,542	4,000,000	
Value	$594,273.00	$600,000.00	
Average unit	$0.161	$0.15	
Duties	$258,548.00	$280,000.00	
Rate	7c. per pound.	7c. per pound.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	43.51	46.67	

[1] See hearings, p. 4311—used for press cloth.

10, 11, 14, AND 15, TOP, SLUBBING, ROVING, RING, GARNETTED, THREAD, YARN, AND ALL OTHER WOOL WASTES, N. S. P. F.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	44,310	100,000	
Value	$17,184.00	$40,000.00	
Average unit	$0.388	$0.40	
Duties	$8,862.00	$14,000.00	
Rate	20c. per lb.	8c., 9½c., 11c., 14c. or 18c. a lb.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	51.57	35.00	

12 AND 13, NOILS, CARBONIZED AND NOT CARBONIZED.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	[1] 232,054	300,000	
Value	$124,520.00	$165,000.00	
Average unit	$0.537	$0.55	
Duties	$46,413.00	$36,000.00	
Rate	20c. per lb.	11c. or 14c. per lb.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	37.27	21.88	

[1] Includes wool extract.

16. SHODDY AND MUNGO.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	No imports.	1,000	
Value	No imports.	$70.00	
Average unit	No imports.	$0.07	
Duties	No imports.	$80.00	
Rate	25c. on shoddy per lb. 10c. on mungo per lb.	8c. per lb.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per ent)		114.28	

17. WOOLEN RAGS AND FLOCKS.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	85,933	500,000	
Value	$26,303.00	$130,000.00	
Average unit	$0.306	$0.26	
Duties	$8,593.00	$10,000.00	
Rate	10c. per lb.	2c. per lb.	Free.
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	32.67	7.69	

18. COMBED WOOL OR TOPS.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	283	2,000	
Value	$176.00	$1,000.00	
Average unit	$0.622	$0.50	
Duties	$157.00	$500.00	
Rate	36¾c. per lb. and 30 per cent.	20c. per lb. and 10 per cent.	15.00
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	88.95	50.00	

Comparison of the imports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, with the estimates for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910—Continued.

19. WOOL AND HAIR, ADVANCED.

	Payne tariff, 1912.	Estimate for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910.	Rate under Underwood bill.
Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	594	3,000	
Value	$536.00	$3,750.00	
Average unit	$0.902	$1.25	
Duties	$498.00	$975.00	
Rate	33c. per lb. and 50 per cent or 44c. per lb. and 55 per cent.	20c. per lb. and 10 per cent.	15.00
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	92.91	26.00	

20. YARNS, VALUED NOT ABOVE 30 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	324	500	
Value	$84.00	$125.00	
Average unit	$0.259	$0.25	
Duties	$118.00	$66.00	
Rate	27½c. per lb. and 35 per cent.	21½c. per lb. and 10 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	141.07	52.80	20.00

20. YARNS, VALUED OVER 30 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	60,706	200,000	
Value	$59,386.00	$184,000.00	
Average unit	$0.978	$0.92	
Duties	$47,127.00	$89,000.00	
Rate	38½c. per lb. and 40 per cent.	21½c. per lb. and 25 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	79.36	48.37	20.00

21. CLOTHS, VALUED NOT OVER 40 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	10,123	15,000	
Value	$3,524.00	$5,100.00	
Average unit	$0.348	$0.34	
Duties	$5,103.00	$3,280.00	
Rate	33c. per lb. and 50 per cent.	25c. per lb. and 30 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	144.79	64.31	35.00

21. CLOTHS, VALUED OVER 40 CENTS, NOT MORE THAN 70 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	282,240	300,000	
Value	$166,659.00	$180,000.00	
Average unit	$0.59	$0.60	
Duties	$207,515.00	$115,000.00	
Rate	44c. per lb. and 50 per cent (wool content).	26c. per lb. and 35 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	124.51	63.89	35.00

21. CLOTHS, VALUED ABOVE 70 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	3,921,318	4,000,000	
Value	$4,513,584.00	$4,800,000.00	
Average unit	$1.15	$1.20	
Duties	$4,207,851.00	$3,440,000.00	
Rate	44c. per lb. and 55 per cent.	26c. per lb. and 50 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	93.23	71.67	35.00

21. KNIT FABRICS, VALUED NOT ABOVE 40 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	12	1,000	
Value	$4.00	$350.00	
Average unit	$0.348	$0.35	
Duties	$6.00	$230.00	
Rate	33c. per lb. and 50 per cent.	25c. per lb. and 30 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	144.75	65.71	35.00

Comparison of the imports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, with the estimates for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910—Continued.

21. KNIT FABRICS, VALUED ABOVE 40 CENTS AND NOT ABOVE 70 CENTS PER POUND.

	Payne tariff, 1912.	Estimate for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910.	Rate under Underwood bill.
Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	1,007	2,500	
Value	$658.00	$1,600.00	
Average unit	$0.652	$0.64	
Duties	$772.00	$1,000.00	
Rate	44c. per lb. and 50 per cent.	26c. per lb. and 40 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	117.44	64.37	35.00

21. KNIT FABRICS, VALUED ABOVE 70 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	7,780	40,000	
Value	$8,423.00	$44,000.00	
Average unit	$1.08	$1.10	
Duties	$8,059.00	$32,400.00	
Rate	44c. per lb. and 55 per cent.	26c. per lb. and 50 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	95.62	73.64	35.00

21. PLUSHES AND OTHER PILE FABRICS.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	7,480	20,000	
Value	$8,990.00	$19,000.00	
Average unit	$1.20	$0.95	
Duties	$8,236.00	$13,750.00	
Rate	44c. per lb. and 55 per cent.	26c. per lb. and 45 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	91.61	72.37	35.00

21. WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S DRESS GOODS, ETC., VALUE NOT OVER 40 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	275	3,000	
Value	$89.00	$990.00	
Average unit	$0.324	$0.33	
Duties	$135.00	$672.00	
Rate	33c. per lb. and 50 per cent.	25c. per lb. and 30 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	151.97	67.87	35.00

21. WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S DRESS GOODS, ETC., VALUED ABOVE 40 CENTS AND NOT ABOVE 70 CENTS.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)		2,000,000	
Value	$537,949.00	$1,160,000.00	
Average unit		$0.58	
Duties	$560,736.00	$796,000.00	
Rate		26c. per lb. and 35 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	104.22	68.62	35.00

21. WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S DRESS GOODS, ETC., VALUED ABOVE 70 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)		7,000,000	
Value	$2,828,917.00	$6,860,000.00	
Average unit		$0.98	
Duties	$2,796,011.00	$4,907,000.00	
Rate		26c. per lb. and 45 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	98.83	71.53	35.00

21. FELTS, NOT WOVEN.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	90,680	100,000	
Value	$115,482.00	$125,000.00	
Average unit	$1.27	$1.25	
Duties	$109,188.00	$88,500.00	
Rate	44c. per lb. and 60 per cent.	26c. per lb. and 50 per cent.	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	84.55	70.80	35.00

Comparison of the imports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, with the estimates for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910—Continued.

22. BLANKETS, VALUED NOT MORE THAN 40 CENTS PER POUND.

	Payne tariff, 1912.	Estimate for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910.	Rate under Underwood bill.
Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	1,821	2,000	
Value	$604.00	$680.00	
Average unit	$0.332	$0.34	
Duties	$582.00	$371.00	
Rate	22c. per lb. and 30 per cent.	23½c. per lb. and 20 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	96.34	54.66	25.00

22. BLANKETS, VALUED OVER 40 CENTS, BUT NOT ABOVE 50 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	1,132	2,000	
Value	$539.00	$940.00	
Average unit	$0.476	$0.47	
Duties	$562.00	$588.00	
Rate	33c. per lb. and 35 per cent.	23½c. per lb. and 25 per cent (wool contents).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	104.28	62.45	25.00

22. BLANKETS, VALUED OVER 50 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	39,421	50,000	
Value	$45,678.00	$55,000.00	
Average unit	$1.16	$1.10	
Duties	$31,280.00	$28,250.00	
Rate	33c. per lb. and 40 per cent.	23½c. per lb. and 30 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	68.48	51.36	25.00

22. BLANKETS, OVER 3 YARDS LONG.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	6,013	20,000	
Value	$5,153.00	$20,000.00	
Average unit	$0.857	$1.00	
Duties	$5,377.00	$14,200.00	
Rate		26c. per lb. and 45 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	104.35	71.00	25.00

22. FLANNELS FOR UNDERWEAR, VALUED NOT ABOVE 40 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	10		
Value	$4.00		
Average unit	$0.39		
Duties	$3.00		
Rate	22c. per lb. and 30 per cent.	23½c. per lb. and 20 per cent.	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	86.41		25.00

22. FLANNELS FOR UNDERWEAR, VALUED ABOVE 40 CENTS AND NOT ABOVE 70 CENTS.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	709	4,000	
Value	$437.00	$2,440.00	
Average unit	$0.616	$0.61	
Duties	$471.00	$1,202.00	
Rate	33c. per lb. and 35 per cent; 44c. per lb. and 50 per cent.	23½c. per lb. and 30 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	107.78	49.26	35.00

22. FLANNELS FOR UNDERWEAR, VALUED ABOVE 70 CENTS PER POUND.

Imports:			
Quantity		150,000	
Value	$128,433.00	$150,000.00	
Average unit		$1.00	
Duties	$119,749.00	$80,250.00	
Rate	11c. per sq. yd. and 55 per cent or 44c. per lb. and 55 per cent.	23½c. per lb. and 30 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	93.26	53.50	35.00

Comparison of the imports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, with the estimates for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910—Continued.

23. READY-MADE CLOTHING AND ARTICLES OF WEARING APPAREL, N. S. P. F. HATS OF WOOL.

	Payne tariff, 1912.	Estimate for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910.	Rate under Underwood bill.
Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	87,676	90,000	
Value	$171,924.00	$175,500.00	
Average unit	$1.96	$1.95	
Duties	$141,732.00	$128,700.00	
Rate	44c. per lb. and 60 per cent.	26c. per lb. and 60 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	82.44	73.33	25.00

23. KNITTED ARTICLES.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	293,478	350,000	
Value	$391,923.00	$455,000.00	
Average unit	$1.34	$1.30	
Duties	$364,285.00	$302,250.00	
Rate	44c. per lb. and 60 per cent.	26c. per lb. and 55 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	92.95	66.43	35.00

23. SHAWLS, KNITTED OR WOVEN.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	16,939	35,000	
Value	$18,035.00	$42,000.00	
Average unit	$1.06	$1.20	
Duties	$18,274.00	$32,200.00	
Rate	44c. per lb. and 60 per cent.	26c. per lb. and 55 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	101.33	76.67	35.00

23. ALL OTHERS.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	576,040	650,000	
Value	$1,608,156.00	$1,787,500.00	
Average unit	$2.79	$2.75	
Duties	$1,218,351.00	$1,202,500.00	
Rate	44c. per lb. and 60 per cent.	25c. per lb. and 60 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	75.76	67.27	35.00

24. MANUFACTURES OF WOOL, N. S. P. F., WEBBINGS, GORINGS, BANDINGS, BINDINGS, ETC.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	31,969	50,000	
Value	$72,439.00	$100,000.00	
Average unit	$2.27	$2.00	
Duties	$59,448.00	$57,800.00	
Rate	50c. per lb. and 60 per cent.	26c. per lb. and 50 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	82.07	57.80	35.00

24. ALL OTHERS.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)	259,043	360,000	
Value	$328,599.00	$468,000.00	
Average unit	$1.37	$1.30	
Duties	$291,972.00	$280,800.00	
Rate		26c. per lb. and 50 per cent (wool content).	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	88.74	59.83	35.00

25. CARPETS, HANDMADE, AUBUSSON, AXMINSTER, ORIENTAL, ETC.

Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)			
Value	[1] $2,564,600.00	$2,700,000.00	
Average unit			
Duties	$1,492,800.00	$1,350,000.00	
Rate			
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	58.19	50.00	35.00 and 50.00

Comparison of the imports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, with the estimates for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910—Continued.

25. CARPETS AND CARPETRY, N. S. P. F., WHOLLY OR IN PART OF WOOL.

	Payne tariff, 1912.	Estimate for a 12-month period under H. R. 3910.	Rate under Underwood bill.
Imports:			
Quantity (pounds)			
Value	[1] $1,433,391.00	$1,600,000.00	
Average unit			
Duties	$838,935.00	$480,000.00	
Equivalent ad valorem (per cent)	58.53	30.00	20.00 to 30.00

[1] Estimated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] as a substitute for the wool schedule.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 75, noes 188.

Mr. MANN. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. MANN.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 74, noes 193.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE L—SILKS AND SILK GOODS.

319. Silk partially manufactured from cocoons or from waste silk and not further advanced or manufactured than carded or combed silk, and silk noils exceeding 2 inches in length, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ELDER Mr. Chairman, being a new Member, I have not bothered the committee any heretofore. But there is one doctrine that our Republican friends have persistently and continuously argued which seems to me an apparent fallacy, and yet it has been the backbone of the Republican vote for many years—that is, that protection is a help to the workingman.

On the one hand, we admit that it has largely increased his cost of living. But, my friends, I believe that a large reason for the high wages in America is this, that we have had great undeveloped resources in this country, and that immutable law—the law of supply and demand—has forced up the rates of wages.

You can go into Canada, into Australia, or into any other new country where they have these great undeveloped resources and you will find high wages in analogous cases.

But in order to see that protection is not a benefit, go into the old countries of England and France and Germany, and what do you find? In the protected countries, such as Germany, you find lower wages than you do in free-trade England. You can come into this country and under the schedules where they have the highest protection you find they are paying the lowest rate of wages.

Take the woolen schedule that we have just passed, as an example. In the New England States, in their sweatshops, you will find perhaps the lowest rate of wages that is paid in America.

Being from Louisiana, my friends, perhaps it is not amiss for me to say that I did not agree with several of the items in this bill.

I do not believe any man could draw a bill on a competitive basis that necessarily contains discrimination for and against that would satisfy me, and I do not believe that I could draw a bill that would satisfy any man on the floor of this House.

I do not think it would be wise for this country to go immediately into free trade, because our economic system is so finely balanced that it would perhaps cause a panic to change our system, but I hope to see the day come in the course of the next 20 or 30 years when we will raise our entire revenues on noncompetitive articles, on an income tax, an inheritance tax, and the excise tax, when this system of robbery and of burdens upon the sweating masses of the American people will come to an end. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have no cause of quarrel with those other colleagues—or a portion of them from my State—who will not heed this appeal. They are honest and sincere gentlemen, perhaps sent here to defend the large industries in their districts, but I believe that as sure as fate within the next 15 or 20 years no tariff wall could preserve and protect the Louisiana cane grower, but that the beet industry of this country would remove him. And, my friends, perhaps it is better to let it come now, and let our people end the protection theory and the idea that they can obtain their living from the sweat of some other poor man's brow. We have a great State, rich in resources. Our soil is most fertile; and though you have struck down a great industry of our State, you have not ruined our people, because they are brave and courageous, and they will turn these fertile lands and these large plantations into smaller farms. Instead of being in the future a State of sugar barons, I hope we will be a State of small farmers; and we will be as we ought to be, one of the brightest stars in the galaxy of the States. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I move to strike out the last word. We seem to have gotten back to a political debate, and I want to say a word or two in answer to some of the remarkable statements—the marvelous statements—made by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I can not understand how the gentleman could make such statements as that and be so ignorant about them. I say that because I have always regarded him as honest. He says I have removed the favor of free wool from the manufacturers of carpets—if it may be regarded as a favor to them—by another provision in this schedule, and that some carpet manufacturer told him so. Well, if somebody did tell him so the gentleman ought to have known better. That same provision has been in the law heretofore. There has been a different duty on carpet wools and wools of the first class all this time, and yet no carpet manufacturer in the United States has failed to get his wool at the carpet wool rate of duty. The gentleman might have explained that to the House, but he thought he was talking to a Democratic caucus and that there was nobody here to pick him up on the proposition. It is a good deal like his talking to that man in Connecticut on the Wilson and Dingley schedules on metals and telling him that there was not anything in the Dingley schedule that was not as high in the Wilson schedule, and then handing him a copy of the comparison of the two. I have in my hand the comparison. It is a book issued by the Senate 8 years ago or 12 years ago, I do not know when. It is absolutely the worst document that was ever issued by any body of men. I am ashamed to say that it was a Republican Senate that issued that book. There are three volumes, and if you take the first volume by itself you can not get any more information out of it on the subject of the tariff than you could out of some of the gentleman's speeches on some other questions.

He says Mr. PAGE is for free wool. Well, I knew that. So is Mr. Emery for free wool. I have never said they were not, but the facts they reported showed what the duty should be if it was to be a protective duty, and those gentlemen approved of those duties if they were to be protective. And they did approve of them. Even Mr. PAGE thought if we were going to put a protective duty on wool they had not got it quite high enough at 18 cents a pound, that it ought to be 21 cents; and after he had studied the subject some more he approved these duties. So it goes all along the line. But what is the use, gentlemen? The gentleman from Alabama takes the last two minutes in debate. He will not allow any interruptions; he will not allow a word to be said; he will not allow his statements to be punctured at the time they are made. He seems to be intent on nothing except to win the applause of gentlemen who do not know but what he is telling the exact truth about the matter and is not misrepresenting anything or drawing on his fancy. [Laughter on the Republican side.] If it pleases him and amuses you, I suppose the whole thing is accomplished. And yet I wonder that the gentleman from Alabama does not raise his debate on this great subject, on this great bill, to a higher plane and not let it result in what appears to me—I say it with all politeness to the gentleman—to be the purest demagogy that I ever heard him utter. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

324. Ribbons, bandings, including hatbands, beltings, bindings, all of the foregoing not exceeding 12 inches in width and if with fast edges, bone casings, braces, cords, cords and tassels, garters, suspenders, tubings, and webs and webbing; all the foregoing made of silk or of which silk or silk and india rubber are the component materials of chief value, if not embroidered in any manner, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about this silk schedule. The schedule in the present law is new and different in principle from any one ever made before. Up to 1909 the silk schedule had been on an ad valorem basis. The question of putting it on a specific basis was taken up by the committee. Several experts went over the schedule; the importers were represented among the experts, and the manufacturers of the silks were represented. They brought in a schedule which they said did not increase the rate of duty. After studying it for a while I told them that I thought it did increase the duty and I would not stand for any such rates. They brought in another one modifying it and the House committee refused to take it up. After the bill went to the Senate, I was in touch with the same gentlemen, and they finally got up a schedule which I

believed would not advance the rates, and I preferred a specific duty if we could get equitable rates. The silk schedule is as purely a luxury as anything in the clothing line in the bill. Finally they got a schedule and presented it to the Senate and the Senate agreed to it, and afterwards I went over it with some of the gentlemen, cut down the rates in some instances, and got a rate that I thought would not be larger than the ad valorem rate in the old law, and it was finally put in the bill. It turned out that it was substantially on the same level as the rates of the former law. I am sorry that these gentlemen have changed it. If they wanted to favor the wholesale purchaser and had lowered the duty below 50 per cent, which is the ad valorem equivalent; if they had taken the rates of 1909 and cut them 5, 10, or 15 per cent to bring them into conformity with their ideas and leave them as specific rates, it would have been better. I think it would have been a great improvement in the bill. I would not offer an amendment, for I might as well throw it to the east winds. There is no use in trying to amend the bill. You have heard a one-sided statement in your caucus, with no one to dispute it or to give you information on a great many items. Your minds are made up and the President has approved the bill, and so on to the end of the chapter.

I simply wanted to call the attention to the schedule which these gentlemen so ruthlessly break up and destroy, representing a great deal of labor, probably ten times that which was put upon it in their committee. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to say a word as to my vote against the substitute of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] on the woolen or Schedule K. I believe I was the only Republican to stand up and pass between the tellers and vote against the proposition. I have no apologies to make for it. I am a Republican and I believe in a protective system, and I will not stultify myself by voting for an amendment offered from this side of the House which will increase foreign importations of woolen goods from what it is now—$15,000,000—to over $9,000,000 per annum, or a total of $24,000,000.

Then, I do not believe in a policy of voting on this or any other schedule until the manufacturers and their employees have been given a full, fair, and impartial hearing. We have arraigned and condemned Mr. UNDERWOOD and his committee for failing and refusing to give hearings, and that is what Mr. PAYNE has neglected to do with his substitute. I am opposed to both the Payne and the Underwood Schedules K as a substitute for existing law.

In the course of this discussion on the tariff I have from the very start criticized the so-called Underwood bill because it proposed to increase the importations of foreign-made goods at the expense of the American manufacturer and the American wage earner. I must be consistent. I can not stand here day in and day out and take that stand and then turn around and vote for a proposition to increase foreign importations more than $9,000,000 under one schedule of this bill.

On yesterday I inveighed against the action of the Democratic Party on Schedule I, which proposes to increase foreign importations of cotton goods $12,000,000, and having condemned the majority for doing that, I could not be consistent, fair, and just to myself to-day to do practically the same thing on Schedule K by indorsing and approving such an un-American and anti-Republican policy. A man that has not the courage of his convictions does not deserve a position on the floor of this House. [Applause.] I must retain my self-respect; I must be consistent in all these matters far above party friends or party conferences.

I notified Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, chairman of the Republican caucus or conference, that I would not support the Payne substitute, in view of the discovery that if adopted it would transfer $9,000,000 of our business to our foreign competitors, injure our woolen mills, and turn many of their men out of employment.

I believe in the principle that we should retain the American market for the American mills and the American wage earners, and by my vote and voice I shall stand here as long as I am in Congress and oppose any bill, amendment, or proposition which will take away from the woolen or cotton manufacturers and wage earners of this country their business and employment and transfer it to foreign shores.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I honor the gentleman for his convictions, but in order that some of the rest of us may be put in a proper light I wish to inquire of my colleague where he got the information with reference to the amount of importations?

Mr. AUSTIN. I take pleasure in giving my colleague from Iowa that information. When we had the Republican conference, which was open and aboveboard, I asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] if he could tell us what the increased importations under that proposed schedule of his would amount to, and he said he could not give me the information.

Mr. PAYNE. Why, the gentleman asked me in regard to the Underwood schedule, not in regard to this.

Mr. AUSTIN. I asked the gentleman about his own proposed substitute.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no.

Mr. AUSTIN. I did; and I can prove it by our colleagues Messrs. FORDNEY, MOORE, GREENE of Massachusetts, and others who were present. The gentleman may not have understood it, because he is a little hard of hearing, but that was my question.

Mr. PAYNE. I answered in regard to the Underwood schedule.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then the gentleman misunderstood me. Then, on the following day, not having received that information from Mr. PAYNE, I requested the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] to send a copy of the Payne substitute to the Treasury experts in order to secure a report, and Mr. FORDNEY in a few days showed me the report, and he again showed it to me on the floor of the House to-day, in which it was stated that the increased importations under that proposed Payne schedule would amount to $9,000,000 over and above the present importations of $15,000,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Right there I want to say that I question the accuracy of that statement, and I am inclined to think that it is the same expert that reported—and they have it in the Democratic handbook here—that under the Underwood bill, with free wool, there will be practically no more importations of wool than there were before.

Mr. AUSTIN. The same expert——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; the same expert that makes those figures.

Mr. AUSTIN. We need not guess about this matter. It is the same Republican official or expert in the Treasury Department who made the estimates on the original Payne bill and on other tariff bills.

Mr. PAYNE. He never made any estimate for me. He may have made it for the committee.

Mr. AUSTIN. I would like to have the gentleman tell me how much the importations would be under this proposed substitute.

Mr. PAYNE. I could not tell the exact amount.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman can give it to us as best he can.

Mr. PAYNE. No man living can tell. It will be guesswork; but I say that this proposed substitute would furnish ample protection for the American manufacturer.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the wool schedule has been passed.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

325. Chiffons, clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including knit goods, made up or manufactured in whole or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer; all the foregoing composed of silk or of which silk or silk and india rubber are the component materials of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 50 per cent ad valorem.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, line 23, strike out the word "chiffons."

Mr. PALMER. I would like to put in a word of explanation in regard to that. Paragraph 325 is the wearing apparel paragraph, while paragraph 326 is the woven fabric paragraph. While it is a little difficult for us men to settle the question, I understand that the expert testimony is that chiffons are woven fabrics rather than wearing apparel, and they are changed to that paragraph.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

326. Woven fabrics, in the piece or otherwise, of which silk is the component material of chief value, and all manufactures of silk, or of which silk or silk and india rubber are the component materials of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 45 per cent ad valorem.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 79, line 9, after the word "section," strike out "45" and insert "35."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama to the fact that a reduction is proposed by this amendment. I proposed to reduce the ad valorem rate from 45 per cent to 35 per cent on woven fabrics. I do not do that because I want to deprive the silk industry of any protection it may have, but in order to assist the committee to be consistent in its arrangement of the duties. The peculiar situation that confronts us here is this: That silk used in the manufacture of umbrellas is rated at 45 per cent ad valorem, while umbrellas are dutiable under this bill at 35 per cent ad valorem. The foreign umbrella may therefore be brought into the United States for 10 per cent less than the raw material from which it is made. It is manifestly impossible for any man to manufacture umbrellas in this country if these rates as written in the bill prevail. One of the largest manufacturers of umbrellas and parasols, who does not live in my district, writes:

We are the largest manufacturers of umbrellas and parasols in the country, but did not think it necessary to ask for a hearing or file a brief while the bill was being considered because never heretofore has the duty on parasols and umbrellas been less than the duty on the component parts, and we did not for an instant imagine that in the new bill there would be a departure from this practice. We believe that there was no desire upon the part of the framers of the tariff act to ruin any legitimate industry, and that it is only necessary to call your attention to this matter to have your committee see the mistake and correct same.

There is absolutely free and keen competition in the umbrella and parasol industry, and while it can doubtless meet foreign competitors if the duty on the finished product is no more than that of the parts, yet we can not survive with a duty of 35 per cent on ribs, rods, and other metal parts, a duty of 45 per cent on silk cloth, and only 30 per cent on the finished product.

It seems to me that the committee in all fairness, if it does not mean to destroy this industry, as it will by this enactment, ought to accept this amendment for a lower rate, especially as it comes from one who believes in protection.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

327. Yarns, threads, filaments of artificial or imitation silk, or of artificial or imitation horsehair, by whatever name known, and by whatever process made, 35 per cent ad valorem; beltings, cords, tassels, ribbons, or other articles or fabrics composed wholly or in chief value of yarns, threads, filaments, or fibers of artificial or imitation silk or of artificial or imitation horsehair, by whatever name known, and by whatever process made, 60 per cent ad valorem.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 79, line 16, after the word "horsehair," insert the words "or of yarns, threads, filaments, or fibers of artificial or imitation silk, or of artificial or imitation horsehair and india rubber."

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately we have not any scientific information from a tariff board or any other source as to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad of the articles covered by this paragraph. My information is that if we had such a report it would show that this paragraph, so far as many articles are concerned, is highly protective. I was very much surprised some moments ago by some statements made by the genial and generally fair gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], touching a tariff board report. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said that some one on this side had said that our wool schedule was prepared by the Tariff Board. If anyone said anything of that sort I have not heard it. There is no one on this side who ever expected a tariff board to fix rates, nor do we ever expect to ask the opinion of a tariff board or commission as to what the rates should be, based on the facts they find.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I can not.

Mr. BRYAN. Do not speak for everybody on this side, then.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I am speaking of Republicans.

Mr. BRYAN. I am sitting right in front of you.

Mr. MONDELL. I am speaking of protectionists, at least I am speaking for those who believe in the principle of protection, protection to the labor and industry of every man under the flag whether he lives on the Pacific coast or on the rock-bound coast of Maine, by the waters of the Gulf, or up yonder on the border of Canada. The gentleman said that we claimed that our woolen schedule was approved by the Tariff Board, and then proceeded to attempt to prove that—that the members of the Tariff Board or some member of it was opposed to a duty on raw wool.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman would not yield to me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from New York stated—I merely quoted from the gentleman from New York——

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman will find nothing in any statement made by any gentleman on this side that we have asked the Tariff Board to make rates for us.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I asked him.

Mr. MONDELL. Neither to-day nor any other time has the Republican Party or any member of it expected a tariff board to fix rates or frame schedules.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is not what I said.

Mr. MONDELL. So far as I am personally concerned, I should be perfectly content to have my friend from Alabama a member of a tariff board or commission. He would endeavor honestly to ascertain the facts; it would be a matter of absolute indifference to me what his view was as to what rate should be fixed on the facts thus ascertained.

This has been so often stated on this side and made so plain that I am surprised that my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] does not understand it. I think he must understand it. The duty of a tariff board is to ascertain the facts, and if the men on a tariff board or commission are honest men, it matters little what their political views or opinions may be as to the policy to be followed in fixing tariff rates. If they will honestly present to us the facts, we on this side will endeavor to fix rates based on those facts in accordance with our understanding of them, measuring the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment.

It proves nothing to say that some member of the Tariff Board, or all the members of the Tariff Board, may have held to the opinion that wool should or should not have been made dutiable.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did not the members of the Tariff Board and the Tariff Board experts help to write and to fix the rates in the cotton bill which you voted for last session and in this wool bill?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not understand that any expert of any tariff board has ever been called upon; neither will they ever be called upon by a Republican believing in protection to do anything but give information relative to the facts their investigations develop, and on the facts thus developed they may be of assistance in figuring what rate will cover the difference in cost at home and abroad. As to their opinions as to what the rate should be, whether protective or otherwise, it matters not to us.

It is the function of a tariff board or commission to ascertain the facts. As to whether the rate should cover the difference in cost thus ascertained is a matter of opinion depending on whether one believes in the principle of protection or not. I and my friend from Alabama could agree on facts; we could not agree as to the rate those facts warrant.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is recognized.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and, I believe, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] disavowed that the Tariff Board or the Tariff Board experts helped to write the Hill cotton bill, for which the Republicans voted last Congress, or helped to write this wool substitute bill, which the distinguished gentleman from New York introduced and for which Republicans voted this afternoon. I want to say to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that the gentleman from Alabama was nearer right than he thought—and he did not have to take the word of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]—that the Tariff Board, or the members of the Tariff Board, and their experts assisted in preparing this substitute and fixing these rates. The Republican campaign textbook last campaign expressly declared that this wool substitute bill and the Hill cotton bill, for which you voted last session, were prepared by the Republicans in conjunction with the members of the Tariff Board and the Tariff Board experts, and those rates were fixed by them. So the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is entirely right.

Mr. MONDELL. The statement made, if that was the statement made in the campaign textbook or elsewhere, is absolutely correct. The rates were fixed by the Republican members of the committee, assisted in the matter of ascertaining facts by the experts of the Tariff Board.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; that these substitute bills were written by the House Republicans and the Tariff Board members; and it is a fact that on the cotton bill the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Hill] was working in its preparation for six weeks in conjunction with Mr. Page and the experts who aided the

Tariff Board in preparing their report on the cotton schedule. And you gentlemen ought to know that. You gentlemen know that there is not a Republican committee or a Republican Congress that has written a Republican tariff bill since the Civil War. The manufacturers and tariff beneficiaries have written the bills for you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman know of any manufacturers that were in favor of either the Hill cotton bill or the woolen bill? He says they have written all the bills.

Mr. KITCHIN. I say this, I never heard of a manufacturer opposing this wool bill that you voted on here to-day. And I want to tell my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], if I have the time, that in the debate on this wool bill last year—and you all remember it—Mr. Hill, in answer to a question from me, admitted that the wool bill for which you voted then, and for which you voted this afternoon, would not admit a penny's worth more of importations into this country and would not reduce the price of woolen goods one penny to the consumer. It was not written for that purpose.

I then replied to him that the Republican bill was a sham revision, a bill to fool the people and at the same time to satisfy the woolen manufacturers in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I do say it does satisfy the woolen manufacturers of this country, and there is not a woolen manufacturer in the United States who opposes the bill for which you voted this afternoon. Not a dollar more of importations will be admitted under the Payne bill of this afternoon than under the present Payne Act, and if I had the time I think I could show it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman from North Carolina is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and he knows that no woolen manufacturers appeared before his committee and indorsed either of these bills. They say it is too low.

Mr. KITCHIN. I never heard of one saying it was too low and not satisfactory to him last Congress. On the contrary, the members of the American Woolen Manufacturers' Association indorsed the bill then. Their representatives, as well as representatives of other manufacturers, had examined carefully into the report made by the Tariff Board, and while the board was preparing its report wrote a letter commending the work of the board. They indorsed it, and Mr. Taft, your President, sent a communication to Congress, including this very letter in which they indorsed the work of the Tariff Board and its work upon the woolen schedule. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

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

Mr. FORDNEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] can take time on the next paragraph.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] if he desires.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Never mind. I will take the opportunity to speak on the next paragraph.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not believe that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] would attempt to do any man an injustice. In fact, I do not believe that any Member of this House will misrepresent another man on the floor of this House. Gentlemen may sometimes, for the purpose of gaining political advantage in argument, make a wild-eyed, fire-eating statement [laughter], such as that which the gentleman from North Carolina has just made, thoughtlessly. He states that the Republican Party never wrote a tariff bill. He says the manufacturers of this country have always written Republican tariff bills.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the honor to take part in the writing of a tariff bill, and I want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], who never made a more untruthful statement in his life, that he is entirely mistaken when he states that the manufacturers, or any other interest in this country, great or small, wrote the tariff rates in the Payne tariff law. The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee heard everybody that came; heard what they had to say, for and against a revision of the tariff, upward or downward, at that time, and from the information presented them, in their best judgment, they fixed the rates as best they could agree among themselves, as you gentlemen have fixed the rates as best you could agree among yourselves.

I venture to say that there was not a man on the Democratic side of the Ways and Means Committee in writing this bill who voted for every rate that is in your bill. No one man on that committee is satisfied with everything written in this bill. You have agreed upon a compromise. You have gotten the best rates you could get among yourselves. You went into caucus and you agreed to stand by the will of the majority. There is no other way to pass your bill. There is no other way for the Republicans to pass a bill. There is no way for any party but to stand by its majority and vote for whatever that majority of the party believe to be the best thing to be done.

I admonish the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] you should withdraw your remarks from the RECORD; and no other Member of this House of Representatives should cast such insinuations and aspersions upon other men as to say that they are so dishonest as to write a tariff law solely in the interest of the manufacturers.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I shall be glad to yield if I can get time to answer the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHIN. I believe the gentleman will admit that the most important schedule is Schedule K. Did not the gentleman hear Mr. Wood, president of the American Manufacturers' Association, admit that the woolen manufacturers and the woolgrowers wrote Schedule K?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; and neither did you hear him admit that.

Mr. KITCHIN. He did admit it.

Mr. FORDNEY. He did not; and neither has any other man admitted that any special interest in this country wrote Schedule K in the Payne tariff law; and when any man makes a statement to that effect he is sadly mistaken—purposely or otherwise.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Wood is my constituent and my personal friend, and he protested to me against that schedule. He never helped to write it.

Mr. KITCHIN. The fact that he is the gentleman's constituent does not make him any more truthful or any more competent to write a tariff law.

Mr. BUTLER. I know the gentleman and I know he is capable of telling the truth, and that he does tell the truth.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think I am capable of telling the truth, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order and gentleman will observe the rule.

Mr. FORDNEY. I hope this colloquy will not be taken out of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Did not the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], on the opening day of this debate, say that Schedule K was not changed in the Payne law from what it was in 1897, in the Dingley law?

Mr. FORDNEY. I think he did, but the gentleman was mistaken when he made that statement. I will say that in Schedule K there were, as I now remember it, three slight changes, slight reductions, but no increases at all in Schedule K.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I will be glad to.

Mr. PALMER. Does the gentleman remember that before the Committee on Ways and Means, in January last, Mr. Chaney, the witness who appeared on behalf of the silk manufacturers, declared that the former president of the Silk Manufacturers' Association wrote the silk schedule for the same committee?

Mr. FORDNEY. I know that the gentleman made a statement that he was asked by the members of the Ways and Means Committee or somebody to prepare rates and present them to the committee, but it has not been shown——

Mr. PALMER. That is what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] said.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no; be fair with me.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have several others here.

Mr. FORDNEY. It was not shown that the rates suggested by that gentleman were written into the law. You members of the Ways and Means Committee last January asked gentlemen to prepare schedules to present to you, and, among others, you asked Mr. Parker, of South Carolina, to present to you rates on the cotton schedule. Mr. Parker presented rates for you to consider. I would not misrepresent you by saying that you accepted just what Mr. Parker prepared, and you have no right so to misrepresent me, to say that I would accept anybody's opinion unless, in my judgment, it was for the best.

I thank you, gentlemen, for your attention. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE M—PAPERS AND BOOKS.

328. Sheathing paper and roofing felt, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not believe that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] intended to misstate any facts with reference to the Tariff Board, but in some respects he has altogether misrepresented their action. The Tariff Board never had any manufacturers appear before them. The Tariff Board never had any hearings where any manufacturers or other parties could appear before them. They sent out their experts to examine their books and factories and took their word for nothing. I think the gentleman is aware of that, but in the heat of debate he said something he did not mean.

Mr. KITCHIN. I did not say they had any manufacturers before them at the hearing, but I said that a group of manufacturers, including the Woolen Association, appointed a committee of manufacturers to go down and see how they were progressing with their work and the method of their work on Schedule K, and that those manufacturers did report—and Mr. Taft sent it to Congress—that they were just doing it all O. K., to the queen's taste of the manufacturers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am glad the gentleman has relieved himself of those facetious expressions, which he knows does not express any fact. The real fact about it is that what the Tariff Board did down there at the Treasury Department was open to anybody and aboveboard, and anyone could go there and examine it and see just exactly what they were doing.

Mr. HARDWICK. That statement is not correct. I know I wished very much to find out some things they were doing, and although I had a very good personal friend down there, it was not considered that it was proper to let me know about it, and I thought that was proper.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Georgia mean to say that the Tariff Board did not openly show the methods they were pursuing?

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, yes; after they were through.

Mr. MANN. While they were at work.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will tell the gentleman what happened. I made some effort to find out what they were doing or intending to do on the sugar question and the method that they were adopting and the conclusions they arrived at, and officials of the board did not think it was proper, as they understood the situation, to give me such information, and I did not, of course, question the propriety of that course.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The information on both the wool and the cotton schedule was open to the public.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; so far as a schedule of questions they were sending out, as I understand it.

Mr. MANN. They did not give secret information that they had obtained from certain manufactories, and never have.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understood the gentleman from Iowa to say that any Member of Congress could go there and find out what they were doing, and I think the gentleman was clearly in error.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman was not in error.

Mr. HARDWICK. They would not tell you how far along they had got with the investigation, nor to what extent they had arrived at conclusions.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Very true. I am talking about facts.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I would ask the gentleman from Georgia if he would consider it proper for an individual member of that board, even if a Member of Congress of the gentleman's party came to him, to give to him information without consulting the board?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly not; but the gentleman from Iowa said that any Member of Congress could go there and get just such information from the board, as I understood him.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I say that any Member of this House could have gone to the office of the Tariff Board and found out what they were doing there as far as the facts were concerned. If they did not apply for facts but conclusions, they would not give them out until they were completed and ready to be given to the President. Of course, if they wanted to find out where the reports came from, they could not get that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the Payne schedule being satisfactory to the manufacturers of wool, I know that there are manufacturers engaged in the business that have objected to it. I know as a member of the Ways and Means Committee in the examination of that schedule that these manufacturers had nothing whatever at any time to do with reference to the preparation of the schedule. It is true that it was prepared before I was a member of that committee, but I knew that it was being prepared at the time, and I know that the manufacturers had nothing to do with it. I can not understand why the gentleman from North Carolina should make the statement he did.

Mr. GARDNER. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to call attention to the fact that I had a strong protest from Mr. Frank P. Hobbs, treasurer of the Arlington Mills. I think he is at the head of some woolen manufacturers' association, and he is a son-in-law of Mr. Whitman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; and there were protests from others engaged in this business, partly because they did not understand the schedule and partly because they were in the habit of protesting against everything.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that some of the statements made by the gentleman from Iowa ought to go unchallenged. I know some members and high officers of the Tariff Board thought, and I believe they were right about it, that acting under the law which made them appointees of the President of the United States that they could not allow Members of Congress to know anything about what they were doing or what the reports were until they were reported to the President of the United States. In this I thoroughly agreed, and I am sure that as to some of the members of the board, if not all, the rule was uniform.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is what I stated—until after the reports were completed.

Mr. HARDWICK. Then they were published to all the world.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I think I can make this thing plain. On January 10, 1912, while we were working on the tariff bill, Schedule K, Mr. UNDERWOOD, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, addressed a letter to Mr. Emery, chairman of the Tariff Board, in which he asked him for certain information the board had concerning the wool and woolen schedule. The board refused to give Mr. UNDERWOOD and the committee the information desired.

I will put into the RECORD the correspondence between Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. Emery relative to this matter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 10, 1912.*

Hon. HENRY C. EMERY,
Chairman Tariff Board, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In the course of my examination of your report on wool and manufactures of wool, I require further information for a complete understanding of it. It may be that this information is contained in portions of the report which have escaped my attention, but I have been unable to find it. If the data desired are contained in the report, I shall be under obligations to you to point it out to me, and in the event that they are not given, I would thank you to kindly supply me with the same. I do not, of course, desire to request any data that may be considered as confidential in the way of making public names or addresses of persons who have supplied you with details. If any of the material sought by me comes within this scope, I take it that it will be possible for you to designate by numbers such returns, retaining your own memoranda which show the names of the concerns to which given numbers refer. I desire the detailed data sought only for the purpose of informing myself and this committee with regard to the general meaning of certain features of the report and not for the purpose of examining the sources which you have used.

The points which I have in mind and about which I would thank you to furnish me additional information are:

Raw wool—

(1) Will you kindly loan this committee the original tables or working sheets showing the full and detailed returns from the reports of field agents with regard to raw wool, you reserving, if desired, names and addresses of the persons whose returns to you are involved?

(2) If no such sheets were compiled for the investigation in Australia, New Zealand, and South America, please inform me more fully as to the conditions under which the inquiry was carried on there and the number of growers visited.

(3) Were general tables compiled showing the data obtained from each and every mill with regard to woolen manufactures? If so, have these been printed; and if not, could you lend these to this committee?

(4) Have you a record of the number of concerns from which costs were obtained and each sample of cloth, and can you lend the committee that record?

I would like the record in this connection both for foreign and domestic mills, with an indication in connection with each of the de-

gree of efficiency of the foreign mills furnishing such costs compared with the efficiency of the mills in the United States furnishing similar costs. If possible, I would be pleased to have these same data for each of the groups of samples which are discussed in your report, together with a memorandum of the location of the mills involved.

(5) Can you supply the committee with a tabular view or statement showing how many ready-made cloth concerns were asked to furnish costs on specimen garments of each given kind, thereby creating the basis for the tables in which typical costs are analyzed?

These are some of the points which have occurred to me in the course of my examination of your report, and if you can put me in possession of the data outlined I shall be especially gratified, and thank you in advance for your prompt reply.

Very respectfully,

O. W. UNDERWOOD,
Chairman.

—

THE TARIFF BOARD, TREASURY BUILDING,
Washington, January 18, 1912.

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. UNDERWOOD: I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of January 10, which reached us on the 13th. The delay since then in replying to it is due to absence from the city.

I regret that it is impossible to meet your five requests fully. You will realize that a very large part of the information we received was given us only on condition that the material should not be made public, except in the form of summaries and conclusions to be printed in our report. It was stipulated that individual figures should not go beyond the possession of the board. We are obliged to respect these pledges of confidence.

Taking up your requests seriatim, I beg to say:

1. The original schedules on raw wool were secured on the understanding that they should be held confidential by us. These could not be submitted in a form which would not make identification possible. The same is true of the working sheets, which are arranged on the basis of counties, giving acreage, size of flock, etc., in a manner which would make it possible to identify the individual sheep owner.

2. As to the investigation in Australia, New Zealand, and South America, this was carried out by wide traveling and consultation with many growers and buyers. You will find on page 519 of Volume II a description of the course pursued by our agent in South America. He visited over 100 leading growers. Similar methods were followed by our agents in Australia and New Zealand.

3. The compilations on wool manufactures were not made by mills, except in the case of those covered by that part of the investigation of which the results are given in Volume IV. The information there is given by establishments.

4. It is not possible for us to give the exact number of mills from which figures were obtained abroad on the different samples, since the results were in some measure summarized by experts employed by us before being submitted. Furthermore, information was secured as to the cost of certain processes from a large number of mills from which complete figures as to total cost were not secured. In the case of American mills the costs given on the 55 samples cover a range of from 3 to 15 mills per sample. In all cases we aimed, both at home and abroad, to take costs on the basis of mills of good efficiency running full time. In the case of the 55 samples of cloth inefficient mills were eliminated. Where, because of unusual success on particular fabrics, one or two mills are able to make a given sample at a distinctly lower cost than other mills of the same general efficiency, that fact is noted in the report. A statement of the locality of such mills would easily identify the particular establishment. However, you will find on page 620, Volume III, a complete list of the 174 mills from which information was received.

5. I think you have misunderstood the table as to costs of "specimen garments." In the case of the ready-made clothing investigation we did not establish a definite number of sample suits, but took costs from a number of manufacturers on actual suits turned out by them. That is, in the table of costs of specimen garments (Tables 14 to 17, in Vol. III, pp. 870 and following) each one represents the cost of an actual suit or garment made by one manufacturer. These are then grouped in various ways to bring out the essential facts as to prices and costs. Altogether they cover 169 suits, 45 overcoats, and 10 pants made in 40 establishments.

I appreciate your statement that you do not wish to examine the sources on which our report is based in such a way as to reveal the identity of establishments who have given us confidential information. However, the original material is of such a nature that if made public such identification would be possible.

As to your expressed desire for information regarding "the general meaning of certain features of the report," we are entirely at your service or at the service of any member of the committee. If the meaning of any part of our report is not clear, we are anxious to make it so and will welcome a call at any time from any member of the committee or of Congress and further explain any question that may arise.

Very respectfully,

HENRY C. EMERY, *Chairman.*

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to yield any further at this time. So that the gentleman's statement—if he will not change the record, and I know he will not since the controversy has arisen, and I know that he would not change it, anyway, without consent—was that while this board was doing this work any Member of Congress of any party could go to them and get the information.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No, no. You will not find that statement in the record. Any Member of Congress could go down there and find out what they were doing. That is what I said, and the record will show it.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman will find that they could not do it. They said, and they said properly, I think, that under the law they were appointees of the President of the United States, and they reported to him, and until they did report to him they could give no information whatever to anybody else. Yet you say the work was open and above board, and that was one of the vital reasons why the Democratic minority at that time, the great majority of it, rejected the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] on this question and declined to permit a tariff board to be provided for by law, because we knew that that very thing would happen if we got a presidential tariff board that under the law reported only to the President and not to Congress.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do say the work was open and aboveboard so that everybody could go down there and find out what they were doing, and that no manufacturer was appearing before them or having anything to do with their findings.

Mr. HARDWICK. I want to say to the gentleman that I disagree with him. Of course I do not mean that their work was underhanded or unfair, because I had a very dear personal friend who was a member of the board; but we did not have any access to their work. Those gentlemen did not feel they had a right, as I do not think they had, to give individual Members of Congress any information about the workings of that Tariff Board before its reports were made to the President and he had made them public.

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

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] for a moment, he stated a while ago that the woolen manufacturers and the American Association of Woolen Manufacturers indorsed the Hill woolen bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. I did not say anything about the association. I said the woolen manufacturers.

Mr. LENROOT. If the gentleman will consult the record, just as it appears, he will see that he referred to the American Woolen Association.

Mr. KITCHIN. Go ahead.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the American Woolen Association presented a brief to the committee of which the gentleman is a member at the hearings last winter. It is found in the hearings, and I hold a copy of it in my hand. I want to read from it some suggestions the American Woolen Manufacturers' Association made as to what the rates in this woolen bill should be. They say—

Subject to the qualifications, we suggest the following as the minimum rates under which the greater part of each branch of the industry concerned can continue—

And so forth—

Should a duty be imposed upon wool the rates hereafter given must be increased to cover the greater cost of raw material.

And so the figures they now give are upon the basis of free wool, just as your bill is—

Tops, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The Hill bill provided for 10 per cent ad valorem and the bill you have just adopted provides for 15, just as suggested by the American Association of Woolen Manufacturers. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, who has written the bill, so far as tops are concerned? The woolen manufacturers' rates on tops are in your bill, and I say you have given the Woolen Trust, if there be such, a protection that can not be justified from any standpoint upon tops. "Yarns." Their suggestion upon yarns is "a rate equal to one quarter of a cent per pound plus the duty on the top, the same being approximately equal to 35 per cent ad valorem." In our bill the rate is from 10 per cent ad valorem to 25 per cent ad valorem. Does the gentleman still say that the woolen manufacturers indorse the Hill bill when the rates you have written upon yarn come very much nearer the suggestion of the woolen manufacturers than do the rates in the Hill bill? Upon cloth they suggest a rate of 55 per cent ad valorem, and say:

We make no distinction between cloths, flannels, blankets, and dress goods, because no simple classification exists.

Is that indorsing the rates in this Hill bill, so-called, when the lowest rate on cloth in that bill is 30 per cent, 5 per cent lower than your own bill? Now, if my friend will be fair he will admit that if there has been any influence exercised upon these bills by the American Woolen Manufacturers' Association, the Democrats have been more susceptible to that influence than have the Republicans. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I made the statement that the woolen manufacturers throughout the United States had approved and indorsed the Payne woolen bill in the last Congress, the same that was introduced here and voted on this afternoon by the gentleman from Iowa and other Republicans, and that statement is absolutely true. Not a word the gentleman read here showed anything to the contrary.

Mr. LENROOT. There is not a single rate that is not higher than this bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Sit down and let us see. Now, here are 40 or 50 Republican gentlemen present. I challenge a single

one of them and the gentleman himself to stand up here and say if you got a single protest or a single line or word of objection from a single woolen manufacturer throughout the United States against the Payne bill introduced at the last Congress as a substitute for the Underwood bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The one filed here to-day?

Mr. KITCHIN. I said the last Congress; certainly you might get them to-day, as they are against any change now.

Mr. BUTLER. I have. I have had protests threatening to read me out of the party if——

Mr. KITCHIN. When did you get them?

Mr. BUTLER. Last year.

Mr. KITCHIN. When did a Republican ever disobey an order from his superior? When did a Republican ever vote against a manufacturer's demand?

Mr. GARDNER. When did the gentleman ever vote against any importer?

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, now, I am going to wind this up——

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman asked us to stand up.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And somebody called the gentleman's bluff; that is all.

Mr. KITCHIN. What did the gentleman from Massachusetts say?

Mr. GARDNER. I said when did a Democrat ever vote against an importer or the press?

Mr. KITCHIN. An importer or the press?

Mr. GARDNER. An importer or the press.

Mr. KITCHIN. So the gentleman by asking that question refuses to answer me in asking if a Republican ever voted against a manufacturer.

Mr. GARDNER. My question was in reply to the gentleman's.

Mr. KITCHIN. The Democrats have always supported tariff bills in the interest of all the people and not of the few. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I was Republican floor leader in the last Congress at the time that the Payne bill or the Hill bill was voted for on the Republican side of the House. I will say for the gentleman's benefit that as the Republican leader in the House, and because of that fact, I received a good many protests from woolen manufacturers against the Payne bill.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, gentlemen, that is the strangest thing in this world that these witnesses never so testified until 12 months after they voted on it. In that connection—some page get me the Republican campaign book—the Republicans in their campaign book last year boasted that it was a bill in the interest of and as protection to American manufacturers, and it declared——

Mr. MANN. And we still will.

Mr. KITCHIN. And it showed that the reduction you did make was the excess of rates that the manufacturers were not utilizing, that they were "useless and ineffective," and that in the Payne substitute bill the rates made would keep out importations to this country and would protect the manufacturers from foreign competition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. CLINE. I want to inquire if the President did not defend the rate of the woolen schedule as placed in the Payne bill on the ground that the manufacturers had so many friends on the Republican side that the rates could not be reduced without endangering the whole bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. He said they were indefensible.

Mr. KITCHIN. The truth is that the substitute then offered and now offered was a sham revision. This is the first time any man on this floor, either Democrat or Republican, declared or intimated that the woolen manufacturers were not content and did not approve of the Payne Act.

Why, that Payne substitute is written, not in the interests of the American public, not in the interests of the men, women, or children who buy woolen clothing, but in the interests of the woolen manufacturers. And every speech that you made in the last Congress and to-day in its behalf is conclusive proof of the charge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] sought recognition a few moments ago.

Mr. KITCHIN. I can get in on another paragraph and finish what I have to say.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask recognition as a member of the committee, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the situation. The Chair, of course, has tried to be fair, and thinks everybody will admit that. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] rose a moment ago and desired recognition, as did the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. The gentleman from Georgia was recognized. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] rose at the same time, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], I desire to ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph shall close at the end of five minutes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] desires five minutes and I desire five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Then we will say 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina asks whether there have been any protests received by the Members on the Republican side against the Payne woolen bill for which we voted to-day. I said that I had received such protests. I did not say that I received them last year, because I do not recollect whether I did so or not. I have this year received telegrams and letters from various manufacturers protesting against the Payne woolen bill, sometimes called the Hill woolen bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you heard the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] read a letter from Mr. UNDERWOOD to Prof. Emery, president of the Tariff Board, and you heard him say that the answer was a prompt denial. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman did not read President Emery's answer. I find that, far from being a prompt denial, it was a partial acceptance. I am going to read some passages from it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Read his refusal, which I read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield.

Mr. KITCHIN. Suppose you read his refusal there.

Mr. GARDNER. Suppose the gentleman lets me read it in my own way.

Mr. KITCHIN. Read the fact that we got nothing from him.

Mr. GARDNER. He says:

THE TARIFF BOARD, TREASURY BUILDING,
Washington, January 18, 1912.

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. UNDERWOOD: I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of January 10, which reached us on the 13th. The delay since then in replying to it is due to absence from the city.

I regret that it is impossible to meet your five requests fully. You will realize that a very large part of the information we received was given us only on condition that the material should not be made public except in the form of summaries and conclusions to be printed in our report. It was stipulated that individual figures should not go beyond the possession of the board. We are obliged to respect these pledges of confidence.

Taking up your requests seriatim, I beg leave to say:

1. The original schedules on raw wool were secured on the understanding that they should be held confidential by us. These could not be submitted in a form which would not make identification possible. The same is true of the working sheets, which are arranged on the basis of counties, giving acreage, size of flock, etc., in a manner which would make it possible to identify the individual sheep owner.

And so on through all the five requests. And now come the last two paragraphs, in which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is especially interested:

I appreciate your statement that you do not wish to examine the sources on which our report is based in such a way as to reveal the identity of establishments who have given us confidential information. However, the original material is of such a nature that, if made public, such identification would be possible.

As to your express desire for information regarding "the general meaning of certain features of the report" we are entirely at your service or at the service of any member of the committee. If the meaning of any part of our report is not clear, we are anxious to make it so, and will welcome a call at any time from any member of the committee or of Congress and further explain any question that may arise.

Very respectfully, HENRY C. EMERY, *Chairman.*

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, while I made the statement that a good many of the woolen manufacturers were not satisfied with the Republican substitute which was offered a year ago, and again offered to-day, I do not make that statement with the idea that the substitute is not a protective measure or does not meet the approval of Republicans generally. The gentleman

from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] has been so in the habit of making stump speeches throughout the country, in which he says that the Republican tariff measures were all written by the manufacturers, that he has really almost come to believe that the Republican side of the House does not act upon its own volition or its own judgment.

There never was a tariff law written that was high enough to suit many of the manufacturers, and there never will be a tariff law written that will be low enough to suit many of the importers. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is very likely to be influenced by the importers. Possibly I am more likely to be influenced by the manufacturers; I do not know. I believe in giving proper protection, reasonable protection, not unreasonably high protection; and whether the Payne bill satisfies the manufacturers or not is not the question that comes into our minds. The question is, Does the substitute proposed conform with the facts found by an impartial tribunal, the Tariff Board, and do we write the law or the bill based upon the facts so as to provide reasonable protection for American industries? And when we say that we believe we do we support the bill.

It is impossible, possibly, for the gentleman from North Carolina to understand that attitude of mind; and yet when he has written more tariff bills he will come to the conclusion, as I am sure is the fact, that he will endeavor to do what he thinks is right, regardless of what some importer or some manufacturer may think or say.

Mr. Chairman, in reference to the Tariff Board, the Tariff Board acted in the open. It could not have concealed, if it wanted to, the schedules upon which it had obtained its information, because those schedules went into the hands of many people throughout the country. No one expected that they would give out special information, and they did not endeavor to do so.

But gentlemen seek to cast odium upon the Tariff Board and say that the Tariff Board would not furnish information.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I remember, when the chemical schedule bill was before the House a year ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] in charge of the bill, had at his side—not in strict accordance of the rules of the House, but by the common consent of the House—had at his side an expert of the Tariff Board whom he brought on the floor of the House; a gentleman, an expert who had helped to write the chemical schedule, who sat on the floor of the House ready to furnish information which would defend it. Nobody objected to that. That was the purpse of the board—to furnish information if it could.

The only trouble on the other side of the House in reference to the Tariff Board is that, having the information, it refuses to pay any attention to it and prefers to write tariff legislation out of ignorance rather than out of knowledge. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

329. Filter masse or filter stock, composed wholly or in part of wood pulp, wood flour, cotton, or other vegetable fiber, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, just to get straight this matter of the manufacturers' indorsement of this bill, I want to say that I never heard of any manufacturer in the woolen interest protesting against it, and I have no doubt in the world that typical standpatters like my friend PAYNE and my friend FORDNEY and my friend MOORE would never have voted for it if they had ever had any protest against it from the manufacturers.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KITCHIN. Wait a minute.

Mr. FORDNEY. No; you wait a minute. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not asking the gentleman to yield to me.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then if you do not ask me to yield, sit down. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. I rise to object, Mr. Chairman, because the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is not addressing himself to the paragraph now pending before the committee. I shall object unless the gentleman allows me to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] can make a point of order.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will make a point of order if the gentleman from North Carolina does not address himself to the pending paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. KITCHIN. The Woolen Manufacturers' Association indorsed it because it was to the interest of the American woolen manufacturers, and the Republican campaign book indorsed it because it was in the interest of the American woolen manufacturers.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The Republican campaign textbook indorsed it last year, and we indorse it to-day.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is the strongest evidence, to my mind, that the manufacturers indorse it to-day.

Mr. MANN. That only shows the peculiar character of the gentleman's mind.

Mr. KITCHIN. In 1867 the woolen manufacturers—and my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] will not deny this—the woolen manufacturers and woolgrowers, by agreement, fixed up the rate and a Republican Congress adopted it. Mr. Wood, president of the Woolen Manufacturers' Association, before our committee admitted this.

Mr. FORDNEY. When?

Mr. KITCHIN. In 1867. It went into the next tariff act. I asked Mr. Wood if that was not practically the same rate that had been in existence since then, with no material change, and he said, "Yes." The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in his speech last year admitted that Schedule K had not been changed materially in 50 years. We all do know—it is a matter of record and has been proven—that Mr. North, who at the time was secretary of the Woolen Manufacturers' Association, prepared the woolen schedule of the Dingley Act. The testimony before the committee this year shows that the harness and saddlery manufacturers fixed or suggested the rate on saddlery and harness that went into the Payne Act. We do know that the lemon growers of California came down here and fixed or suggested the lemon rate, and they fixed it at 1½ cents, and into the Payne Act it went. We do know that Mr. Littauer, the great glove manufacturer, fixed the glove schedule. We do know the gentleman who appeared before us representing the silk industry told us that he had suggested to the committee the rates, which they changed, in the silk schedule in the Payne law. And we know, too, that many of the reductions were not made until the manufacturers themselves asked them to reduce the rates.

Now, I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to name a single rate on any article except lumber that the people use that was reduced except at the request of the manufacturers themselves. Take boots and shoes. Why, the boot and shoe manufacturers themselves came here and said that 25 per cent was too high; that if they were given free hides they would consent to a reduction of 10 and 15 per cent. Some, however, said they could stand free boots and shoes, and in the Payne Act the rate was reduced to 10 and 15 per cent.

In regard to machine tools the manufacturers themselves came down here and went before the committee and said, "While we have 45 per cent on machine tools, that is too high. We do not want that. It is interfering with our foreign trade. If we keep this high rate upon our goods other nations will retaliate and keep us out of their markets," and they asked Mr. PAYNE and his committee to reduce the rate on machine tools down to 30 per cent, and it was reduced down to 30 per cent. They always raise the rates when the manufacturers ask them to do so, and they never reduce rates until the manufacturers ask a reduction. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. I move that debate on the pending paragraph be now closed.

Mr. FORDNEY. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. PALMER. Can not the gentleman get in on the next paragraph?

Mr. FORDNEY. I reserved a point of order for the purpose of getting an opportunity of making a reply.

Mr. PALMER. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman allow me one minute to read three telegrams from woolen manufacturers?

Mr. PALMER. Can not the gentleman read them on the next paragraph?

Mr. MANN. Oh, let the gentleman do it now, and make it six minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Then I will make it six minutes.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I wish to call attention to the fact, after this is over, that we had an understanding this morning that we would endeavor to proceed as rapidly as we could with the bill, without too much side political debate. I hope both sides of the House will endeavor to observe that understanding as far as practicable.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman from Illinois should not have insisted on this six minutes' debate, because I suspect that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is going to make a political speech.

Mr. MANN. He is only going to reply to one that was made a moment ago.

Mr. PALMER. That is what I said.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. GARDNER. I have here a telegram from Mr. Frederic S. Clark, president of the Talbot Mills, which reads as follows:

NORTH BILLERICA, MASS., *April 21, 1913.*

Hon. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Although the Underwood Schedule K would be very objectionable, the Payne-Hill bill would not be a satisfactory substitute. There are many grave objections to it.

FREDERIC S. CLARK,
President Talbot Mills.

Here is one from Edwin Farnham Greene, treasurer of the Pacific Mills:

BOSTON, MASS., *April 21, 1913.*

Hon. AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Consider it a very great mistake for Republicans to reintroduce so-called Hill bill on Schedule K as representing their views. The bill is inconsistent and quite inadequate to properly protect the industry.

EDWIN FARNHAM GREENE,
Treasurer Pacific Mills.

Here is one from Franklin W. Hobbs. Mr. Hobbs is the son-in-law of William Whitman; he has recently been elected to succeed him as president of the Arlington Mills. Whitman was formerly president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, but it appears that that office is now held by John P. Wood, of Philadelphia:

SOUTH BOSTON, MASS., *April 16, 1913.*

Hon. AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Referring to your telegram 15th, my objections to so-called Hill bill are wool duty impracticable, compensatory duties utterly inadequate, protective duties absurdly low. The whole trade believed such a bill disastrous, and was amazed last year that the Republicans introduced it. The party must not repeat the blunder. The new Democratic bill, radical and disastrous as it will be, is more protective to the woolen industry. We would be handicapped in trying to secure improvements in Democratic bill if measure introduced by Republicans was actually worse.

FRANKLIN W. HOBBS,
President Arlington Mills.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] should make such rash statements as he did in his remarks a few minutes ago about who wrote the rates in the Payne tariff law. He was not a member of the Ways and Means Committee at that time. He says he has read the hearings. He states that Mr. Littauer wrote the glove schedule. He is just as near the mark as the Irishman was that shot at a pigeon with both barrels of his gun. He turned his head in the opposite direction, pulled both triggers, and let go, and when the gun went off the pigeon flew away. Mr. Littauer came before the committee and gave testimony. Mr. Littauer asked for a higher rate of duty on ladies' gloves. He pointed out that in the Dingley law the rate of duty on men's gloves had been increased from $2.50 to $4 a dozen pairs, and that before the adoption of that rate Germany furnished us with 95 per cent of the men's gloves consumed here. But after the rate was advanced to $4 a dozen pairs, the people of the United States are manufacturing 95 per cent of the men's gloves consumed in this country. Mr. Littauer wanted the same rate of duty on ladies' gloves that was written in the Dingley tariff law on men's gloves. He did not get it. I was one of the members of the committee that wanted to give that higher rate, so that ladies' gloves consumed in this country might be made by American labor and American capital.

Now, it is not true that Mr. Littauer wrote the glove schedule. It is not true that any man or set of men wrote the saddlery schedule. It is not true that any man or set of men wrote the wool schedule, except the Republican members of that Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. How about boots and shoes?

Mr. FORDNEY. It is not true that any man wrote the schedule on boots and shoes. It is true that Mr. Jones, of Massachusetts, came before the committee and stated that if the committee would give them, the shoe manufacturers, free raw hides he would be willing to have boots and shoes put on the free list. I doubted the correctness of his statement and the sincerity of that statement, and so told him then and there. He came back afterwards on his bended knees and begged the pardon of the committee and said that he did not mean just what he had stated. He did not recommend any rate of duty on shoes. The rates all through the bill were fixed by a majority vote of the 12 Republican members preparing the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did not they in their brief suggest that if you would give them free hides that 10 or 15 per cent would be the proper rate and they would stand for that?

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not read their briefs. I listened to the statements of the gentleman himself.

Mr. KITCHIN. I did read the brief, and it shows that.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not care a ha'penny what they wrote or what the brief states; I listened to the words of the man's own mouth.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman said that the woolgrowers——

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman is going to read from a report I can not yield.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to read what they said.

Mr. FORDNEY. Not in my time. I say that I can go through the hearings of January last and find any amount of such reports or testimony before the committee, taken in the hearings that you lent a deaf ear to; and you have no right to say that because such things are in the hearings that any man wrote these schedules. It is true that way back in 1867, when a Republican tariff bill was being prepared on wool, a committee was appointed. It selected a committee of manufacturers to get information; months and months were spent by that committee in furnishing information, as the Tariff Board has recently done, and upon the report of that committee the Ways and Means Committee prepared their report on wool. I have that information at my office, and if the gentleman doubts what I have said on this subject I will at a later time present it to the House, showing exactly what was done by that committee at that time. The country was uninformed as to the cost of production at home and the cost of production abroad right after the Civil War.

They therefore appealed to the men in the business to give them an intelligent estimate of the cost of production of the various kinds of cloth made from wool—made in this country and made abroad. That was the only time in the history of the Republican Party that a committee of manufacturers or any manufacturer has been asked to furnish information except to come before the Committee on Ways and Means and make his statement and furnish his views on the cost of production at home and the estimated cost abroad. You have prepared your bill along those lines. I do not impugn dishonest motives to you, and you should not to me, for doing the same thing your committee have done.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

330. Printing paper (other than paper commercially known as handmade or machine handmade paper, japan paper, and imitation japan paper by whatever name known), unsized, sized, or glued, suitable for the printing of books and newspapers, but not for covers or bindings, not specially provided for in this section, valued above 2½ cents per pound, 12 per cent ad valorem: *Provided, however,* That if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government shall impose any export duty, export license fee, or other charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee or otherwise) upon printing paper, wood pulp, or wood for use in the manufacture of wood pulp, there shall be imposed upon printing paper, when imported either directly or indirectly from such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government, an additional duty equal to the amount of such export duty or other export charge imposed by such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government, upon printing paper, wood pulp, or wood for use in the manufacture of wood pulp.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 80, at the end of line 13, insert the words "valued at above 2½ cents per pound."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 80, line 19, after the word "paper" insert the words "or upon an amount of."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the amendment which was just agreed to, would not that leave the matter in such shape that if Canada should impose an export duty upon

print paper, valued at less than 2½ cents per pound, we would have no recourse against that? There is nothing in here to prevent that, except where you have the free list. You impose a duty on chemical pulp which we do not import to any extent from Canada.

Mr. HAMMOND. The effect of this amendment is simply to limit the retaliatory duty to paper valued at more than 2½ cents a pound, because in the free list we have paper up to 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. MANN. I understand. This bill carries news print paper, which is the term usually used, at less than 2½ cents per pound on the free list.

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But supposing Canada imposes an export duty on that paper.

Mr. HAMMOND. There is no retaliatory duty.

Mr. MANN. Of course not in the free list. There is a retaliatory duty on chemical pulp.

Mr. HAMMOND. But not upon print paper.

Mr. MANN. Is not the gentleman afraid that is rather a dangerous proposition?

Mr. HAMMOND. The purpose of it is to have print paper up to 2½ cents per pound admitted to this country without the imposition of any duty here. Of course if we should impose a retaliatory duty we would make it cost that much more.

Mr. MANN. I think not. If we impose a retaliatory duty there will be no possibility of their imposing in the near future an export duty, because the paper could not stand the export duty and our import duty.

Mr. HAMMOND. That would depend on the size of the export duty.

Mr. MANN. I think it would not depend upon the size of the export duty. On 2½-cent paper you would have to make some duty. Of course, if they put one one-thousandth of 1 per cent, that would not mean anything.

Mr. HAMMOND. If they put it 10 per cent——

Mr. MANN. If they put a 10 per cent export duty on it and we had a retaliatory duty, that would be 10 per cent import duty here. That paper could not stand that, coming from Canada, and hence they would not do it.

Mr. HAMMOND. It is very difficult to determine just what Canada will do or will not do under certain conditions. At one time we contemplated a retaliatory duty in connection with the provision admitting news-print paper under 2½ cents free of duty, but later on it was thought that by so doing we would simply make it more difficult to bring that paper into this country. For that reason the committee decided to strike out the retaliatory provision. Of course, the gentleman understands that the amendment that was just adopted has nothing to do with the question we have been discussing.

Mr. MANN. I do not so understand; quite the contrary.

Mr. HAMMOND. I think it has nothing to do with it for this reason, that we are now engaged in perfecting the paragraph that contains retaliatory duties upon paper valued at more than 2½ cents per pound, and this amendment which was agreed to simply proposes that the retaliatory duty shall be levied on paper valued at above 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. MANN. The dutiable part of this paragraph has not affected paper valued less than 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The proviso is one which I wrote some years ago, I think in practically the same language; perhaps exactly the same.

Mr. HAMMOND. It is very like the language of the Payne bill.

Mr. MANN. That applies to print paper regardless of value.

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman's amendment is designed not to apply to print paper valued at 2½ cents or less per pound.

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That is the danger in the matter. With print paper admitted free of duty from Canada, Canada having a supply of the raw material, the spruce wood, it is almost sure that the development of the industry will be mostly in Canada. When they have acquired the development of the industry and possess the mills, possessing the raw material, the danger is that they will do in some form what Brazil did in regard to coffee. We do not get any benefit from taking the tariff off coffee and if they shall in the end have an incidental development in Canada, then, they having the industry, impose an export on paper, we will be in a worse position so far as paper is concerned than now. I do not think they will do that if we had an import duty based upon the export duty, if they make one, of the same amount.

Mr. HAMMOND. The gentleman states that if they develop the industry there and practically control it then they may put an export duty upon print paper. I fancy that he is not far out of the way in such speculation. If they secure that control of the market and then put an export duty upon paper and we have to have that paper we must pay that export charge, and if there be an additional retaliatory duty here we must pay more for it than if we took it at their export duty.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman understands it would not have any practical effect now either one way or the other. It is a mere declaration of policy written into the law, as far as that is concerned. I think in the interest of the paper manufacturers, and principally the paper consumers of the country, we ought to declare our policy that if Canada at any time proposes to impose an extra duty we will impose an import duty of the same amount, and therefore would prevent an export duty being imposed.

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

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

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 80, line 20, after the word "pulp," strike out the period and insert the words "necessary to manufacture such printing paper."

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information in regard to this paper? Do I understand paper at the present time up to two and a half cents a pound is admitted free of duty from Canada?

Mr. HAMMOND. At the present time all paper from Canada valued at not more than 4 cents a pound is admitted free of duty, if it is made of wood or wood pulp, subject to no export restrictions. We in this bill have a provision admitting news-print paper, valued at not more than two and a half cents, free of duty, and I suppose the effect of this provision, if it is adopted and enacted into law, will be to repeal or at least render nugatory section 2 of the Canadian reciprocity act.

Mr. DONOVAN. Now, my next question is, At the present time what is the export duty on paper up to two and a half cents a pound from Canada?

Mr. HAMMOND. The export duty on paper going into Canada?

Mr. DONOVAN. No. What duty does Canada impose upon a similar grade of paper, say, of 2½ cents a pound?

Mr. HAMMOND. I am unable to inform the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps I can give some information.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]?

Mr. HAMMOND. I do.

Mr. MANN. There is no export duty on paper from Canada.

Mr. DONOVAN. No export duty; but what does Canada impose on paper from this country?

Mr. MANN. I do not know; but it is quite a duty.

Mr. DONOVAN. The point I want to make is to show what a foolish transaction it is upon our part to allow print paper into this country practically free, at 2½ cents a pound, and we pay $6 or $7 a ton to ship paper there. In other words, we have performed a fool business act in connection with Canada. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. The observations of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN], of course, not only apply to paper, but a good deal more strongly to other articles in the bill. Print paper coming from Canada now under the Canadian reciprocity laws is admitted free of duty under certain conditions. Those conditions are such that more than half of the news-print paper which is imported from Canada is actually now admitted free. That paper is made from pulp wood cut upon what are known as the private lands, and comes in free because there is no restriction in Canada upon the exportation of the pulp wood. Most of the forests in Canada are owned by the Provinces, and are called "Crown lands." The right of stumpage is leased or sold, and there is a restriction in all the leases or sales providing that the wood shall be manufactured in Canada. That is considered a restriction. Paper made from that pulp wood, or from pulp that is made from that pulp wood, does not come in free. The Treasury Department has ruled where paper is made partly from pulp wood that is cut on Crown lands and partly from pulp wood that is cut on private lands, they will ascertain the proportion of the pulp wood that was had in the manufacture of paper and admit free the proportionate part made from the pulp wood cut on the private lands, and impose a duty on the proportionate part made from pulp wood cut on the Crown lands.

This bill provides for the admission of the news print paper up to 2½ cents a pound free. As I understand, the real purpose of fixing this at 2½ cents a pound—and I originally made

the limit in the law which this follows—was in order to prevent the Canadians taking advantage of the American consumer by charging more than 2½ cents for the ordinary newsprint paper. As long as they keep the price down to 2½ cents, they get it in at a lower rate of duty, or, by this bill, free. The minute that goes up above 2½ cents, there is an import duty on it.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a very brief observation in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN]. He comes from a section of the United States that has always been famous for its ability to make trades. The Yankees are the best traders probably in the world, and his natural view of tariff making as a good Yankee is that we ought not to give away something to another country without getting something in return from them——

A MEMBER. Even nutmegs.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Even nutmegs, as some gentleman prompts me to suggest. But his remarks are in line with the message recently sent to the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts by the governor of that State, in which he deprecated the proposed Democratic tariff revision upon the ground that the only proper way to proceed to revise the tariff was to do so by making a reciprocal trade or bargain with some other nation, and that seems to be the opinion also of my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN].

Now, I agree that it would be very desirable, indeed, if we could get other countries to make reciprocal bargains with us, so that in reducing our own tariff duties for the sake of our consumers, we might also get them to reduce their tariff duties so as to give extended markets to our producers.

But the trouble with that arrangement is that if we wait for that time we shall never get any revision of the tariff downward at all. We have just been through a great campaign in which we wrote upon our own statute books a law offering reciprocal bargains to the Dominion of Canada, and instead of accepting them the Canadians rejected their own side of the agreement, so that the proposed reciprocity fell to the ground.

Sent here, as we were, commissioned by the consuming public of the United States to give them relief from tariff burdens, against which they were justly complaining, what assurance have we of giving relief to that situation if we pay no heed to that cry and, instead, offer to them a bargain with some other country? If I were confident that we could get those bargains and write them immediately into law I would desire, for the sake of the manufacturers in the United States, to do so.

But a burned child fears the fire, and we have just been burned in our endeavor to make a trade with the Dominion of Canada, our nearest neighbor, the country most like ourselves in habits, commerce, and business manners; and my conviction as the result of that experience is that unless we ourselves proceed immediately to revise the tariff for the sake of the American consuming public we shall have to wait until the cows come home. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer briefly the inquiry of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN]. I agree with him in the main, but I think that he does not quite appreciate the situation that exists at the present time. In order to obtain the pulp to make news-print paper there must be a large supply of spruce wood. It so happens that Canada has that large supply. We do not have it in the United States, but we have a great demand for the paper itself, so we are hardly in a position to retaliate against importations, under any terms, of news-print paper from Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

331. Papers commonly known as copying paper, stereotype paper, bibulous paper, tissue paper, pottery paper, letter-copying books, wholly or partly manufactured, crêpe paper and filtering paper, and articles manufactured from any of the foregoing papers or of which such paper is the component material of chief value, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 80, line 24, after the word "paper," insert the words "weighing not more than 10 pounds per ream of 480 sheets."

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

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be allowed to make an observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DONOVAN. The passage of this bill, if so amended, will result in this: That the Canadians will receive all the benefits of the so-called reciprocity act without giving anything in return. That is true, is it not? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation, too. I represent in part a State that has the spruce and also has the paper mills for the manufacture of paper. This industry is only one of many which will suffer in the great State of Washington.

While I am on my feet I want to suggest to my good Democratic friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN], that, following up the discussion that was had on this side this afternoon as to who wrote the items of the wool schedule, we shall be indebted to him if he will disclose to the House who wrote the little item concerning gun wads which will soon be reached. Taxed gun wads under any tariff bill have never produced more than $300 of revenue per year to the United States. While my Democratic friend from Connecticut is bewailing the loss of protection for his paper mills, for his hat makers, and for his makers of notions of a thousand kinds, it must console him to know that the gun wads, made only in his State, are protected, and that protection is certainly not for revenue. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I will answer no; of course Canada does not receive all the benefits of reciprocity. Neither does Canada receive all the benefits under section 2 of the act. Canada, under section 2, might send us paper under 4 cents free of duty. Under this bill all paper valued over 2½ cents a pound is subject to a duty.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What is the construction of this committee, if this becomes a law, upon section 2 of the reciprocity act?

Mr. HAMMOND. Well, of course, the Committee on Ways and Means is not a judicial body. I do not know that the committee as a whole has expressed any opinion upon this matter. I stated a moment ago that it was my own opinion that the effect of this legislation would be to render nugatory section 2 of the Canadian reciprocity act, and I assume that if section 2 is rendered nugatory it would be practically impossible for the Canadian reciprocity act to become a law without being reenacted here.

Mr. MANN. Of course, so far as paper under 2½ cents being admitted free is concerned, that would not necessarily conflict with section 2 of the Canadian reciprocity act, because that is giving something more than is given there.

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But as to paper between 2½ and 4 cents, where you impose a duty upon it in this bill that would be in direct conflict with the provisions of section 2 of the reciprocity act?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes; it would.

Mr. MANN. I take it that if that act is a practical repeal of section 2 of the Canadian reciprocity act it acts practically as a repeal of the entire act.

Mr. HAMMOND. That is my opinion.

Mr. MANN. Then why not repeal it, and not leave it as a matter of uncertainty?

Mr. HAMMOND. I shall be very glad to vote to repeal it.

Mr. MANN. I have always voted for the Canadian reciprocity act.

Mr. HAMMOND. I have always voted against it, and I voted to repeal it.

Mr. MANN. I understand. I voted the other way; but if it is to be repealed in this way by implication, it would seem to me that for the purpose of avoiding possible international disputes or questions in court it would be advisable to do directly that which otherwise would be done indirectly. In other words, when you are writing a law it is better to make it clear on those things concerning which you know questions will arise, if you can do so, than to leave it until after the questions have arisen.

Mr. HAMMOND. If the gentleman from Illinois has an opportunity and does move to repeal the Canadian reciprocity act, I will assure him of one vote.

Mr. MANN. As far as I am concerned, I do not intend to move to repeal it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I do not think myself that this law will repeal the entire Canadian reciprocity treaty. It will have that effect as to section 2 undoubtedly, in my opinion, but I think the balance of the act will stay on the statute books. Of course,

whether Canada will at any time accept the balance of it with that portion out, I do not know.

Mr. MANN. But, if the gentleman will pardon me, it may be that we can change our position with that degree of celerity which would fit the case. We are now claiming that section 2 is a part of the whole Canadian reciprocity act, and hence that where we grant free paper coming from Canada, that does not grant free paper coming from Sweden under the clause that gives Sweden the same rate of import duty that any other country has, on the ground that this is a reciprocity treaty with Canada and is to be treated as a whole. Perhaps we could switch around. I do not know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But my friend from Illinois overlooks the fact that Canada has not ratified this reciprocity treaty, and therefore it is not a question of repealing a treaty. Of course, if we should leave the law on the statute books and Canada should then accept the whole of it, it will then become in the nature of a treaty; and being ratified after this law goes into effect, the only effect it would have would be so far as this particular bill changes the terms of that act.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken in that. We would not ratify it after this bill went into effect. We have passed the law, as far as we are concerned. It is on the statute books. Now, suppose we in effect repeal one section of that law and then Canada passes a law in the same terms as the one which we originally passed, we would not either one of us get together. The minds of the two Governments would not meet. It would not amount to anything. It seems to me it is a practical repeal.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman was genuinely in favor of the Canadian reciprocity act, as I was. And having, after a great congressional convulsion, secured the passage of our side of the law, does not the gentleman think that instead of endeavoring to repeal the whole law we might leave it on the statute books, with the hope that, should Canada change her mind about it, this one trifling point might easily be adjusted between the two countries, and we could get all the benefits we hoped for from the whole reciprocity act?

Mr. MANN. I should say it would be desirable either to repeal it, or else put into this law a saving clause that if the Canadian reciprocity act should be accepted by Canada section 2 should remain in force.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. With all this talk I have not received a satisfactory answer on the point I wanted to bring out. My claim is that if this Underwood bill reported by the committee goes into effect paper will be allow to be brought into this country free of duty up to 2½ cents. That is, when we take it off it comes in free from the Canadian Province, and paper going out of this country must pay a duty. Now, the gentleman from Washington asked me a question, and I did not answer him, because I did not know. I do not want to appear discourteous to the gentleman. I suppose that the chairman of the committee ought to answer the question. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

332. Papers, including wrapper paper, with coated surface or surfaces, not specially provided for in this section, including wrapping paper with the surface decorated or covered with a design, fancy effect, pattern, or character, whether produced in the pulp or otherwise, but not by lithographic process, whether or not wholly or partly covered with metal or its solutions (except as hereinafter provided) or with gelatin or flock, or embossed or printed, cloth-lined or reenforced paper, parchment papers, and grease-proof and imitation parchment papers which have been supercalendered and rendered transparent, or partially so, by whatever name known; all other grease-proof and imitation parchment papers, not specially provided for in this section, by whatever name known; bags, envelopes, printed matter other than lithographic, and all other articles composed wholly or in chief value of any of the foregoing papers, not specially provided for in this section, and all boxes of paper or wood covered with any of the foregoing paper, 35 per cent ad valorem; albuminized or sensitized paper or paper otherwise surface-coated for photographic purposes, plain basic papers for albuminizing, sensitizing, baryta coating, or for photographic or solar printing processes, 25 per cent ad valorem.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 3, strike out all after the word "papers" and down to and including the word "printed," in line 10, and insert the words "including wrapping paper, with coated surface or surfaces, or with the surface wholly or partly covered or decorated with a design, fancy effect, pattern, or character, whether produced in the pulp or otherwise; all of the foregoing not specially provided for, whether or not wholly or partly covered with metal or its solution or with gelatin or flock or embossed or printed except by lithographic process."

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 20, amend by inserting after the first word "paper," at the beginning of the line, the words "papier mâché."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 11, after the word "paper," strike out the words "parchment papers."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter addressed to me by the Glen Mills Paper Co. protesting against the reduction of the duty upon what is known as vegetable parchment paper. I move to strike out the two words. If I should be successful, that I may keep the record straight, I would like to give notice that I shall move to substitute for the duty on parchment paper the rates that we find in the present law. Mr. Chairman, in my time, I ask to have this letter read.

The Clerk read the letter, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *April 21, 1913.*

Hon. T. S. BUTLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We write you in regard to the proposed change of duty on vegetable parchment paper.

The rate in force at the present time is 2 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem. The proposed change (H. R. 10 of Apr. 7, 1913, p. 81, par. 336) by the House committee is 35 per cent ad valorem duty on parchment paper, including it with a number of other papers.

This change would be a most disastrous one, because it would not only reduce the rate to a point which would enable German competition to practically undersell the entire market in this country, but it would further continue this paper in a class with a larger number of other papers, and for this reason and also by making the duty ad valorem, it would render frauds by undervaluation and misdescription as prevalent as they were in prior years, and almost impossible of detection.

Ad valorem duties are generally conceded to be a fruitful source of fraud. Misdescription and undervaluation are almost impossible to follow up, and it would be but a very short time before the American manufacturers of this paper would be driven out by the Germans.

Practically the only foreign country making this paper is Germany, and none of the German paper has been imported since 1909.

Parchment paper of domestic manufacture formerly sold in this country at 12 cents per pound, and its price has continuously declined until it is now 7½ cents per pound, and this has been entirely under stress of domestic competition. In the meantime, the efficiency of labor has declined, and the wages have been increased so that the economies and the better methods of manufacture have been partly offset by the inefficiency and high cost of labor.

We respectfully request you to use all possible means—

(1) To prevent the inclusion of vegetable parchment paper in a class along with other papers.

(2) To prevent any change in the existing specific duty.

(3) In the event of change, to prevent it being placed on an ad valorem basis.

The present duty is 2 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem. We think that if it were necessary to make any reduction that the reduction would be sufficient if the 10 per cent ad valorem were stricken out.

Thanking you very much for your favor, we are,

Truly, yours,

THE GLEN MILLS PAPER CO.,
Per J. M. DOLAN.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, the letter has been read and the views of my constituents will appear in the RECORD. I now await the operation of the committee upon the request of my constituents. I have endeavored to comply with their request. They will not hold me responsible for the failure, but they will charge it properly to the Democratic side of the House.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, in the letter just read, if I understood correctly, the writer stated that 10 per cent ad valorem might be dropped and the specific rate continued. The present rate upon parchment paper, reduced to an equivalent ad valorem, is 47 per cent. Deducting 10 per cent would leave an equivalent ad valorem of 37 per cent. The rate we have fixed at 35 per cent, so that there is not a great difference between what the gentleman says might be done with safety and what we have done.

Mr. BUTLER. The principal protest is against the ad valorem duty. My constituents want a specific duty. I am not criticizing the gentleman because he does not accept the amendment. The gentleman will recall that while the principal protest is against the specific duty, it is also against the reduction which the gentleman's committee has made.

Mr. HAMMOND. The reduction is only about 2 per cent from what the gentleman would be content with if it was a specific duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 25, after the words "ad valorem," strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the words "parchment paper, 2 cents per pound."

Mr. MOORE. This is merely reenforcing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], and slightly reduces the Payne rate.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 11, after the words "reenforced paper," insert the words "parchment and vellum."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is to encourage Americans to manufacture parchment and vellum. It all comes in from foreign countries now, and it could be made here if there were a duty upon it.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 22, after the word "purposes" insert "30 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in order to make a compensatory duty between paper to be prepared for photographic process and the actual paper ready for the photographer's use. It seems that there should be a distinction between the two, as testified to by some constituents of mine. The following message I received to-day:

Rate on sensitized or surface-coated photo paper should be higher than on plain. It is a luxury; benefits Eastman only.

We have heard a great deal about hitting at the trust, and at the request of these constituents of mine I beg to solicit the assistance of the Democrats in an endeavor to hit the trust in one particular. This seems to be a very good means of giving the trust just a little bit of a knock, or, rather, letting one of them have a little of the kind of treatment which it has been agreed we ought to give to them.

Further, I would ask the gentleman from Minnesota in charge of this section if there should not be a compensatory duty between these two kinds of paper. I also wish to submit a brief that has been sent to me that was prepared for submission to the House Committee on Ways and Means during their sessions last winter, but which was not submitted, in view of the fact that a general appearance was put in on behalf of the paper manufacturers in my section rather than for this special kind of paper. I would ask the Clerk to read this in my time. May I ask the indulgence of the gentleman from Minnesota, also, that he answer the question which I have asked?

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned, B. D. Rising Paper Co., are manufacturers of paper at Housatonic, Berkshire County, Mass. We join with other manufacturers in the request that there be no radical change in the classification of papers as it appears in the tariff act of August 5, 1909. Manufacturers and importers have become familiar with the classification, and so have the inspectors and appraisers. Any change would necessitate much labor and argument and the loss of valuable time in determining the duty on different kinds of paper under a new classification. We are particularly interested in—

"PAR. 411. Plain basic papers for albuminizing, sensitizing, baryta coating, or for photographic or solar printing processes, 3 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem."

Very little of this kind of paper was made in this country previous to the enactment of the tariff of 1897, and even afterwards, as that act imperfectly described the paper; large quantities were brought in as "printing paper." This undervaluation was made impossible by the act of 1909, and under the protection thus afforded a large business has been developed, affording employment to many people.

Any reduction in the duty on this paper will result in the business going entirely to foreign mills, because they are able to produce the goods much cheaper than in this country. The supply of raw material for the manufacture of blue-print and photographic papers in this country is not sufficient, and very large quantities are imported from Europe. American manufacturers must pay more for these materials than the foreign manufacturers or they can not obtain them. When they have done so and have paid freight and other charges to bring the materials to their mills, and added the high labor rates prevailing here, the cost of the finished product must be greater than if manufactured abroad.

That the present duty on these papers is none too high is further shown by the fact that importations are increasing rapidly, as will be seen by the attached statement from the records of the Treasury Department:

	Pounds.
Plain basic photographic paper imported year 1907	2,218,496
Plain basic photographic paper imported year 1911	3,550,510

Note the increase of 60 per cent in four years.

All photographic paper imported year ending June 30, 1907	$593,040.64
All photographic paper imported year ending June 30, 1910	761,940.00
All photographic paper imported year ending June 30, 1911	1,147,039.00

Note the steady increase and that the value of paper imported in the year ending June 30, 1911, is nearly double that for the year ending June 30, 1907.

There is no reason why all this paper should not be made in this country except that the foreign manufacturers have the advantage of lower costs of labor and material.

It should further be noted that photographic paper, either plain or coated, is not one of the necessaries of life, but is sold at an enormous profit by one of the biggest and worst trusts in the country.

Any reduction in duty will benefit nobody but the manufacturers of camera supplies, who send large sums of money out of this country, and cause a loss of employment, which will greatly injure the wage earner.

B. D. RISING PAPER CO.,
CHAS. MCKENNON, *Treasurer.*

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, when the question was asked by the gentleman from Connecticut a few moments ago, whether or not section 2 of the Canadian reciprocity is repealed by this act, no one seemed to be able to give the information. The reciprocity act that was heretofore passed by this House and enacted into law did not conform with any of the principles that are advocated by the Republican Party, in that it provided for the importation of the products of another country into this country without duty, whereas that country charged us a duty when we shipped our products into that country. That is not a good business policy. I do not think that conforms to the best interests of America, and I think that the people of this country and the manufacturers of paper are entitled to know whether or not, by the enactment of this into law, that particular section will or will not be repealed. It is reported by the Tariff Board that it costs $3.50 a ton more to manufacture paper in this country than it does in Canada. But there is nobody who need say that Canada would put an import duty upon the products that we ship into that country, providing they were not opposed to the import or to our export. According to the information I have, we have 40,000,000,000 feet of fir spruce and other paper timber in this country, sufficient to supply the need for all time, if it is properly conserved, for the manufacture of paper. One of the purposes for the enactment of the Canadian reciprocity treaty and for this particular provision was, according to Democratic principles, that we would get our product cheaper, and I leave it to the House or any Member here to say whether or not that condition has come about, and I stand with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] to repeal that act in toto from top to bottom, and I hope before this Congress adjourns that that will be done. The reciprocity treaty with Canada was rejected by that country, and belittled us in the eyes of the world. The Republican Party heard from the American farmers in the election of 1912 because of having promulgated reciprocity with Canada, and by the passage of this act promulgating free trade and one-sided reciprocity with the world the Democratic Party will hear from the people in 1914.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

333. Pictures, calendars, cards, labels, flaps, cigar bands, placards, and other articles composed wholly or in chief value of paper lithographically printed in whole or in part from stone, metal, or material other than gelatin (except boxes, views of American scenery or objects, and music, and illustrations when forming part of a periodical or newspaper, or of bound or unbound books, accompanying the same, not specially provided for in this section) shall pay duty at the following rates: Labels, flaps, and cigar bands, if printed entirely in bronze printing, 15 per cent ad valorem; if printed otherwise than entirely in bronze printing, but not printed in whole or in part in metal leaf, 25 per cent ad valorem; if printed in whole or in part in metal leaf, 30 per cent ad valorem; booklets, books of paper or other material for children's use, not exceeding in weight 24 ounces each, fashion magazines or periodicals, printed in whole or in part by lithographic process, or decorated by hand, booklets, decorated in whole or in part by hand or by spraying, whether or not lithographed, 12 per cent ad valorem; decalcomanias in ceramic colors, whether or not backed with metal leaf, and all other decalcomanias, except toy decalcomanias, 20 per cent ad valorem; pictures, calendars, cards, placards, and all other articles than those hereinbefore specifically provided for in this paragraph, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 82, line 4, strike out the words "other than gelatin," and, after the word "or," insert the word "other."

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 82, line 25, after the words "ad valorem," strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"*Provided*, That articles composed wholly or in chief value of paper printed by the photogelatin process and not specially provided for in this act shall be dutiable at 3 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is lower than the Payne rate and is simply intended to protect the American manufacturers against foreign competition.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

334. Writing, letter, note, handmade paper and paper commercially known as handmade paper and machine handmade paper, japan paper and imitation japan paper by whatever name known, and ledger, bond, record, tablet, typewriter, manifold, and onionskin and imitation onionskin papers calendered or uncalendered, whether or not any such paper is ruled, bordered, embossed, printed, lined, or decorated in any manner, 25 per cent ad valorem.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 83, line 8, after the word "manner," strike out "25 per cent" and insert "35 per cent."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the paper industry is one of the largest industries in western Massachusetts, and the mills feel that the rates proposed in the Underwood bill are very detrimental to their interests. They consider that the lowest rate in this section should not be under 40 per cent. This rate of 35 per cent which I have proposed is a reduction from the existing rate, as I understand it, and it seems to me that it is not more than a fair return on the industry that it represents. You will note by the brief filed by the Paper Makers' Association that the comparative rate of wages in this country and in Germany is as follows: The skilled labor in Germany receives from 8 to 16 cents per hour and in America from 25 to 50 cents per hour. Unskilled labor in Germany receives from 6 to 11 cents and in America from 13 to 25 cents per hour.

Mr. AUSTIN. What about the length of hours they work?

Mr. TREADWAY. Both the skilled and unskilled laborers work shorter hours in America than they do in Germany. This is very strong proof that labor will obtain a large share of any benefit of a tariff act, and if the tariff is reduced on these papers labor must eventually give up a portion of its gain. We have been over this subject with our friends on the other side so frequently that I do not care at this time to transgress upon the time of the House. We make this appeal in behalf of the men employed in the paper mills of western Massachusetts, not in behalf of the manufacturers.

The competition between the paper mills there is such that the profits have been extremely low, and I could furnish, if you desired it, statistics corroborating these statements. It seems to me that we ought to consider the welfare of the employees in these great mills and not compel them to accept a lower scale of wages in competition with foreign labor.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I have but a moment. I do not intend to go into any lengthy discussion, as I realize it is useless, the Democratic caucus having settled in advance and without consideration of the merits of the case what action is to be taken upon every amendment offered in behalf of the great industries of my State.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], I think, started to interrupt.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was simply going to ask the gentleman not to be discouraged. This side has succeeded in getting so many amendments on the bill that if you talk a little longer you may get another.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will appreciate your cooperation in behalf of the men I am speaking for.

Mr. AUSTIN. You will get it.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

335. Paper envelopes not specially provided for in this section, folded or flat, bordered, embossed, printed, tinted, decorated, or lined, 15 per cent ad valorem.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 83, lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "not specially provided for in this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND].

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I notice that this makes a very severe reduction in fancy envelopes. I am not very well informed in reference to the business. Embossed, printed, tinted, decorated, or lined envelopes are reduced from 25 to 15 per cent, the same as plain envelopes.

Mr. HAMMOND. The average rate upon envelopes, I think, is 27 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Plain envelopes now come in, I think, at 20 per cent, and fancy envelopes at——

Mr. HAMMOND. Thirty, is it not?

Mr. MANN. Thirty-five per cent. Of course, whatever the average is does not make any difference as to my inquiry of whether there ought to be little higher rate, either as a protective or a revenue measure, on fancy envelopes.

Mr. HAMMOND. I will say to the gentleman that he has undoubtedly noticed an apparent inconsistency in the rate upon writing paper and the rate upon envelopes. That was suggested to the committee, and it was proposed at one time to increase the rate upon envelopes. We have not done so, however. The difference in rates has been carried for a number of years, and is in the present law. Believing the ad valorem would take care of the different values of the envelopes, we did not feel like going over 15 per cent. We desire to make a reduction, and if we did not go below 20 per cent, there would be no reduction on plain envelopes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 83, line 10, after the word "flat," insert the word "plain."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 83, line 9, strike out paragraph 335 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"335. Paper envelopes not specially provided for in this section, folded or flat, if plain, 20 per cent ad valorem; if bordered, embossed, printed, tinted, decorated, or lined, 35 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MOORE. This restores the Payne rate, and the reason for it is this, that the duty fixed upon envelopes is here fixed at 15 per cent while the duty on the paper from which the envelopes are made is fixed at 25 per cent. These figures would make it almost impossible for the manufacturer of envelopes to successfully compete with the foreign manufacturer.

Mr. PAYNE. I am afraid the gentleman does not understand the theory. They put them all at the low rate of duty in order that it may benefit the impecunious consumer of the United States. The gentleman does not understand the theory.

Mr. MOORE. Evidently I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

337. Books of all kinds, bound or unbound, including blank books, slate books and pamphlets, engravings, photographs, etchings, maps, charts, music in books or sheets, and printed matter, all the foregoing and not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem. Views of any landscape, scene, building, place, or locality in the United States, on cardboard or paper, not thinner than eight one-thousandths of 1 inch, by whatever process printed or produced, including those wholly or in part produced by either lithographic or photogelatin process (except show cards), occupying 35 square inches or less of surface per view, bound or unbound, or in any other form, 45 per cent ad valorem; thinner than eight one-thousandths of 1 inch, $2 per thousand.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 83, line 22, after the word "section," strike out "15 per cent ad valorem" and insert in lieu thereof "25 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] if this paragraph, re-

ferring to "books of all kinds," will also include Bibles, which have been transferred to the free list?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It would if they were not on the free list.

Mr. MOORE. Then Bibles are to be distinguished from "books of all kinds" as referred to in this paragraph?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. The committee is of the opinion that there is one Book in all the world that ought not to be taxed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE. I am glad the committee is of that mind, for this is the first time they have displayed any religious feeling since this discussion began. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, not desiring to delay the committee further, I wish to say that the printers' and pressmen's and binders' unions, and union men generally, are opposed to this transfer of books to the free list. They are also opposed to the reduction of duty from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. I shall extend in the RECORD some things they have to say on that subject. I think this paragraph is decidedly against the interests of union labor, of which we have so many champions on the other side of the House.

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

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me a question right there?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he objected to the passage of this schedule?

Mr. MOORE. I object to the passage of the schedule; yes. I object also to the passage of the bill.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is it because the gentleman thinks that the work on the books—the work of the printers and all—will be done on the other side, and that that work will be given to labor of that class on the other side?

Mr. MOORE. I say that if we had the printing done on the other side, and employed the pressmen on the other side, and employed the bookbinders on the other side, and all the other labor of diversified character entering into the making of books of all kinds, whether Bibles or not, included in this paragraph, it would transfer the industry to the other side of the water, and we would have to buy what they send to us. I think it would be far better to have this work done in the United States, rather than have it sent over to Canada or Europe or Germany or England and have their people make them. I think it would be better, if we had money to spend, to spend among our own people, in our own country, and I think that it would be better, even in the case of Bibles, for which there is a demand, and in which, for the first time, there seems to be an interest on the Democratic side. I think it would be a splendid thing for our people to buy them from American publishers. The truth is that Bibles are being distributed all over the world, and they are being printed in the United States, and the printing and circulation of the Bible gives our people employment and helps to civilize the nations of the world, and that civilization brings money to the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, allow me to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we are going to have so much money in the near future under the operation of this bill that we shall not be able to spend it all at home, and here is a provision under which we may be able to spend some of it abroad. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. I know my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is speaking satirically in this instance, although he is right in his opposition to the bill.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask if he knows why they propose to place Bibles on the free list in this bill?

Mr. MOORE. No.

Mr. MANN. It is probably because they know the people throughout the country will have so much spare time on their hands, not having anything else to do, that they will have ample leisure in which to read the Bible, and they think they ought to be furnished with it cheaply. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOSTER. On the contrary, I think the people have been enduring so much suffering on account of the operations of the Payne law in the last four years that they should be permitted to get comfort from reading the Bible, and to that end they should be permitted to buy it cheaply. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. They will have to do something more than merely read the Bible if they want to make a living.

Mr. MOORE. The communications I referred to were as follows:

ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Allied Printing Trades Council of Philadelphia that the Presbyterian Publication Committee is advocating the removal of the present duty on Bibles of foreign manufacture and the placing of religious publications of all kinds on the free list; and

Whereas the universally accepted theory of tariff protection comprehends the equalizing of opportunities for American and foreign labor; and

Whereas there has been placed before committees of the Congress indisputable evidence that the printing industry of the United States stands in great need of additional protective legislation in order to successfully compete with foreign markets: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Allied Printing Trades Council of Philadelphia, in regular meeting assembled on Friday evening, February 21, 1913, does hereby earnestly protest against any reduction of the present import duties on printed matter; and be it further

Resolved, That Members of the Congress be fervently petitioned to promote legislation designed to levy such additional duties on imports of printed matter as they, from their investigations, shall find to be just and proper.

ROBERT L. BARNES, *Secretary.*

ALLIED PRINTING AND BOOKBINDING TRADES ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
New York.

The following was adopted at a meeting of the representatives of the Allied Printing and Bookbinding Trades Association of America at the National Hotel, Washington, D. C., April 20, 1913:

"*Resolved*, That we earnestly petition the United States Senate to grant public hearing to American citizens on the revised and amended tariff bill.

"As members of trades who are threatened with loss of employment by reduction of Schedule M, we ask that the United States Senate grant to us the opportunity of proving that our industry is in great danger if the revised bill should become a law.

"We ask this privilege as American citizens to lay before your body evidence which will disclose and prove to you the dangers of this legislation to the American workman."

PHILADELPHIA PRINTED BOOK BINDERS' UNION,
Philadelphia, February 17, 1913.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Find inclosed copy of a resolution adopted by our organization, which is self-explanatory. We are seeking your aid in this matter, which means so much to our craft, not only in Philadelphia but throughout the country.

Our committee will be pleased to call upon you while in Philadelphia to explain any feature that you should want explained.

Thanking you for any aid that you may extend to us in this matter, I am,

Yours, sincerely, J. HOWARD BERRY, Sr.

P. S.—Find inclosed copy of our agreement and scale of wages that we have with our employers, showing our reliability.

B.

Whereas it has been brought to our attention that the Presbyterian Publication Committee appeared before your honorable body, requesting that all religious publications be placed upon the free list, also asking that the 25 per cent duty on Bibles be taken off; and

Whereas we, members of Local No. 2, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, which have a membership of over 15,000 mechanics, both male and female, throughout the United States who are employed in making these Bibles and religious books, and who are a part of this great constituency, endeavoring to build up our industries by having uniform laws maintained, where the journeymen and apprentices can earn living wages and support their families properly; and

Whereas at the present time here in Philadelphia the largest Bible publication house in America, employing hundreds of skilled mechanics, and having done abroad thousands of dollars' worth of Bibles and religious publications each year under our existing tariff laws, by having Bibles and all religious publications upon the free list, as advocated by the Presbyterian committee, would mean throwing out of work thousands of employees throughout the United States and closing down our workshops, for if American mechanics can not compete with the foreign labor under our present tariff laws it would mean the elimination, so far as the American workmen are concerned, of our present book industry if all books were placed upon the free list; and

Whereas at the present time figures taken from statistics showing the difference between the American and foreign paid labor and hours' work per day, with almost the elimination of child labor, in America, but not in force in some of those foreign competitive countries which American labor must compete against, also in foreign countries operating our American-manufactured labor-saving machines, same as are operated in our country:

Countries.	Hours per day.	Maximum wages per week.
Germany (work home at nights)	9	$6.00
France (work home at nights)	9	7.00
England (child labor)	9	12.00
Belgium (sweatshop system)	[1]10	6.00
Russia (sweatshop system)	[1]10	5.00
Austria (sweatshop system)	[1]10	5.00
Italy (sweatshop system)	[1]10	4.50
Spain (sweatshop system)	[1]10	4.50

[1] Or more.

Also in some of these countries the mechanics' families are working on book covers during the day while the fathers and brothers are in the binderies. In Belgium, Russia, Austria, Italy, and Spain children are employed in these workshops 10 and 12 years old, while in the United States our child-labor laws in most States prohibit girls and boys from working in factories under certain ages, which, at an average, is four to six years above those in foreign countries. These are the conditions confronting the American mechanics and workmen, who receive most universally the eight-hour day and wages ranging, in the book industry, from $18 to $22 per week, along with our great cost of living here in America: And be it

Resolved, That Local No. 2, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, do hereby unanimously protest against any such reduction, knowing the deplorable calamity it would cause, not only to the bookbinding industry but throughout the printing trades; and be it further

Resolved, That Local No. 2, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, recommend an increase on the present tariff on Bibles and religious books, also all books bound in foreign countries, printed sheets flat or folded, books partly bound, covers for books, either leather or cloth covers for books, with or without any labor upon the same, pieces of leather or any other materials, stamped or printed, for books or bookcases, should have sufficient duties added to equalize the difference between American and foreign-paid labor; and be it further

Resolved, That Local No. 2, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, wish to present the deplorable conditions of their industry caused by the unjust discrimination of our import laws, not only upon Bibles and religious books, but our fine bindings that have left our shores to be done in foreign binderies, which it has forced in America the closing of our fine binderies and forcing our mechanics into other fields, after spending their lives in becoming masters of their respective trades; and be it further

Resolved, That we ask for no advantage over our foreign competitor, but place the tariff high enough that it will equalize the difference between paid labor in European countries and the United States, and if the foreign countries can produce a superior and cheaper book after all conditions are equal, then they should have the trade on supremacy.

[SEAL.] A. NORMAN HANNINGS, *President*.
WILLIAM J. LEWIS, *Secretary*.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is exercised over the rest of this paragraph. I remember four years ago there were brought before us barrels of post-card pictures of scenery in this country "made in Germany." It seemed to be one of the chief occupations of people in Germany, and it was impossible to find any such views of American scenery made in the United States. I recall that a contract was made in my own town for the production of such pictures in Germany. We put the duty up so there was a 75 per cent rate on those things, and thereby we stopped that German business. As a result the retailers and the public here are now getting them for about the same price as they formerly paid for the foreign-made pictures of our home scenery, and our people do the work.

Pictures of that character are used on various other things besides post cards. They are used in many instances on the calendars which newspapers sell to the newsboys once a year, on New Year's Day, when the boys come around and tax us a quarter or half a dollar apiece for calendars. There is no excuse for allowing the newspapers to procure these calendars more cheaply. Of course there is no connection between the newspapers getting these a little cheaper under this change in the tariff and a desire on the part of Democracy to "snuggle up" closer to the press. Perish any thought of that kind! And still it is difficult to see what other motive there was on the part of the committee in making such a severe cut, unless they prefer to see the legend on American landscapes, "Printed in Germany." That may be a dear thought to them, although it causes the cheek of our worthy President to blush with shame every time he sees it. Perhaps they want to shame him. I do not know but they want to get even with him for changing the bill from what it was when the Ways and Means Committee had it. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Possibly it may be chagrin because the pie counter has been kept from so many and they want something to bring him to a realizing sense of their gnawing hunger. But, Mr. Chairman, I will not interfere with the harmony of the bill by even offering an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

339. All boxes made wholly or in chief value of paper or papier-mâché, if covered with surface-coated paper, 35 per cent ad valorem.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, strike out paragraph 339.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

340. Playing cards, 60 per cent ad valorem.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, line 14, after the word "cards," strike out "60" and insert in lieu thereof "50."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the committee has treated playing cards as a luxury. They have put the rate so high that it is impossible for the poor man to obtain a pack of cards to while away a winter evening. Having information that cards are used by the other side who are largely in the majority, and that there will be ample time after the bill goes into effect for them to spend their time as pleasantly as possible, I have moved to reduce the rate.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman use playing cards himself?

Mr. MOORE. Not at all.

Mr. MANN. If he did he would know that the cost of cards does not cut much ice—at the end of the game. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I suppose the gentleman will follow up this amendment when we come to the paragraph relating to poker chips, making the blue chips a luxury and the white ones a necessity. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. He would if he knew the difference. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. I knew some gentlemen on the other side would give me some expert information. [Laughter.] If anybody knows anything about cards, the gentlemen on the other side of the House do. Now, in the interest of the "downtrodden and the poor" I have offered this amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

Schedule N—Sundries.

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—the tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) 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 proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

343. Braids, featherstitched braids, fringes, gimps, gorings, all the foregoing of whatever material composed, and articles made wholly or in chief value of any of the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, 50 per cent ad valorem.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 85, line 1, strike out the letters "ed" in "featherstitched," so that it will read "featherstitch."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

344. Braids, plaits, laces, and willow sheets or squares, composed wholly or in chief value of straw, chip, grass, palm leaf, willow, osier, rattan, real horsehair, cuba bark, ramie, or manila hemp, suitable for making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, or hoods, not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained, 15 per cent ad valorem; if bleached, dyed, colored, or stained, 20 per cent ad valorem; hats, bonnets, and hoods composed wholly or in chief value of straw, chip, grass, palm leaf, willow, osier, rattan, cuba bark, ramie, or manila hemp, whether wholly or partly manufactured, but not blocked or trimmed, 25 per cent ad valorem; if blocked or trimmed, 40 per cent ad valorem. But the

terms "grass" and "straw" shall be understood to mean these substances in their natural form and structure, and not the separated fiber thereof.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 85, line 16, at the end of the line insert the words "and in chief value of such materials."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

345. Brooms, 15 per cent ad valorem; brushes and feather dusters of all kinds, and hair pencils in quills or otherwise, 35 per cent ad valorem.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph and insert the following in lieu thereof:
"345. Brooms, made of broom corn, straw, wooden fibers, or twigs, 15 per cent ad valorem; brushes and feather dusters of all kinds, and hair pencils in quills or otherwise, 35 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

348. Buttons or parts of buttons and button molds or blanks, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for in this section, and all collar or cuff buttons and studs composed wholly of bone, mother-of-pearl, or ivory, 40 per cent at valorem.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia offers an amendment, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph:
"348½. Bituminous coal and shale, 40 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel; coal slack or culm, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, 15 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel: *Provided*, That the rate of 15 cents per ton herein designated for 'coal slack or culm' shall be held to apply to importations of coal slack or culm produced and screened in the ordinary way, as such, and so shipped from the mine; coke, 20 per cent ad valorem; compositions used for fuel in which coal or coal dust is the component material of chief value, whether in briquettes or other form, 20 per cent ad valorem: *Provided further*, That on all coal imported into the United States, which is afterwards used for fuel on board vessels propelled by steam and engaged in trade with foreign countries, or in trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States, and which are registered under the laws of the United States, a drawback shall be allowed equal to the duty imposed by law upon such coal, and shall be paid under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe."

Mr. AVIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of Members of the House, and particularly of Democratic Members, to the fact that at no time in the history of this Government, except during the anthracite strike of 1903, when all coal was admitted to this country by law free of duty for one year, which was a measure of emergency and expediency, has bituminous coal ever been placed upon the free list.

Recognizing that there is a popular demand for revising the tariff downward, it will be noted that I have fixed the duty on bituminous coal at 40 cents per ton, on coal slack or culm at 15 cents per ton, and on coke at 20 per cent ad valorem. The duties provided in the present law are 45 cents per ton on bituminous coal, 15 cents per ton on coal slack or culm, and 20 per cent ad valorem on coke. I do not know whether it will have any weight or influence with the distinguished gentlemen on the other side of the aisle or not, but permit me to inform you that the amount of duty on bituminous coal named in the proposed amendment is the same as that provided in the Wilson-Gorman law. While I think the present duties on bituminous coal, coal slack, culm, and coke are none too high to adequately protect our great and growing bituminous-coal and coking industries and the many thousands of hard-working miners and their families, who are dependent upon these industries for their livelihood and daily bread, yet I have proposed to lower the duties provided by existing law to the figures named in the amendment which I have offered.

The great bituminous-coal and lignite producing States of this Union are Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, Alabama, Virginia, Colorado, Wyoming, Washington, and Montana.

The Nation's annual production of bituminous coal and lignite is about 406,000,000 tons, the value of which, in round numbers, is $450,000,000, and in which production 555,000 men are engaged. A higher wage scale and a higher production cost prevail in this country than in any other country in the world. In British Columbia and Vancouver wages are from 30 to 50 per cent lower than in this country; in Nova Scotia wages are from 20 to 25 per cent lower than here; and the average wages paid to coal miners in this country are more than double those paid in England, while the hours of labor are much shorter.

I for one am unwilling to and will never vote to reduce the wages, to lower the standard of living, or increase the hours of labor of our American miners to those or that, as the case may be, of foreign countries. While the wages of coal miners in this country and in the State of West Virginia, which I have the honor to humbly represent, exceed those of any other section of the universe, I earnestly desire our bituminous coal and coking industries to be made and kept so prosperous that coal miners will be, as they should be, the best paid laborers for the least number of hours work of any of our industries. And why not? The coal miner is certainly a laborer worthy of his hire. No employment is more hazardous or fraught with more danger, no work more exacting and uncomfortable, and no occupation more conducive to physical infirmity and loss of health and limb than his. Yet our Democratic friends would place bituminous coal and coke on the free list and place in jeopardy the industries in which he is engaged.

Since I have been here I have heard it asserted that with coal on the free list there would be no danger to our bituminous coal and coking industries from abroad; that with the exception of Canadian coals, no other coals can be brought into competition with our coals. Let me remind you in this connection that during the great anthracite strike when all coals were placed upon the free list, coal was imported from England as well as from Canada, and that the prices of coal in this country fell to such an extent that the bottom virtually dropped out of the domestic market. While this country exports very little bituminous coal other than to Canada, the importation of coal from Canada is increasing, particularly from Nova Scotia, British Columbia, and Alberta. Canada imposes a duty of 45 cents per ton on all bituminous coal and lignite imported from this country, yet the gentlemen on the other side would open, without any reciprocal arrangement, our markets free of duty to Canadian coals. The coals of British Columbia and Alberta directly compete with the coals and lignite of Montana, Washington, and Wyoming, and indirectly compete with those of Utah, Alaska, and North Dakota, while Nova Scotia coals compete with the coals of our eastern coal-producing States, and particularly with the coals of West Virginia.

A reciprocal arrangement with Canada might be of benefit to the coal operators of western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and perhaps northern West Virginia, because a considerable quantity of coal is shipped from the United States into Ontario and that section of Canada between Montreal and Winnipeg.

Canada has no coal tributary to that area and is largely dependent upon coals produced in the United States for the adequate supply of that area. The distance to said section is too great and the cost of transportation too high for successful competition by the coals of Nova Scotia. An investigation will disclose, however, that no coals produced in this country can pay the Canadian duty and successfully compete with the coals of Nova Scotia in the St. Lawrence market.

While my remarks so far have more particularly related to the country at large, I desire to say a few words, before the expiration of my limited time, as to the probable effect of free bituminous coal on the southern part of West Virginia and the district I represent.

The gentlemen on the Democratic side seem to have some unsatisfying grudge against the great State of West Virginia, as would appear from the duties that they have agreed upon in the Underwood bill. To the New England manufacturers they have said: "We have partly compensated you for excessively lowering the duties on your manufactured products in this bill by giving you free raw wool, free coal, free lumber, cheap raw cotton," and so forth, but no compensation do they offer or give to the State of West Virginia and her people. I want to call the attention of the gentlemen on the other side to the fact that nearly everything West Virginia produces has either been placed on the free list or the duties thereon lowered to such a great extent that her industries will be either completely destroyed or seriously crippled. In my humble opinion West Virginia will be more severly hit and injured by the provisions of this bill than any other State in the Union. They propose to put coal, wool, and lumber on the free list and to reduce far below the protective principle duties on iron, steel and tin plate, glass and pottery, cattle, sheep, wheat and other farm products, besides other things which West Virginia and her people largely produce and are vitally interested in.

West Virginia has 826 coal mines and 36 coking plants, employing over 73,000 people, with an annual production value of about $60,000,000, upon which nearly one-third of the people of West Virginia are dependent and directly sustained; she has 62 glass and pottery plants, employing over 11,000 people, with

an annual production value of $11,000,000; she has 104 lumber plants, employing 7,700 people, with an annual production value of exceeding $18,000,000; she has 600,000 cattle and 900,000 sheep, and the value of her stock and farm products exceeds $71,000,000. The Democratic Members of Congress now propose to take away from her, by admitting bituminous coal free of duty, her New England coal market and to give the same unconditionally to Nova Scotia.

While the States of Ohio and Pennsylvania are very rich in bituminous coal, yet West Virginia contains more than both of them, with that of Virginia thrown in for good measure. In southern West Virginia there are three great bituminous coal fields, namely, the New River, the Kanawha, and the Pocahontas fields, producing the highest grade of bituminous and semibituminous coals produced in the United States. West Virginia ranks second in the bituminous coal producing States, and her annual production is about one-sixth of that of the entire Union. The maintenance of West Virginia's coal production is largely dependent upon her retention of the New England market, in which market over one-third of the entire coal production of the Pocahontas and New River fields is consumed. Nova Scotia is now contending vigorously for that market. Her mines are in their youthful period, and although her coals are not as excellent as West Virginia coals, the latter's coals can not successfully compete in New England against Nova Scotian and other foreign coals coming into this country free of duty. In addition to the water haul on her coals to New England markets, West Virginia has to pay an overland haul of about one-third of 1 cent per ton per mile, while Nova Scotia has very little overland haul to pay on her coals.

From the best figures obtainable it costs Nova Scotia only about 55 cents per ton to transport her coals to Boston, while it costs West Virginia about $2.10 per ton to transport her coals to the same market. While in heating units the New River and Pocahontas coals of West Virginia have an advantage of about 17 per cent over the coals of Nova Scotia, yet this advantage will be quickly overcome by Nova Scotian coals in lower selling prices if Nova Scotia is not required to pay any import duty thereon. Canada evidently does not think that there is any great disparity in the value of the coals of West Virginia and Nova Scotia, because she burns the coals of Nova Scotia in preference when she can get them as cheaply as she can the coals of West Virginia.

I would like to see West Virginia lessen the hours and increase the wages of her miners. If West Virginia is to be deprived of the New England market for her coals, I am very much afraid that such deprivation will result in a reduction in wages of the miners of West Virginia, as well as in the number of days work.

When all of the foregoing matters are taken into consideration it seems to me, although I can not hope for or expect it from the gentlemen on the other side, that this amendment should receive serious consideration and should be adopted. I again remind Members of the House that the duty on bituminous coal provided in this amendment is less than the duty imposed upon bituminous coal by Canada, and that to put bituminous coal, coal slack or culm and the products thereof, and coke on the free list means the annual loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars in revenue, besides leaving the great bituminous coal and lignite industries, and the many thousands engaged therein, without any protection whatever.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVIS. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How does the duty in the proposed amendment compare with the present rate?

Mr. AVIS. It is 5 cents a ton less.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, so far as 99 per cent of the people of the United States are concerned, so far as nearly that much of our territory is concerned, it makes little difference whatever whether bituminous coal has a duty upon it or is free, for there are but very few regions in our country to which bituminous coal can under present conditions be profitably shipped from abroad. By placing coal on the free list we lose near half a million of revenue and we do not make coal cheaper for any man under the flag. Our good friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] suggested the other day that it was a self-denial upon his part, coming from a great coal region, to stand for free coal. He knows, of course, as we all know, that it does not make a particle of difference so far as Alabama is concerned whether coal is on the free list or carries a duty. No foreign bituminous coal can reach Alabama or her markets. Of our total importations of bituminous coal last year—1,761,000 tons—724,000 tons, or nearly half, came into Montana, Idaho, and Washington. It so happens that the State of Wyoming ships nearly a third of its coal production northward, and nearly that amount of the coal output of our State will be lost to American miners and mine owners by the placing of coal on the free list, and not a single, solitary small American consumer will, in my opinion, receive coal a particle cheaper after we have lost the revenue and our miners have lost their employment and our mines their markets. We had an illustration of that one year when we provided for a rebate of the duty.

At that time there was one mine in our State that had a contract of 750 tons per day with a great smelter. Immediately after that contract expired the Canadian coal mines secured that contract by reducing the price, not 65 cents, the tariff rate, but 10 cents a ton. The Canadian gains our market not by reducing his price the amount of the duty, but by a few cents a ton. So far as the ordinary consumer was concerned in that territory, he did not get coal any cheaper.

I realize that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle will on the stump make much of the fact that they placed coal on the free list. They have given the poor man free coal, they will claim, and yet there is not a man over there who knows anything about it—and I see my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] smiles—who does not know that there will not be a citizen under the flag, unless it be some great mining or manufacturing corporation, that will get a pound of coal a penny cheaper by placing coal on the free list. But you will close the mines or change the direction of at least a third of the tonnage of my State, you will crowd that coal southward in competition with coals mined elsewhere. We are entitled to this market, and we are certainly entitled to it when that coal is sold under the active conditions of competition that now exists; our miners are entitled to the employment; our mines greatly need that market.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, everybody who knows anything about the matter knows that the miner of bituminous coal who makes 5 cents a ton makes a lot of money, and most of the miners of bituminous coal make nothing whatever on the coal they mine. To put coal on the free list and destroy this enterprise in the State of West Virginia adds but one more to the difficulties under which the American people will be obliged to labor when this bill becomes a law. If the bill does become a law, it will add four or five hundred million to the imports of this country, to come into competition with the labor of the factories of America. If we add anything like this amount to what is already imported from European nations, where the labor cost is anywhere from 25 to 50 per cent of what it is here, we are bound to displace that much American labor——

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will not yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I would like to ask the gentleman something about the condition in West Virginia, where they have set aside the civil law there——

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say to the gentleman, my colleague, I know that there is no labor in America that is not protected which is as well paid as the labor employed in the construction of buildings throughout the United States——

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MADDEN (continuing). And if we place the factories and the great industries of the United States——

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN (continuing). At the mercy of the European nations, where the people are upon a starvation basis, in competition with the labor of this country we are bound to destroy the opportunity which otherwise would be afforded in this country for them to live as human beings should live.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I made the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois is out of order and has been continuously for 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I see no reason why the people who are employed in this country should be embarrassed by having dumped on the American market the products of European labor. Everyone who gives any consideration to this question must agree that when you bring a dollar's worth of finished products from abroad and place it in competition with the finished products of American labor you are going to reduce the opportunity of the labor of this country by that amount. If 1,000 men could make all the shoes used by American people,

and the factory in which those men are engaged was transferred to England or Germany or France, why, as a matter of course, the factory in the United States would have to be closed, and thereby the opportunity for employment of American citizens to make goods for American consumption would be destroyed; and I can not undertsand why the Democrats insist upon placing the people of this country in competition with the people abroad. I have always been educated to believe that the first consideration with American legislators was for the good of the people of the country for whom they were legislating.

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

Mr. MADDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. AVIS. I want to ask the gentleman if he was aware of the fact that the present strike in West Virginia was not on the ground of wages; that West Virginia pays the highest wages of any State in the Union and pays 25 per cent increase in wages over that of Nova Scotia, and that on an 8-hour day whereas in Nova Scotia they have a 10-hour day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Then what do they strike for?

Mr. MADDEN. When they have a strike under Republican rule they go on strike because they want more wages, and they want more wages because there is more opportunity for employment; but when they go on strike under Democratic rule they go on strike for a job, and they do not care anything about wages. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I, for one, wish to protest against the passage of this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. AVIS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

349. Cork bark, cut into squares, cubes, or quarters, 4 cents per pound; manufactured cork stoppers, over three-fourths of an inch in diameter, measured at the larger end, and manufactured cork disks, wafers, or washers, over three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness, 12 cents per pound; manufactured cork stoppers, three-fourths of an inch or less in diameter, measured at the larger end, and manufactured cork disks, wafers, or washers, three-sixteenths of an inch or less in thickness, 15 cents per pound; cork, artificial, or cork substitutes manufactured from cork waste, or granulated corks, and not otherwise provided for in this section, 3 cents per pound; cork insulation, wholly or in chief value of granulated cork, in slabs, boards, planks, or molded forms, ½ cent per pound; cork paper, 35 per cent ad valorem; manufactures wholly or in chief value of cork or of cork bark, or of artificial cork or bark substitutes, granulated or ground cork, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will say, Mr. Chairman, when my colleague and good friend from Chicago gets himself exercised over giving protection to the coal operatives in the State of West Virginia, where, due to the unfairness to the employees there exists a condition which should bring the blush of shame to the face of people of public spirit, that it does seem to me indeed that he needs to be educated.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have not the time just now.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. AVIS] says they pay the coal miners there better than anywhere else in the country, but I deny that. I know something about what coal miners receive for mining coal, and I know they do not only refuse to pay them as other miners are paid in other parts of the country, but they have a condition now, as I am informed, that is a condition of peonage, and probably it will be investigated in the near future and the facts brought out in regard to it.

It is quite a spectacle, indeed, to see our friends on that side of the House getting up for the purpose of protecting corporations that are trying to take the legal, constitutional, and natural rights from their employees and then rob them by selling them their supplies at an abnormally high price. The coal miners of West Virginia are a good deal like the negro's coon trap: It catches them both ways—in the first place, by giving them low wages, and, in the second, making them buy everything they need from them, thereby taking away all the little pittance they do get.

Now, the argument that is given on that side in regard to the protection on coal is that it does not affect the price; it does not make any difference to the consumers of this country, because the tariff does not keep up the price. At the same time, if you take the tariff off the low-priced Canadian coal and that of other places, it is going to put the American coal operators out of the business. That is about as consistent as any argument that is given for a protective traiff. This is, indeed, as I said before, a spectacle showing how much those who are defending the protective-tariff system care for the American workingman. All they care for him is to get out of him what they can for the least possible amount in return for his work. This has been true everywhere. The people that are clamoring the loudest for this high-protective tariff are the ones who are using their influence everywhere and all the time to keep down the price of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. AVIS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman allow me a moment? I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 5 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Will not the gentleman make it 10 minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman desires to speak; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] does not know anything more about the provisions of this tariff bill than he does of the wages and strike conditions in West Virginia, he is not competent to vote on the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] I want to call his attention to the fact, when he speaks of the gentlemen on this side of the House, if he will go back into the history of legislation on this subject, that he will find that ex-Senator Henry G. Davis, who was at one time the vice-presidential nominee of his party, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee when the Wilson-Gorman bill was under consideration and stated that the placing of bituminous coal on the free list would ruin the coal-mining industry in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVIS. I will not yield now, sir. You would not show me that courtesy, and I can not show it to you. [Applause on the Republican side.]

He, the gentleman from Illinois, speaks of the coal operators. I am not here at this time to discuss strikes between coal operators and miners. I am here to discuss a business proposition, and, in stating that business proposition and in discussing it, I want to emphasize the fact that nearly every miner in the State of West Virginia, or, at least, in my section of the State of West Virginia—and I live in the strike zone—whether he be a Democrat, Socialist, or Republican, favors a protective duty on bituminous coal. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, the members of his own party in the mining sections of West Virginia would hardly listen to him if he argued for free bituminous coal. Not only that, I want to emphasize a statement enunciated a moment ago that this strike trouble in West Virginia was not solely over wages. It was largely over two questions. It is true that among the miners doing work other than digging coal there was a strike over the hours of labor. They wanted the reduction of an hour, but the main trouble in that strike was for recognition of the union and for what was known as a check weighman. All the other elements that entered into the strike were practically agreed upon, and it would have been settled a year ago but for the two principal questions. But, I say, with that I have no concern at this time. I think that some mistakes were made on both sides. But I do want to say to you that the people who live in the Pocahontas field and the people who live in the New River field want a protective duty on coal.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER]?

Mr. AVIS. Wait until I finish my sentence, and I will be very glad to answer. I started to say that the operators of the Pocahontas and New River fields ship a large percentage of our coal production—at least 12,000,000 tons each year—into New England.

I understand and am informed that the nearest thing to a coal trust in this Union is the Boston Gas Co., which, I understand, controls the output of the Nova Scotia mines, and by placing coal on the free list you are legislating in favor of 10 hours' labor and lower wages, and in favor of the only coal trust in the United States, if there be one. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. RUCKER. A few moments ago the gentleman was speaking of a strike in West Virginia.

Mr. AVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUCKER. I understood the gentleman to say that the cause of the strike was the failure of the operators to recognize the union.

Mr. AVIS. Yes; that was one cause, but that was not the only cause. Another cause was the question of having a check weighman.

Mr. RUCKER. Was not the other cause the fact that the company refused to pay the men oftener than once in 30 days, and the men demanded that they should be paid every 15 days?

Mr. AVIS. I said that.

Mr. RUCKER. And another cause was that the corporation required the men to spend their money at the company's store, and on their side they asked the right to buy wherever they pleased.

Mr. AVIS. No. I am informed that they already had the right to buy where they pleased.

Mr. RUCKER. Is not that one of the things that the Republican governor exacted of the operators in the settlement of the controversy?

Mr. AVIS. The Republican governor of West Virginia suggested that they already had that right in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. RUCKER. I understood further that some distinguished Democrat appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and said that the cost of labor in the West Virginia coal fields was about 80 per cent of the cost of mining coal?

Mr. AVIS. Yes, sir. Senator Davis said it was 95 per cent.

Mr. RUCKER. What is the rate that the miner gets in the New River country, on the Norfolk & Western and on the Chesapeake & Ohio road?

Mr. AVIS. The report for this year is not in yet, but it is shown that the average wages paid to the coal miners in West Virginia is about 44¼ cents per ton and about $575 per annum.

Mr. RUCKER. It is about 75 or 80 cents a ton, is it not?

Mr. AVIS. Total labor cost exceeds that.

Mr. RUCKER. Do they not sell it for $1.50?

Mr. AVIS. No, sir. In the last few years it has sold below $1 per ton, and the average last year was 98 cents per gross ton of run-of-mine coal.

Mr. LANGLEY. The labor cost is 95 per cent, according to the statement of ex-Senator Davis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] appears again in the rôle of the professional friend of labor. I want him to hear me.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I hear you.

Mr. LANGLEY. Come a little closer. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. But the unfortunate thing for American labor is that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] appears in this case as the friend of Canadian labor and not of American labor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I believe the gentleman is a labor-union man. The mines in my State which will suffer from free coal are unionized; and, without desiring to contradict my good friend from West Virginia [Mr. AVIS], the wages of miners in Wyoming are considerably higher, if I am correctly informed, than anywhere in the eastern fields, and higher, I believe, than wages paid to coal miners anywhere except, perhaps, in our neighboring State of Montana. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We have miners—scores of them; and I have the good fortune of a personal acquaintance with many of the miners of my State—who never go into a mine without making from $3.50 to $5 a day before they leave the mine, and ordinarily they work no more than seven hours. And these are the miners whose opportunity for work is to be reduced by the placing of coal on the free list.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] has given so little attention to this question that he does not understand that when a mine operator in Canada has an opportunity, without loss, to make a reduction of the entire amount of a 45-cent duty, he need not cut his price 45 cents—it is not necessary for him to cut it more than 10 or 12 cents a ton in order to drive the American out of the market—and when he has reduced his price by that amount and driven our mines from the market, he can raise his price again to the old figure, and our people can not get in, because there is the potentiality of the opportunity to control and still have a profit.

When we reduced the duty on coal from 65 cents to 45 cents under the Payne bill, the Canadians drove us back just about 100 miles. We lost all of our markets along the line of the Great Northern Railway. That great railway has been getting cheaper coal, perhaps, transported over its own railroads, but if there is anyone else on earth except this great railway in that northwestern country who will be benefited by reducing the rate on coal, I do not know who it can possibly be.

Free coal means that one-third of the product of our State will lose its market, and one-third of the miners—union miners, working reasonable hours, content with their employment, who have had no recent serious disagreement with the operators—must either lose their employment or wages be threatened.

We have troubles enough in our country through this bill without losing our coal markets; wool on the free list; sugar going to the free list; and now a third of the market for our coal mines taken from us by this Democratic Congress. Yet, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], who calls himself a friend of union labor, is going to vote for this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

As matters now stand the competition among our northern mines is so intense, the summer trade so small that even though our miners receive good wages while working, the working days are often so few, the idle days so frequent, that their yearly income is much too small to comfortably support a family. We need more rather than fewer markets, for it is of the utmost importance that our miners have steadier employment as a good or fair wage per ton or day helps little if work is slack. I call on my friend from Illinois, who, I think, is a friend of labor, to help preserve the American market for coal mined by union American labor.

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:

350. Dice, dominoes, draughts, chessmen, chess balls, and billiard, pool, bagatelle balls, and poker chips, of ivory, bone, or other materials, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Where is the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

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

During political campaigns we are not greatly surprised to hear much political buncombe which the speaker himself does not expect the audience to accept very seriously; but when I came to the Congress of the United States, the place where we are supposed to find the greatest debaters, the most earnest men, I expected to find something a little different. But lo, and behold, we find here raised to the *n*th power all of the political balderdash that we hear from one end of the country to the other every two years. We hear the self-appointed agents and guardians of the downtrodden, as they would have us believe, pleading piteously for the American workingman. Who gave them their commission? I would like to see the captions of those letters to which they so continually refer. I know that those which I have received—not very many—are not from those labor organizations to which they have been so fond of alluding.

Let us consider briefly the fundamentals of the minority's tariff position. It is and always has been simply a proposition to levy a tax on the American people, the whole people; a scheme to require them to pay bounties to a few people for their enrichment and then to insist that it is for the benefit of all. They tell us it is for the benefit of the American workingman. How solicitous indeed our Republican friends have become about the American workingman since they have gone out of office. [Applause on the Democratic side]. Just think how ridiculous is the proposition that because there are poured into the hands of a few men, into the hands of a privileged class, great fortunes which are wrung from all of the people by means of a taxation which they euphoniously call protection; that by virtue of the fact that you have put these benefits into their hands they suddenly become philanthropic, and are going to hand over the money so acquired to their workmen. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] My friends, labor will receive, as wages, just so much as its employer is compelled to pay in order to procure that labor and no more, whether or not the tariff be high or low. That is only human nature.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. No; I do not care to yield. I have not taken any of the time of the committee up to this moment.

Why, gentlemen, I claim that instead of the tariff being an advantage to the American workingman it is a positive disadvantage even as to his wages. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Because it does nothing more nor less than give to the tariff beneficiaries of the United States an opportunity to combine among themselves, and then say: "We have it all to ourselves anyhow. We will therefore demand just such a price as we see fit for our products and we will pay just as much as we see fit to the men whom we employ." Is not that the common sense of the proposition? Would you or I or anyone else pay more than we were compelled to pay for labor? Not very likely. Oh, the high priest of protection from Michigan informed us yesterday, by having the Clerk read the clever little

letter from his farmer friend, how this friend of his is getting $1 apiece for his chickens, 50 cents a dozen for his eggs, 50 cents a pound for butter, and all that sort of thing. But has the gentleman stopped to think about the man who is buying these things? There are two sides to his proposition——

Mr. FORDNEY. He told you in the letter what the men were getting.

Mr. CROSSER. I can not yield to the gentleman, for I have but little time.

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not ask the gentleman to yield, and I would not if I was in his place.

Mr. CROSSER. There are but two sides to that proposition—the buyers' and the sellers'. But, Mr. Chairman, while I am bitterly opposed to all kinds of tariff privileges, I do not advocate the immediate removal of all tariff duties any more than I would advocate the immediate taking away of all opium or morphine from the slaves to these drugs. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] We must give industry an opportunity to settle its nerves, which have been shattered by the drug of tariff privilege.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that the tariff question has very little to do at the present with the matter of wages. The gentleman from Michigan himself proved that conclusively the other day. He told us that he had employed labor in the wilds of the State of Washington at $3.50 per day, and that he had employed in Mississippi labor of the same character for $1.75 per day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And yet, my friends, both of these States are favored with the same beneficent tariff laws.

I have no doubt that the statement of the gentleman is absolutely correct, and it is quite likely that all labor in the newer countries of the West is better paid. Then it is also true that the colored man of the South is not so easily organized. But tell us why the wages in free-trade Britain are almost double the wages paid for the same class of labor in high-tariff Germany. Tell us why it is that the industries which enjoy the highest tariff privilege in the United States pay the lowest wages. The woolen industry, for example, enjoys the benefits of the highest tariff, and yet the employees of the woolen manufacturers at Lynn, Mass., received but a miserable pittance for their long hours of toil. So it is with the employees of the cotton industry and those employed in some of the metal trades. The fact is it is the veriest nonsense to suppose that because we give certain concerns the right to levy a tax upon the whole people for the purpose of increasing their profit these concerns will forthwith transfer this profit to their employees. How many of the gentlemen on the other side of the House would support a proposition to permit the present beneficiaries of the tariff to levy a direct tax upon the people for the purpose of collecting a sum equal to that derived from the present tariff law? Why, not a single man of you would vote for such a bill, although it would be much fairer than permitting these men to mulct the public by means of an indirect tax. Why do men cling so fondly to the plan of granting bounties to the few through this indirect taxation? Simply because, as the old woman said, "It is the best way to get the most feathers with the least squawking." And yet we hear men again and again blandly asserting that the purpose of the tariff is to raise wages, although they make no pretense at showing any casual connection between the tariff and wages. As their authorities to support different tariff rates they read us letters, petitions, and briefs from this interest and that. I am frank to say that I believe capital in the true sense of the word has suffered along with labor. The real dog in the manger that robs both capital and labor is the monopolist of the natural resources. Break the stranglehold of private monopoly of the natural resources and then both labor and capital will thrive and become healthy again; but until we do break the hold of such monopoly, all your high tariff will serve but to increase the tribute it may exact from capital and labor; and if such private monopoly of natural resources is permitted to exist you may establish absolute free trade without improving greatly the condition of our people.

It is undoubtedly true, however, that by reducing the tariff low enough to make competition possible we shall to that extent weaken the hold of monopoly and thus compel it to give up part of its booty. The country therefore has great cause to rejoice over the prospective passage of the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is a wise man who knows himself, and it is a very wise man who is able to judge of his own speeches. I congratulate the last speaker that in his opening remarks he so aptly characterized the speech he was about to deliver. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CROSSER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. That courtesy is like the one he showed me the other day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. I do not know what courtesy I showed the gentleman the other day, for frankly I have not become acquainted with the gentleman until now.

The Clerk read as follows:

356. Matches, friction or lucifer, of all descriptions, per gross of 144 boxes, containing not more than 100 matches per box, 3 cents per gross; when imported otherwise than in boxes containing not more than 100 matches each, one-fourth of 1 cent per 1,000 matches; wax matches, fuses, wind matches, and all matches in books or folders or having a stained, dyed, or colored stick or stem, and tapers consisting of a wick coated with an inflammable substance, 25 per cent ad valorem.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 88, line 13, after the word "substance," insert the words "and night lights."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

357. Percussion caps, cartridges, and cartridge shells empty, 15 per cent ad valorem; blasting caps, 75 cents per thousand; mining, blasting, or safety fuses of all kinds, 15 per cent ad valorem.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 88, line 15, after the word "caps," strike out the figures "75" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "2.25."

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to substitute the present tariff on blasting caps for that contained in the bill. I have introduced this amendment at the request of a number of gentlemen who are interested in a blasting-cap factory at Stege Station, in the city of Richmond, in my district, who inform me that if this tariff is reduced from $2.25 to 75 cents a thousand the blasting-cap industry in this country will cease; that they will close up their factory. Nearly all the blasting caps imported into the United States come from Germany, and the German article is one that can not be depended upon. Blasting caps are used for the purpose of setting off blasts of dynamite and powder.

The United States Bureau of Mines and the mining bureaus of the mining States in a number of their pamphlets and bulletins have called the attention of the mine operators to the fact that a great many of the accidents in the mines have been caused by defective blasting caps, and to be careful to use none but the best, and those manufactured in the United States are the best. There are but three blasting-cap factories in the United States—one in California, one in Pennsylvania, and one in New Jersey.

Now, in the event of war, it would be a serious matter if we had to depend on foreign importations for Army and Navy use, as blasting caps are contraband of war. I do not expect that the Committee of the Whole will accept this amendment, but I am presenting it to bring it to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee in the hope that when the bill reaches the Senate it may be given a reasonable and proper rate that will permit this industry to be continued. During reecnt years the price of the American article has decreased and the quality has been improved until we manufacture the best blasting caps made in the world, while the imported foreign article continues to be unreliable and unsatisfactory.

Under the Wilson bill the tariff rate was $2.07 per thousand, with an ad valorem equivalent of 85.24 per cent. Under the present law the tariff is $2.25 per thousand, with an ad valorem equivalent of 46.55 per cent. Manufacturing these caps is a dangerous occupation, and the wages paid operatives in this country is from $2.50 to $10 a day, according to the skill required and the danger encountered in the different departments of the factory in which the operative is employed. In Germany the highest wages paid is less than $2 a day.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment of my colleague I desire to call attention to a recent report of Consul General Robert P. Skinner, at Hamburg, published in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports, dealing with the blasting-cap industry in Germany. This report calls attention to the wages paid in Germany in the blasting-cap factories, which I wish to contrast with the wages paid in these factories in the United States. It shows that in the German factories the wages paid for men are 15.5 cents per hour, for women but 6.7 cents per hour, and for the children but 5.2 cents per hour. For an eight-hour day that would be $1.24 for the men and 53.6 cents for the women. In the blasting-cap factory in the district of the gentleman who has just spoken, the wages range from $2.50 to $10 a day. There is not a man

or woman employed there who does not receive a minimum wage of $2.50 or a maximum of $10, as against a little over $1.24 and 53.6 cents. This is another illustration of the necessity for obtaining information from some reliable body so that when a tariff bill is before the House we will have information that is reliable and upon which we can base schedules that will protect the industries of this country. This is another instance of where the committe strikes at a California industry. I will insert an extract from the report of Consul General Skinner:

German manufacturers of blasting caps employ women for drawing the detonator tubes and for charging and packing the finished product. They are also employed in the manufacture of electric fuses and fuses for war purposes.

Probably one-half of the employees in German factories of this class are adult men, one-third women, and one-sixth minors. It is impossible to obtain absolutely correct figures relating to this special industry as a whole. In regard to one very important concern manufacturing blasting caps, the following entirely dependable figures have been obtained: Number of men employed, 96; women, 59; boys, 15; girls, 7; total, 177. The men are paid at the rate of 65 pfennigs (15.5 cents) per hour, the women 28 pfennigs (6.7 cents) and the boys and girls 22 pfennigs (5.2 cents).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, just a word or two in relation to this blasting-cap proposition. In the interest of labor again we hear the distinguished Representatives from the State of California asking for a return to the Payne rates, and the gentleman who has just taken his seat has compared the cost of labor in the production of these articles in this country and abroad, and he would return to the duty of $2.25 a thousand in order to protect that difference in labor cost. Yet he must know that upon the value of this article in 1911 the rate of $2.25 would be over 95 per cent ad valorem of the import value of the article. He certainly has qualified as a friend of labor when he would protect the difference in cost of production to within 5 per cent of the entire cost of our production, material, labor, and everything else. It seems to me to be a sufficient answer to all these arguments to say that as to this line of goods our exports, including kindred articles like cartridges, mining, blasting, and safety fuses, and percussion caps amount to $2,294,000 per annum, while our imports amount to $173,000. There can not be this startling difference in the cost of production, which is going to drive the American producer out of existence, if he can take abroad two millions and a quarter of his goods and compete with the foreigner in his market, while the foreigner brings here less than $175,000 worth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know where the gentleman from Pennsylvania got his figures, but I notice from the report which he submitted to the House on this bill that he gave the import value of blasting caps at $4.83 a thousand, and I am quite sure of my arithmetic when I say that $2.75 is not 90 per cent of $4.83.

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

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. I said on the price which prevailed in 1911. The price has since risen.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is begging the question. That was not correct, as to the price in 1911.

Mr. PALMER. Well, I am stating the fact. The gentleman is speaking of another year.

Mr. MANN. On this subject I ask to have read in my time a letter from the president of the Aetna Powder Co., which does not manufacture blasting caps.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHICAGO, *February 18, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Relative to the duty on blasting caps, paragraph 437 of the tariff act 1909:

We consider the maintenance of the present tariff on blasting caps a matter of great importance to the welfare of our industry in this country. We manufacture and sell dynamite. We believe that when our product leaves our mill it carries with it that degree of perfection which the exercise of the highest degree of skill and the application of sound scientific principles can give it. But when it passes into the hands of the consumer its ability to do the work expected of it is dependent in some measure upon other elements, chief of which is the blasting cap. The best dynamite ever made will fail if used in conjunction with a poor cap. Either the charge will not be set off at once, thereby enormously increasing the hazard to the user who is apt to believe that it will not go off at all, or the combustion will be incomplete or retarded, thereby failing to develop all of the disruptive force of the dynamite. In either event the average consumer condemns the dynamite and the manufacturer thereof must contend with a criticism which is unjust and undeserved.

We do not manufacture caps; the margin of profit is so small and the risk so great that we prefer to buy. We buy caps from domestic manufacturers and urge our customers to buy the caps from us, thus assuring ourselves, as far as we are able, that our dynamite will develop the highest efficiency.

Domestic manufacturers have given us an efficient cap at a reasonable price. In fact, the cost of the cap to the consumer, especially in view of the importance attached to the work it is required to do, is insignificant. The dynamite costs the consumer from $12 to $15 a hundred pounds, while 100 caps will cost him only 75 cents.

Foreign blasting caps in this country are of a quality decidedly inferior to the domestic. We speak from experience. We have handled the foreign cap, have given it an extensive and a thorough test, and know, to our cost and injury, that it is wholly unfit to develop the efficiency of the high-grade explosives now produced in this country.

It is proposed now to reduce the tariff on blasting caps. Domestic manufacturers tell us, and we believe that we know enough about the manufacture of explosives to vouch for the accuracy of the statement, that if the tariff is reduced they will be forced either to retire and to leave the field to the weak and cheap foreign cap or to lower the standard of their goods to the level of the inefficiency that now comes from abroad. Either event would surely work serious harm to both the maker and the user of dynamite.

We feel the strongest interest in the maintenance of the present high efficiency of the domestic blasting cap. Necessarily, therefore, we are much concerned in the proposition now being advanced that the tariff on blasting caps be reduced. We believe that such action on the part of Congress would have a most damaging effect. We are therefore taking the liberty of addressing this communication to you for the purpose of acquainting you with our views on the subject.

Yours, very truly,

THE AETNA POWDER COMPANY.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

358. Feathers and downs, crude or not dressed, colored, or otherwise advanced or manufactured in any manner, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; when dressed, colored, or otherwise advanced or manufactured in any manner, including quilts of down and other manufactures of down, 40 per cent ad valorem; artificial or ornamental feathers, fruits, grains, leaves, flowers, and stems or parts thereof, of whatever material composed, not specially provided for in this section, 60 per cent ad valorem; boas, boutonnieres, wreaths, and all articles not specially provided for in this section, composed wholly or in chief value of any of the feathers, flowers, leaves, or other materials or articles herein mentioned, 60 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That the importation of aigrettes, egret plumes or so-called osprey plumes, and the feathers, quills, heads, wings, tails, skins or parts of skins, of wild birds, either raw or manufactured, and not for scientific or educational purposes, is hereby prohibited; but this provision shall not apply to the feathers or plumes of ostriches, or to the feathers or plumes of domestic fowls of any kind.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 88, line 18, after the word "downs," insert the words "on the skin or otherwise."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he would consider an amendment striking out the proviso.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I can not help considering it if he offers it. I do not think it is probable it will go through.

Mr. MOORE. It is not probable such an amendment would pass. Mr. Chairman, of course this is a matter in which I must submit to the chairman of the majority, but I am very much surprised at this method of reducing the cost of living. There is a certain element of selfishness about this entire paragraph. In the first place, it is proposed that notwithstanding birds of high plumage may be killed in foreign countries and that the meat of the bird shall be admitted into this country, the feathers of the bird, which the ladies of America would like to have for ornamental and millinery purposes, must be excluded. To be sure, there are some societies of ladies and gentlemen endeavoring to preserve the song birds of this country, and who are also extending their influence to foreign countries in order that no one shall kill birds beyond our borders, but the fact still remains that the birds are killed and that we admit, in one of the foregoing paragraphs of this bill, the meat of the bird after it is killed, while we deny the right of admission to the plumage of the bird, which adds so much to the adornment of the ladies of this fair country of ours. Now, it appears——

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

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does not my friend from Pennsylvania think that the ladies are now ornamental enough without requiring this additional degree of ornamentation? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Yes; there is no doubt about that. Added to the attractive personality of the gentleman from Illinois he is a good judge of beauty and does not hesitate to express himself freely on that subject. But the truth of the matter is that

the elimination of these feathers may be in the interest of the Ribbon Trust of the United States [laughter], and at the same time aid in the depopulation of the feathered flock both of the barnyard and the pigeon cote. But what I object to particularly is that the gentlemen who are now in control of this House and the country, many of them pushing women's suffrage with the loudest possible acclaim, propose by this bill to reduce their personal expenses in the purchase of these high-priced feathers for the ladies whom they so much admire. [Applause.] Not only do they do that with respect to feathers—and in this particular I am surprised at my handsome and well-groomed friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who conducted the steel schedule through the House the other day and then admitted himself to be an expert on arborculture—but they also intend to reduce the cost of living for themselves personally by reducing the rate upon the trimmed hats that come into this county. It is economy at the expense of the fair ladies of the land. [Applause.] You are putting out of business three or four concerns that are dependent upon the manufacture and the sale of this sort of plumage, but as the responsibility is all yours I suppose we will have to submit.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

359. Furs and fur skins of all kinds not dressed in any manner, except undressed skins of hares, rabbits, dogs, goats, sheep, and not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem; furs dressed on the skin, not advanced further than dyeing, 30 per cent ad valorem; manufactures of furs, further advanced than dressing and dyeing, when prepared for use as material, joined or sewed together, including plates, linings, and crosses, and articles manufactured from fur not specially provided for in this section, 40 per cent ad valorem; articles of wearing apparel of every description partly or wholly manufactured, composed of or of which fur is the component material of chief value, 50 per cent ad valorem. Furs not on the skin, prepared for batters' use, including fur skins carroted, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word simply for the purpose of saying that my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Philadelphia——

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman correct that?

Mr. PALMER. Has, per his usual, spoken upon all sides of the question which was involved in the feather schedule; and, inasmuch as he is, as usual, the author of all the newspaper reports of his speeches which reach the Philadelphia press, I want him now to interpret his remarks. I want him to stop and not sidestep and go upon record and say whether he stands with the good women of Philadelphia who would save bird life by restricting the importation of bird plumage of this kind, or whether he stands on the side of those who would kill birds in order to ornament themselves. I want him to say whether he is in favor of this proviso or whether he is against it.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will take back what he said about the speeches I will answer him.

Mr. PALMER. I am so anxious to get the answer that I will take back anything.

Mr. MOORE. I admit that I am the author of the speeches I make. [Laughter.] I also contend that the gentleman has no right to be envious if my speeches are reported and his are not. Merit in this matter will count as in all other things [laughter], and if the speeches of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] are not sufficiently interesting to be reported, that is his misfortune and not my fault. I will continue to have published as widely as possible everything I am able to say about the inconsistency of the Democratic program, all it is possible for me to construct and make public. And so far as the gentleman's question is concerned, I will say to him that when I have an opportunity to meet the fair ladies of Philadelphia I will tell them in confidence what I think upon this subject, and I will not unbosom myself to the gentleman at this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEENERSON, Mr. MANAHAN, and Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota rose.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent——

Mr. MANN. There is quite a contest on this——

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman better make it 20 minutes. I would like to speak 10 minutes myself.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not agree to that.

Mr. MANN. There are three gentlemen here who wish to speak, and I would like to speak myself.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to reserve 5 minutes to this side. Can we not make it 20 minutes, and I will yield 15 minutes of that time to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not propose to agree to anything unless I have 5 minutes. This is the only thing I have argued, and it seems to me if you parcel it out that way I will have to beg for more time.

Mr. PAYNE. He may lose his amendment if he does not have 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 20 minutes, 15 minutes of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and 5 minutes by himself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 89, line 15, after the word "sheep," insert the following:
"Marmot, wolf, raccoon, red fox, kitt fur, pony, house cat, wildcat, opossum, muskrat, Japanese mink, Chinese weasel, kangaroo, hair seal, wool seal, wombat, vellaby, squirrel, black bear, brown bear, badger, civet cat, beaver, kolinsky, mink, fitch, nutria, skunk, wolverine, otter, cross fox."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, the furs named in this amendment constitute the materials out of which the fur clothing and the fur robes of the people of the Northern States, where it is cold and these things are needed, are made. Now, raw fur, or fur undressed, has been on the free list ever since this Government was founded. For 124 years they have been free of duty. It has always been recognized by the Republicans and Democrats alike that these things are a necessity, and if the gentleman who is chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the other eloquent gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], and the others, would come up into northern Minnesota, where the thermometer goes down as low as 45 or 50 degrees below zero, and then ride 30 or 40 miles in a sleigh, I will guarantee that they also would admit that this kind of fur is a necessity.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I decline to yield to the gentleman.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has stated in the hearings that he has observed the ladies on Fifth Avenue wearing sealskin coats, and therefore he thinks that they are a luxury. [Laughter.] I do not care how fashionable ladies are adorned on Fifth Avenue. They may wear what they please, but coon-skin coats are an absolute necessity in the northern country. [Laughter.] If the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means do not know that fact it is much to be regretted.

Every now and then some majority member of that committee comes in here and says he pleads for "the clothing of the poor." [Laughter.] Another comes in and says he pleads for "the food of the poor man." [Laughter.] You heard it stated and repeated and reiterated over and over again that they are taxing luxuries. I say that a greater injustice was never perpetrated upon humankind than is now attempted to be perpetrated in this paragraph that proposes to tax the fur clothing which is necessary to keep people of the Northern States warm in the winter on the Democratic theory which comes from Alabama that fur is a luxury and has to be taxed. [Laughter and applause.]

You have stripped my people, gentlemen, of every vestige of protection. You have taken away the duties on what my people produce. Everything produced on the farm is opened to the competition of the world. And when you have done that and have deprived the Government of thirty or forty or fifty or a hundred million dollars of revenue, now you pretend, for the sake, as you assert, of a million and a quarter dollars of revenue, to place a tax on the coon-skin coats which my people wear in the wintertime. [Laughter.] The only thing that you have left on the free list, so far as furs are concerned, are a few measly rabbit skins and dogskins. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen, do you think any farmers in the northern part of the country will vote the Democratic ticket when the only thing that they can wear in the winter is dogskins? [Laughter.] Even the beautiful hair that grows upon the back of the Angora goat of Texas bears a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem, because they do not come in under your classification of goatskins. Goatskins, you know, are pretty smooth. [Laughter.] You do not get any hair on them unless it is from these long-haired goats in Texas. [Laughter.]

Now, I will say to my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who spoke about furs the other day, that if he thinks these things are not a necessity I will meet him in any mass meeting in the winter or in the fall in Minnesota, and if 90 per cent of the farmers who come out to that meeting do not wear fur coats I will give him a certificate of election as long as he lives. [Laughter and applause.] You can not hold a meeting or go into any town in the northern part of this country in the wintertime without seeing the farmers wearing these very same furs that are mentioned in that amendment of mine. Fur clothing and fur robes are also necessary to the thousands of rural carriers in the North and street-car drivers and all who are exposed to the weather.

You call these things luxuries. A muskrat cap is a luxury, according to your idea. [Laughter.] At the same time that you have placed a tax on the raw fur and compensatory duties in proportion—a tax on the raw material—you have in this same bill continued curling stones and curling-stone handles free as a necessity. [Laughter and applause.]

These things are all imported from Scotland at the high price of fifteen or twenty dollars for every stone used in fashionable winter sport by the idle rich in New York and other large cities. Instead of being necessities, those are luxuries. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. No, Mr. Chairman; I do not think I used up all my time. I ought to have about one minute left, according to my count. [Laughter.] Just imagine how a man will feel standing in a dogskin coat watching those fashionable people on the ice at a bonspiel playing with curling stones. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am impelled by a feeling of sympathy for the majority to make an observation in their behalf. The onslaught of my Viking colleague [Mr. STEENERSON] so absolutely destroyed every semblance of justification for this schedule that I hardly feel it necessary to say anything to sustain his amendment. I am more inclined to think it would be the charitable and proper thing for me, under these circumstances, to enter into a defense of the majority and its misguided committee. I think we have been unnecessarily severe with them in our discussion to-night. There is needed a defense of this schedule from some one, and the committee is silent.

Now, I am not going to defend the whole bill. I am not a criminal lawyer. [Laughter.] I only wish to defend this committee, who for the first time that I have observed in this discussion have seen fit to protect one of the industries of my State. They put a protective tariff on the gopher skins of the Gopher State, and for this small favor we are thankful and appreciative.

But, Mr. Chairman, now that I am on this line of defense I think this observation ought to be made in this connection: This particular paragraph represents very clearly the general incongruity and inconsistency of the whole measure. It severely taxes the consumers of the North on a stern necessity of life while pretending solicitude for consumers.

There was a debate this afternoon as to who was responsible for this bill, and gentlemen went into ancient history to show who was responsible for other bills in years gone by. To a new Member this is mystifying and unconvincing. It does not make any difference who is responsible for any bill that ever was written. The bill must stand or fall upon its merits as a law. If it is good, it will work out well. If it is bad, it will work out ill. It does not make any difference who the author was or is.

When they consider these obvious contradictions in this law, I know that my colleagues have unnecessarily uncharitable feelings toward the majority in regard to this measure. They see in it so many glaring inconsistencies. They see a high and noble purpose in one paragraph, and evidence of mendacity in another, the good and bad confused and commingled without sense, system, or sanity. I have been mystified for an explanation. What is the cause of it? How did it happen? Who is responsible? God only knows who was responsible for this monstrosity of a law. But, Mr. Chairman, I think I understand the forces in which the Ways and Means Committee drifted, and I feel it my duty to my associates to offer them my theory—my defense of the committee.

This bill is not a result of the belief in the doctrines of Thomas Jefferson, who was a protectionist—my colleagues know that. They know also it did not result from a study of political economy. Every political economist must condemn it. This Underwood bill has no common or mortal parentage; nor does it come from any particular or presidential source, as some say.

I found this little book coming down on the street car to-night, and discovered in it the explanation and inspiration of this law. It is not a campaign book. It is an almanac. The proof is in the bill. It fluctuates like the changing seasons. It blows hot and cold; is as inconstant as the moon, and as uncertain as Venus in the morning.

Evidently this bill was written at different times and suffered in the writing from the different conjunctions of the planets, sometimes one force exercising itself and sometimes another. I do not favor the more prosaic theory of some observers that some days the committee ate too much meat and felt destructive, and so on those days they put in schedules that would destroy industries. They say that on other days probably the moon, at least, was full. [Laugher.] Anyhow, they got it, I surmise, from the almanac. I see the effect of all the signs of the zodiac in this measure. There is Aries, the ram, ramming this bill right through regardless of consequences. I see Taurus, the goat [laughter]—no; not the goat——

Mr. GARDNER. Capricornus is the goat.

Mr. MANN. The Angora goat? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANAHAN. Taurus is the bull, typical of the original Bull Moose and of this bull-neck, stubborn committee that will not yield to any argument; and, as I said, the ram is represented, and the lion. You beheld him yesterday in charge of the ceremonies, with his bushy locks [laughter]—the lion of the zodiac—with much more noise in his voice than intelligence in his argument. [Laughter.]

Then there are the other signs of the zodiac—even the creeping crab is represented, with all its mendacity.

Now I see my time is about to expire. I want to say, gentlemen, that Minnesota needs cheap furs. It is not right to put a tariff on this great necessity. It is not fair to the consumers, and it is not fair to anybody. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SLOAN. Do you not think the majority will need protection on their bare skins when the people get after them? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANAHAN. They undoubtedly will need bear skins on their backs when the lash of public scorn scourges them from the temple of this great Government.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. There is an amendment pending, offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON]. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] desires to offer an amendment. I do not know whether the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] desires to be heard upon the Steenerson amendment or not.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the committee is not able to satisfy the various gentlemen from Minnesota. As I was listening to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN], who addressed us so eloquently the other day, and described what he called the prehistoric Democrat, with long ears, it occurred to me to wonder whether he was speaking of himself, for I understand that he has only been in the Republican Party about two years. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANAHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I can not. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] is a little bit vague in his zoology. His remarks upon the fur-bearing animals bear less weight in this House since he has announced that he considered Taurus as a goat. [Laughter.] As to the other gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], I was moved almost to tears by his plea for the people of Minnesota. He announced that we have stripped them of all protection, and in consequence he wants fur to cover their shivering persons. He says that if I would come out to Minnesota I would have a different opinion about the fur schedule. I visited his State last summer and drove around that magnificent city of St. Paul, and I want to say that his State in summer is a good deal hotter than Florida, whatever it may be in winter.

I drove about the magnificent city and the cab driver pointed out the palaces of the rich on the hill. I asked him "Whose house is that?" He said, "Mr. So-and-so, a fur dealer." "Whose house is that?" "That is Mr. So-and-so, who made a great fortune out of Canadian furs." Another man had a palace built out of money he had made in furs. Why, gentlemen, the Minnesota Members in this discussion defend the great rich fur merchants in the city of St. Paul and Minneapolis.

Mr. STEENERSON. There is no fur dealer in my district.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I can not yield. They are making pathetic appeals in behalf of the farmers of Minnesota, whereas what they are really doing is to represent the great rich men who live in palaces on the hills of the Twin Cities.

I spoke about the furs on Fifth Avenue. Every man in this House who is a member of the Husbands' Protective Union ought to desire not only a 10 per cent duty, but a prohibitive duty, so as to keep them out of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In New York the richest shopkeepers we have are fur dealers, just the same as they are in your State, and the only difference between the two gentlemen from Minnesota and myself is that I believe these fur merchants ought to pay some fair share of the taxes of the Government, and the contention of the two gentlemen from Minnesota is that they ought to be allowed to go without paying any of the burden of taxes.

I do not know why furs have always been on the free list. I suppose that up to recent times the Hudson Bay Fur Co. of Canada occupied a position of influence and power in that country, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway does to-day. I have no doubt they had sufficient influence with our Government in the past to keep furs on the free list.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question, just to set him right? [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. No; the gentleman will pardon me. Just as I believe the Canadian Pacific Railway to-day considers it has enough influence with our Government to make us repeal the Panama Canal act providing free tolls in the Canal Zone for American coastwise ships. I believe the day is past when our tariff laws, or any other laws, ought to be written for the benefit of any other nation or any powerful financial influence in any other government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe the gentlemen from Minnesota, representing as they do the powerful rich men of their State, are also indirectly representing the Hudson Bay Co. of Canada. I am willing to tax them; are not you? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAYDEN). The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEENERSON) there were 56 ayes and 102 noes.

So the amendment was lost.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend paragraph 359 by striking out all of said paragraph down to and including the words "ad valorem," in line 22, page 89, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Furs and fur skins of the Russian sable, marten, ermine, mole, lynx, black fox, silver fox, sea otter, fisher, fur seal, blue fox, white fox, chinchilla, polar bear, and grizzly bear, 10 per cent ad valorem; furs dressed on the skin but not made into articles, 20 per cent ad valorem; furs not on the skin, prepared for hatters' use, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this bill takes off the duty on wool in order to destroy the sheep industry and puts a duty on skunk skins in order to protect the skunk industry in the United States. [Laughter.]

I call the attention of the committee to the following communications:

CHICAGO, *April 15, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have your letter of April 12, together with copy of the new tariff bill, and have noted the recommendations of furs on Schedule N, paragraph 363.

We are inclosing herewith a copy of a letter which we filed with the Committee on Ways and Means on January 27. We respectfully ask you to read the arguments put forth in this letter and then compare same with the new recommendations in Mr. UNDERWOOD'S bill. You will note that the new bill makes an exception of the skins of dogs, goat, and sheep in the undressed class and leaves them to come in free, while the other high-class furs are recommended for 10 per cent duty. The "rugs" and "mats" referred to in our appeal are included in manufactures of furs (see lines 21 to 25) of the new bill, and we conscientiously believe that they should also be made an exception of under this listing and be allowed to come under a duty of not over 20 per cent as they were under the old Dingley tariff, as per suggestion on the attached slip.

These are the roughest and lowest class of furs imported into this country, and the coats and robes made from them are not a luxury but are necessities to our farmers all over the country, they being the only low-priced article of fur which they can get. Under the Payne tariff this class of goods was advanced from 20 per cent to 35 per cent, and the new recommendation would advance them another 5 per cent in the face of all the arguments which we, and we believe other manufacturers, have put forth. This is adding a needless burden to the consumer, and simply increases the cost of these rough furs, bringing them up to a point where they are higher than at any time in the history of our business.

We firmly believe that even the present duty on this class of goods is unjust, and we ask you and your colleagues to lend every effort to have the prepared material of dog, goat, and sheep skins put under a separate heading at a lower rate of duty.

As the bill now reads a furrier can import the finest grade of dyed sealskin at 10 per cent less than we can bring in the "rugs" of a common goat, dog, or sheep skin. We leave this to your own good judgement as to whether or not it is fair to the consumer of the cheap goods which are a necessity as against the article which is a luxury. We also call your attention to the fact that the skin can be imported already dyed, while our material, which is imported entirely in the undyed state, is 10 per cent higher.

If there is anything about this matter which you are not quite clear on, the writer will be more than pleased to give you further information you may need, and we sincerely hope that you will see that justice is done and that this revision is made, so that the farmer, who is the largest consumer, will not have to pay this unjust tax.

We suggest the following addition to the proposed tariff bill, to be inserted in paragraph 359, Schedule N:

"Furs of goat, dog, and sheep not further advanced than dressing, when temporarily joined together for use as material in the form of 'plates,' 'mats,' or 'rugs,' 20 per cent ad valorem."

Thanking you for your attention to the matter and trusting to hear from you, we remain,

Very truly, yours,

A. HOENIGSBERGER,
HARRY L. HOENIGSBERGER,
D. HOENIGSBERGER,
Members of Above Firm.

P. S.—We are writing you at the suggestion of a mutual friend, Mr. Felix A. Norden, of Chicago.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Referring to paragraph No. 439 under Schedule N of the present tariff, we beg to petition your committee in regard to the rough furs, which are commonly known as goat and sheep "rugs" and "mats" and dog "mats," and ask that this class of furs be separated from the general class and be put by themselves with a special rating of their own. We ask this for the reason that they are of an entirely different class of material, being cheaper and rougher than what are commonly known as "fancy furs." However, on account of not having a separate classification, they are included in the second part of paragraph No. 439, under "Manufactures" of furs further advanced than dressing and dyeing and prepared for use as material, including plates, linings, and crosses, 35 per cent ad valorem, thus putting them on an equal basis with goods which are already prepared in the greater part for manufacture. We give you the following arguments in favor of a separate listing and reduction:

First. We have no ax to grind. We neither gain nor lose on account of the higher duty. The only effect which it has is to make the manufactured article cost more to the consumer without giving to any one any added protection whatever, as this class of furs is used only for the manufacture of carriage robes and a cheap grade of men's fur coats, none of which are imported into this country in the manufactured state.

Second. The term "rugs" and "mats" is simply the trade name for certain standard sizes of furs, and has no meaning in any other sense than this. While they are not one separate skin, they are simply pieced out on the sides with a loose stitch and basted to bring them up to the standard of measurement. This stitch is absolutely worthless as far as being of any use in the manufacturing, it being necessary to rip the sewing, cut the "rugs" and "mats" apart, rematch them, and sew them before they are of marketable value, as far as manufacture is concerned. The principal reason for these furs being imported in these sizes is because the importer in this country is better able to ascertain what amount of material he is getting than if he bought these in the regular skin shape, the skins being of variable sizes.

Third. It requires just as much work to manufacture a robe or coat from these "rugs" or "mats" as it would to manufacture from natural-shaped skins.

Fourth. The natural-shaped skins, which are no further advanced than these "rugs" and "mats" can be brought in at 20 per cent, even though they may be dyed abroad. The fancy fur plates, such as squirrel, etc., even though dyed, can be brought in at the same rate of duty (35 per cent) as our "rugs" and "mats," which we import in the undyed state entirely.

What we claim is that China goat and sheep "rugs" and "mats" and dog "mats" loosely basted together to make a standard size, not machine sewed, should be under a separate heading, so worded, at 20 per cent duty.

In making this appeal to your committee we beg to impress upon you the fact that this will reduce this class of skins to the old rate of duty at which they were always entered under the old Dingley tariff; that the advance of 15 per cent made in the last revision of the tariff simply increased the cost of the manufactured article to the consumer, giving no protection to any manufacturer in this country; and that under the present tariff it would be advantageous for us to have our raw material dyed abroad instead of in this country, as we are doing now, and importing it in the dyed state, being able to do so without any increase in the tariff rate.

We beg you to take this all into consideration and give the matter an unbiased decision.

Very truly, yours, ——— ———.

CHICAGO, *April 23, 1913.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of April 19, in reply to mine of April 15, and thank you for your attention. I am, however, taking the liberty of writing to you again to once more call your attention to the fact that the goods which we use, namely, goat, dog, and sheep, are not the kind of goods which commonly come under the heading of "furs." The latter include sealskin and all the other kindred grades, while ours is of the cheapest kind of domestic animal.

In talking of this fur schedule, we trust you will keep the above fact before you, and we sincerely trust that the suggested amendment sent in our last letter will be offered when the bill is being put before the House.

Assuring you that your efforts will be appreciated, we remain,

Very truly, yours,

A. HOENIGSBERGER.
H. L. HOENIGSBERGER.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I send to the desk should satisfy the gentlemen of the committee—yes, even the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON]. It provides substantially two things:

First, it sets forth all of the high-grade raw furs used as luxuries by the people of this country, on which there is placed the duty provided in this bill of 10 per cent ad valorem. If one agrees with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] that furs used as luxuries ought to be taxed, then this amend-

ment of mine is the proper and safe way to accomplish such result without injury to the important fur industry.

Secondly, it provides that the provisions of the Wilson bill and of the Dingley bill as to duties on furs dressed and partially made shall be substituted for the remaining provisions in this paragraph down to the part providing for the finished article. It leaves the duties on the finished the same as in the bill, and as in the existing law, of 50 per cent on all finished garments. It is easy to perceive that the gentlemen of the committee do not understand the situation of this industry and the uses of fur garments in the North. Nearly all of the rural free-delivery carriers in the Northern States, and, I will venture to say, more than 10,000 of them, are obliged to wear fur coats in their daily journeys of 25 miles or so in the severe days of winter. Nearly all of the teamsters up in our section of the country are obliged to wear fur coats, or linings of fur or skins of some sort. The street-car drivers who are exposed, the inspectors of out-of-door work, the policemen, nearly all of the farmers who can do so, and all chauffeurs and motorists are obliged to wear fur coats, costing from $25 to $50 each.

Under the provision of the existing law these furs as they come into this country to be made over into garments are taxed substantially 35 per cent on admission. Under the Wilson bill and under the Dingley bill they were taxed only 20 per cent. Under the provisions of the Payne-Aldrich bill they were taxed 35 per cent, but under the provisions of the present bill these necessities of life are taxed 40 per cent, an increase of 5 per cent. That is why I think there should be called to your attention the cruelty and the injustice which you are doing to the people of the North, who are exposed to the severities of the weather and need comfortable clothing to don. For that reason I have provided the list of furs which are clearly luxuries and that ought to be taxed if you decide on a policy of taxing raw materials in this industry. The remainder, which are used by the people of moderate circumstances, are articles of entire necessity. We provide that raw furs shall be placed upon the free list, and furs dressed and partially made are placed back to the old provisions of the Wilson and Dingley bills at 20 per cent.

Four years ago we from the North objected to the increase of the tax on our necessities—of clothing, from 20 to 35 per cent—since it did not protect anybody, and was only an unjust exaction from our people. We object now to the increase still further of the taxes on our necessities of living from 35 to 40 per cent. You are in this way unfairly and unjustly taxing the garments of our daily living. You are taking money out of the pockets of the rural free delivery carriers, of the teamsters, the farmers, the policemen, the firemen, the motormen, the men of humble means who are exposed to the inclemency of the weather. You are depriving them of clothing they need for their daily use, and you are doing this when there is no necessity, because the revenue will not be increased. It will rather diminish. In addition to that you are keeping away a large business from that section of the country. The furs which come down from Canada as a rule are the ordinary furs for daily use and moderate-priced goods. They come in small packages—5, 15, 20, to 100 pounds. They have been coming down to St. Paul and Minneapolis for more than 50 years. They are sent by the trappers and farmers of the extreme north; and the moment you put a tax on the furs coming into this country from that region it will divert those furs, because of the trouble and difficulty of forwarding them, and they will be sent east to Montreal and London to be made up, thus depriving our people of that work, depriving our people of the opportunity to get that sort of cheap furs for their daily clothing.

You do not understand the injustice you are doing, not only to the wearers, but to a legitimate and helpful industry employing many thousands of our people in profitable employment. You seem to think you are only taxing those people 10 per cent.

That fact is of small consequence. The fact that you place any tax on raw furs at all dislocates this industry and prevents gain and even competition with its foreign rivals. But, fully as important, you must know that these furs, coming in under the description of plates, crosses, and linings, as a rule, are not suitable for use in that form, but have to be torn to pieces and entirely remade. You are taxing in reality, at this rate of 35 per cent, articles which you provide for in your bill which shall be admitted free—skins of goats, dogs, sheep, and so forth, your bill providing in terms for their free admission because they are used as garments for the poorer man. As a matter of fact, they will only be admitted at 40 per cent, under your bill, because of the way they are and must necessarily be imported, and if you gentlemen had the information before you of the business as it is actually done and must be done you would have omitted this provision from the bill. The reason substantially is that the Chinese and Siberians, who produce these skins, prepare them in that way and can not be taught or persuaded to change their customs of a thousand years, and you are penalizing our poor people for it. Of course I do not expect that you will accept the amendment, but I do want you to understand in all sincerity and fairness what the condition of our people has been and is and must be, and I have offered you a practical amendment, which satisfies your conditions and tries to meet what you are accomplishing, and I hope you will see fit to adopt it. I will place in the RECORD a list of furs classed as luxuries, as set forth in my amendment, another class of common furs, and still another class which is subject to change, and may be at one time expensive and again cheaper, depending on the fashion of the day.

This statement is prepared by Mr. C. L. Kluekhohn, of St. Paul, former president of the St. Paul Association of Commerce, and of lifelong experience in the northern fur industry, and by Mr. E. L. Ulman, of New York and St. Paul, who has devoted his life to this business.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request of to-day, we herewith beg to submit the following list of furs, which we have divided into various classes to the best of our knowledge and belief:

We class as articles of luxury Russian sable, marten, ermine, mole, lynx, black fox, silver fox, sea otter, fisher, fur seal, blue fox, white fox, chinchilla, polar bear, grizzly bear.

We class as articles of necessity, which are bought by people of small means, marmot, hare and rabbit, wolf, raccoon, red fox, kitt fox, house cat, wild cat, opossum, muskrat, Japanese mink, Chinese weasel, dog, goat, sheep and lamb, hair, seal, wool seal, wombat, wallaby.

There are a number of articles that are used by people of moderate means whenever prices are low, but which sometimes are fashionable and then are high in price. A duty on these would also be a serious handicap to American merchants engaged in interstate trade: Squirrel, black and brown bear, badger, civet cat, nutria, skunk, wolverine, beaver, kolkinsky, mink, fitch, otter, cross fox.

We respectfully submit that while certain raw furs can be classed as articles of luxury, the revenue derived from them would be small and difficult and expensive to collect on account of the nature of the material and the difficulty in classifying and valuing them.

All raw furs have been free of duty during the entire history of our Government and none of the great commercial countries put a duty on these articles, and any duty, great or small, will seriously handicap, if it would not entirely destroy, all international trade in raw furs on the part of American merchants who have been for generations engaged in the building up of a large business of this kind on a basis of free trade and exchange of this material with all commercial countries.

We respectfully call your attention to the fact that the small revenue to be derived would result in serious injury to an important branch of American commerce.

As explained to you to-day, dogskins and goatskins used for fur purposes are rarely, if ever, imported as raw skins. On account of long-time custom and habits it is impossible to induce the Chinese exporters to sell them to us in any way, except as so-called mats, robes, or rugs, which are never used in their original condition, but are only used in the manufacture of the cheapest fur coats for farmers and teamsters. Until the passage of the Payne bill these have never borne a duty more than 20 per cent.

Yours, respectfully,

C. L. KLUEKHOHN.
E. L. ULMAN.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

360. Fans of all kinds, except common palm-leaf fans, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this, Mr. Chairman, only for the purpose of making a personal explanation, confession, and apology. I know I can not have redress outside of this Chamber against the gentleman from New York for the grave accusation he made against me. He says I was a Democrat two years ago. I confess it, gentlemen; God forgive me [laughter], I was a Democrat. I was a Democrat until I became convinced that I could not do my share for better laws in this country working in the ranks of Democracy. I became convinced that its organization, its ideals, and its handicap was such that it would not be possible for that party to do the constructive work of legislation demanded by the industrial conditions of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.] It was not easy for me; to be frank and sincere, it was not easy for me to sever the ties that bound me to associates for many years, and if I had not felt compelled by my conscience to do so, and to do so at a time when every intelligent man in the United States knew that conditions looked favorable to party success at the polls, to do so when apparently and in the judgment of my friends I was making a grave mistake so far as personal advancement was concerned, because if I do say it, I held a high place in Democracy and the confidence of some of its best men.

I was a Democrat until I became convinced as a thoughtful, earnest student of political conditions that the only hope of this country having laws that were right and fair to all was under the leadership of the great progressive Republican, ROBERT LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, the ablest constructive statesman of our day. That is why I became a Republican and enlisted in

that great work. [Applause on the Republican side.] And, Mr. Chairman, before I conclude let me make another personal observation, since it has been forced upon me here, and that is that I am in sympathy with many things that those gentlemen on the other side are dreaming about. It was not all sarcasm on my part in alluding to the astrology exemplified by the makers of this bill. These men are stargazers, so far as the Government is concerned, dreamers of noble dreams, but impractical executors of ordinary business, and so I say I will admit I was for a long time a Democrat and a dreamer myself, and possibly the gentleman from New York is correct when he makes personal allusion to the size of my ears. Possibly it was because I look like any ordinary Democrat; but I am surprised that he took the chance of lese majeste when he considers the appearance of the great leader of his party to-day in making an allusion of that kind. Perhaps I, like many other Democrats, elongated my ears listening for the impossible, but I saw in time my error, and therefore I trust the future will not aggravate my appearance. But I am not complaining about my appearance any more than about my belated enlightenment. I was not elected to represent the great State of Minnesota on my looks. I was elected because more than two to one of the people of that State believed that I stood for just and honest legislation, and I have not taken the position in this tariff debate on a single schedule that I did not feel impelled to take by my convictions of right and wrong. [Applause.] There is much good in this bill and, unfortunately, much evil also.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, the difficulty which besets a political flopper in explaining his frequent changes under political exigency in a five-minute speech must be apparent to everybody. [Laughter.] I presume, however, the gentleman's apostasy from the Democratic Party occurred after he began to derive his information from the almanac.

Since learning the book of his faith and authority our minds are entirely enlightened and cleared up as to the origin of the antiquated wit and wisdom with which gentlemen on that side have illuminated the debate on this bill. I want to warn the gentlemen, however, that their almanac authority is liable to lead them astray. It does not even regulate the weather, much less the politics, nor will it keep their consciences nor their arguments straight. He prays forgiveness for having been a Democrat. Though he secured his own election by the flop to the Republicans, his added weight on that old hack helped us defeat the party. So we can easily forgive him if he will agree not to come back and adulterate the party and handicap our success in another election. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I want to tell him that we know the author of the almanac from which he has been deriving his politics and inspiration for his frequent changes, and he will not do. The author went clipping by a farmer in Georgia one day, a fair, bright day, with no sign of rain, there not being a cloud as large as a man's hand, and the farmer said, "You had better gallop, Doc, or you will get rained on before you get to town." The doctor thought it was ridiculous. He rode on; and sure enough, it rained pitchforks and ladles before he reached town. He was so disgusted he would not dismount. He turned around and rode back, and he said to the farmer, "How in thunder did you know it was going to rain on such a fair day?" The farmer said, "I take old Doc So-and-So's Almanac, and he said it would be a fair, dry, beautiful day, and I knew it was a lie." [Laughter and 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:

361. Gun wads of all descriptions, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 90, line 3, strike out paragraph 361.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to give notice that I shall ask to have gun wads placed on the free list when the item is reached. They are here in the bill at 10 per cent ad valorem. For years they have never been at less than 20 per cent, and they have never brought in over $300 revenue, but that tariff has been sufficient to keep German wads out. I want to impress on my friend from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] that all business industries everywhere will suffer as those over which he is worrying. Gun wads are manufactured by the Union Metallic Cartridge Co. and the Winchester Arms Co., two of the industries of Connecticut. Let them wince with the rest of us. Further, I want to say that if all the industries of my State are to suffer through free trade, then I hope that we can have some free gun wads from Germany with which to shoot a little game upon which to live. [Applause on the Republican side.] I want to tell my Democratic friend, Mr. DONOVAN, that his hats are not hurt any worse than our shingles.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have sat here since last Tuesday morning listening to the tariff experts on the other side of the aisle, particularly to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and I have wondered while listening to the learned arguments of those gentlemen what would happen to the country if the Lord in His wisdom should see fit at some time to remove them from among us. But I have been consoled for my country by recollections of a circumstance which once occurred in a city of my district.

A gentleman living in my district had for years been the yardmaster for a railroad company. His name was Ashley Girardeau, which was pronounced as though spelled "Jerrydo." Early in the spring of one year he decided that he ought to have an increase of salary. So he went to the superintendent of the road and told him he had been with the road a long time and thought his services were very valuable and that he wanted an increase.

The superintendent said to him, "Well, Jerry, we have been thinking of laying off a few people during the summer, and suppose you just take a rest for two or three months and let us see how things go." He says, "All right. I will quit; that is what I will do." He saw his wife that night and told her what had happened. He said, "Susie, I want you to go down to the yard with me early in the morning and I want you to just see them get a train out of those yards. You get up earlier than usual in the morning and get breakfast and go with me and we will just see them do that thing." They got up early and went down and saw that the trains went out as usual. He said, "They can't do it again; that was just an accident." The next morning they went down, and again the trains moved out as usual, and for several mornings the same thing happened. He finally said to her "You come with me and we will visit with the folks up in Jefferson County awhile and then we will come back. They can't keep this thing going without me. They'll find out they can't run this thing without me." They spent the summer visiting his kin, and in the fall they came back and he went down to the yard Everything seemed to be moving smoothly. The day was hot. He did not see anybody but an old one-eyed gray-haired darky hanging around, but he seemed to be a person of some consequence. So he approached him. He said, "Do you stay here?" The old darky said, "Yas, sir; yas, sir." "Did you ever hear of a man by the name of Girardeau who used to be around here? Did you ever know him?" "No, sah," he said; "I didn't zackly know him; but I'se heerd of him. Yas, sir; I'se heerd of Mr. Jerrydo. Yas, sir; I'se show heerd of him, becase I'se got his job." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is a bit presumptuous for me to suggest anything, to offer an amendment even, when one is obliged to stop and think that one has to meet the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], that of his associate in the chair right adjoining him [Mr. HARRISON of New York], and that of the gentleman at the table, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. But possibly we do meet them, or they might comprehend that they erred in finding, as they did, in this particular schedule. It is the last schedule, Schedule N, Sundries, which came late, after several months' work, when possibly they were out of temper and in no state of mind to deliberate as fair men ought to. I am going to claim this, gentlemen, that if the statement I make is true, that the treatment of the subject in hand, the fur-felt hat industry, as they treated it, was not fair treatment, the only way to account for it was that it was too much labor for a human being to perform.

I am probably representing a class of labor which, in my opinion, is treated more cruelly than any other class from beginning to end of this report of the Ways and Means Committee.

But I am going to claim, too, that if this matter had been considered at the beginning of the hearings there is no question as to what the result would have been. You will appreciate my point of view when I tell you that the distinguished chairman of this committee, though campaigning in a strange State, among a strange people, with the natural prejudices of those people against him and his associates in his section of the country, when he went amongst my people practically carried—yes, swept—the State from end to end with his eloquence. How? By the same means that he carries this body whenever he so desires—by his personality. When you think that misfortune or errors may befall you, you have only to look upon that face and you forget them all. [Laughter and applause.]

Unfortunately, I am occupying a position here formerly filled by one of the most noted men of our country. Probably no man ever came out of that State so well known, either favorably or unfavorably [laughter] as my predecessor. At home he said to his people since the election and within a few days that I am a free trader. The distinguished gentleman who is chairman of this committee says to his associates here in this body that the way I was returned and elected was that I accused Mr. Hill of being a free trader. [Laughter.] But that is neither here nor there. This can not affect our people.

The personality of the gentleman from Alabama is what made our people politically go to him. On the 13th day of March of this year he repeated at the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee, in yonder Office Building, what he said to them in Connecticut. This is in his report as chairman, volume 4, page 3861: "Of course," says the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, "of course none is in favor of reducing the tariff if it is going to injure any American industry." That was on the 13th day of March. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the men who are working at this business for a living are already hungry. The gentleman from Alabama has cited the figures as to these hats, but if he had looked a little further the figures would have spoiled his case. I have the census figures here to show that out of the total amount of business in fur-felt and wool-felt hats, fur-felt hats, generally known as felt hats, form only 83½ per cent. The fur-felt hats should never have been classed with the wool-felt hats. They are separate industries. The fur-felt hat industry is carried on under many disadvantages, when you understand that the fur of the rabbit and, in fact, everything that goes to make a fur hat comes from the other side of the ocean, and this side furnishes nothing except the water that comes from the heavens and a little of the spirits to cut the shellac.

We claim that under the present conditions in the hatting industry any reduction in the tariff is going to be a loss to our industry. This is not like the great steel industry, which is located near the source of its raw materials. And if there is a loss it must follow that there will be a gain to some one, for there is no loss without some gains. The gain in this case will go to the workers who pay homage to the British lion and to the coat of arms of the Italian house of Savoy.

The Italians and English are nearer the source of supply of materials. Are you going to help them, and at the same time put a profit into the pockets of the importer, while you do not make it possible for the American consumer to buy a hat one cent cheaper than he has ever purchased it?

There is merit, gentlemen, in the case of the American hatter. His own country is his own market. There is great competition among the hat manufacturers of this country. He has to compete in this country, for in the majority of the great countries of the earth, which are the fields of the exporters of goods other than hats, the people do not wear stiff hats. You could not sell a stiff derby hat in the Far East. The people there wear turbans. The Chinese do not wear the same kind of headgear that is worn in this country. The Russian moujik would not give up his cap for a black or brown stiff hat, while in the South American countries the preference is for lighter headgear of palm leaf, cork, and straw. What chance has the American hatter to expand his trade under a policy of trade expansion? I dare say that the millions of people in the Far East who buy our cotton goods and other manufactured goods have no more use for an American fur felt hat than the Sultan of Sulu has for a red flannel undershirt.

The census statistics now show that we have only eight months' work in the hatting industry each year. According to these figures we have 25,900 people employed in the month of January and in February 19,000, and these are two of the eight months that the plants are supposed to be in operation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should not feel that I had as good a case as I have if the consumer, the American millions who wear derby hats, was going to be able under this change of schedule to get the article one penny cheaper.

Who will get it? Why, the middleman. The committee has changed the schedule so that it will represent about $1.20 a dozen to labor, amounting to 10 cents a hat in labor when the raw material is deducted. Will that 10 cents per hat reach the public? No. If the committee had listened long enough and with patience to get at the facts, they would have rendered justice instead of giving the column of figures that they have in their report.

It would seem from the spirit of things in this House that only one class, and that the agricultural class, was represented here. I want to say to you gentlemen who come from agricultural districts that you have 7,000,000 workers employed in manufacturing in this country. They have made this land the great market that it is. Now, I am speaking for 25,000 workers and their families who are a large unit among the buyers of the products of the farm. Do you wish to cut down their buying power and put good American money into the pockets of the subjects of two foreign princes?

This bill as it is drawn means less revenue, less work for American hat makers, more profit for the middleman, and money for the European that he would get under no other conditions.

You will remember that the agriculturist that owns a place nearest the city has the best market, and because of his location he has the most valuable possession. When you injure the market you are injuring yourself, and you can not afford to do that by any sort of reasoning.

You have heard the gentleman from New York tell that out of 400 farmers in his district 300 owned automobiles. This bespeaks of the greater prosperity of the American farmer during the past few years. The men who work at hat making are not in the automobile class. Many of them live in tenement houses with from 50 to 100 people. [Applause.]

I am not making this appeal for a great big money-bloated industry such as some that have fattened under protection without aiding anyone except the stockholders. I am speaking for an industry that at this very time is suffering from a panacea that is peculiarly all its own. The changing fashions is the ailment that has struck the hardest at the foundations of this industry that feeds and clothes nearly 150,000 people in the United States of America. Motoring, the golf links, and the young idea aping the manners, customs, and clothing of the rich are some of the things that have hurt the business. Added to this the Democratic Party wants to take away a part of the duty which fosters a poor class of workers who are on their last legs, so to speak.

I have here in my hand a book which I have just picked up by the strangest coincidence. It tells of the recent trip to Europe of Samuel Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, and he is discussing trade conditions in this country with a fellow passenger. They are both agreed that the fur-felt hat industry in this country is in dire straits. And mind you, gentlemen, this condition exists under the present tariff of 51 per cent.

In these days of civilization, in this day of fair play, I think that we have an opportunity to say a word for the poor man who ought to get from the Democratic Party, if nowhere else, what he is justly entitled to.

All I am asking of you is 10 cents on every American made fur-felt hat. The man who goes to market now to get a hat pays $1.50, $2, $2.50, $3, and $4 for them. If this bill is passed with this schedule unchanged I will wager that you are not going to buy these hats for $1.40, $1.90, $2.40, $2.90, and $3.90.

Before the final vote is taken on this bill I want you to imagine, if you will, the distressing predicament of the workman in Danbury, Conn. Usually a man of family, a skilled mechanic, with years of training, he has perhaps saved enough money to buy a home. Now, in middle life, he finds his trade disappearing in this country. He can not seek other employment because Danbury is a city whose 25,000 inhabitants are absolutely dependent on hat manufacturing, there being no other industry in the town. He is averse to leaving the city to seek employment, because he does not wish to abandon the house he has purchased. He is not earning sufficient to provide the absolute necessities for his family—can not sell his house, because the trade depression has depressed property values in the town, and hardly able to make payments and meet taxes on his home, his bank balance is depleted and rapidly becoming exhausted—his savings of a lifetime are threatened.

With conditions no better than stated, the hat manufacturers are making every effort to work out their own salvation, under the most heart-breaking conditions, and they do not ask the aid of the Government in the form of additional tariff protection. They do request, however, in the fight they are making to recover their lost business that the Government shall not

impose a further handicap and burden in the form of a reduced tariff that will invite an influx of foreign-made fur-felt hats.

Are you going to forget the divine word, "Love thy neighbor as thyself"—and in the season of your prosperity forget the skilled mechanic, the hatter? It is in your power to hold up his arms in the hour of his need.

It is simply a question, gentlemen, whether you will give your aid to the workingmen of your own country, or to some other workingmen who live 3,000 miles away and have never seen the Stars and Stripes flying to the breeze over American institutions. Gentlemen this is not a question of revenue, but a matter of patriotism, and I appeal to you. I thank you. [Applause.]

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

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

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

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, has my time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. Some time ago.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut is right when he says that I am not in favor of destroying any legitimate industry. But I do not think that the gentleman from Connecticut has much of a case in this instance. The statistics show that the production in this country of goods embraced under this paragraph, according to the census of 1910, was $46,952,000, and the imports for the year 1912 amounted to $875,000. It is readily seen that the amount of imports, as compared to the American consumption, is less than 2 per cent under the existing rate of 51 per cent ad valorem. The rate is a specific one, but the equivalent tax is 51 per cent ad valorem. The importations are less than 2 per cent of the consumption.

Now, the Democratic Party stands for a competitive tax. They have reduced the rate from 51 to 40 per cent. The Treasury expert who made up these figures in this handbook made them up without my supervision. He estimates that the increased imports under this reduction of duty will amount to $125,000, or about a quarter of 1 per cent. Now, even if the imports were doubled, that would only make them about 4 per cent of the American consumption. Gentlemen who stand for protection can very readily say: "We do not want anything to come in." The gentlemen on this side of the House, who stand for a revenue tariff and a competitive tariff, certainly could not complain if the imports, as compared to American consumption, were increased to a total of 4 per cent, being less than 2 per cent now. As I say, the estimate of the Treasury expert indicates that the increased imports will not amount to more than one-quarter of 1 per cent. This shows clearly that, so far as this particular item is concerned, the committee certainly have not been drastic in their action. The only thing I can say is that the gentlemen who are interested in this hat industry have been the most persistent, continual, insistent advocates of maintaining a prohibitive tariff tax in their trade that ever appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of this House.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman if I have any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

366. Indurated fiber ware and manufactures of pulp, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

367. Jewelry, commonly or commercially so known, valued above 20 cents per dozen pieces; rope, curb, cable, and fancy patterns of chain not exceeding one-half inch in diameter, width, or thickness, valued above 30 cents per yard; and articles valued above 20 cents per dozen pieces designed to be worn on apparel or carried on or about or attached to the person, such as and including buckles, card cases, chains, cigar cases, cigar cutters, cigar holders, cigarette cases, cigarette holders, coin holders, collar, cuff, and dress buttons, combs, match boxes, mesh bags and purses, millinery, military, and hair ornaments, pins, powder cases, stamp cases, vanity cases, and like articles; all the foregoing and parts thereof, finished or partly finished, composed of metal, whether or not enameled, washed, covered, or plated, including rolled gold plate, and whether or not set with precious or semiprecious stones, pearls, cameos, coral, or amber, or with imitation precious stones, 60 per cent ad valorem. Stampings, mesh and other materials of metal, whether or not set with glass or paste, finished or partly finished, separate or in strips or sheets, suitable for use in the manufacture of any of the foregoing articles in this paragraph, 50 per cent ad valorem.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 91, line 2, after the word "pieces," insert the words "60 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 91, line 17, after the word "stones," insert the words "or pearls."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 91, line 18, after the word "stampings," insert the word "galleries."

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

369. Laces, lace braids, lace window curtains not specially provided for in this section, coach, carriage, and automobile laces, and all lace articles of whatever material composed; handkerchiefs, napkins, wearing apparel, and all other articles made wholly or in part of lace or of imitation lace of any kind; embroideries, wearing apparel, handkerchiefs, and all other articles or fabrics embroidered in any manner by hand or machinery, whether with a plain or fancy initial or monogram or otherwise, tamboured, appliquéed, or scalloped by hand or machinery; edgings, insertings, galloons, nets, nettings, veils, veilings, neck rufflings, ruchings, tuckings, flouncings, flutings, quillings, ornaments, all the foregoing, of whatever material composed; woven fabrics or articles from which threads have been omitted, drawn, or cut, leaving open spaces in which figures or designs are formed by threads other than the threads of the fabric, and articles made in whole or in part of any of the above materials; all the foregoing, 60 per cent ad valorem.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 93, line 2, after the word "drawn," insert the word "punched."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 93, line 3, at the end of the line, strike out the comma and insert the words "alone or in combination with the threads of the fabric, not including hemstitching or poke stitching."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there will be a little discussion on this subject, and I will ask the gentleman from Alabama if we can not agree upon some time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is that the leather paragraph?

Mr. GARDNER. The leather paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will agree to 15 minutes' debate on the subject, 10 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman's side and 5 minutes by our side.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes' time.

Mr. MANN. Can the gentleman not give us 15 minutes on this side?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at the end of 20 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois and 5 minutes by myself. It is understood, of course, that this covers the leather proposition.

Mr. GARDNER. I shall want to discuss boots and shoes when we get to the free list, but other leathers now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, as I said a moment ago, it is my intention to discuss the boot and shoe item when we reach the free list. If boots and shoes had been retained on the dutiable list they would have been included with leather in the paragraph which we have just reached.

To-night I shall confine myself to a discussion of the duties on leather. The second largest shoe city in the world, the city of Lynn, is situated in my home county. It is represented by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN]. The fourth largest shoe city in the world, the city of Haverhill, is also situated in my home county. I represent Haverhill. Essex County, Mass., is the largest shoe and leather district on earth.

Now, I am obliged to admit that the gentleman who represents the Lynn half of our county [Mr. PHELAN] knows a great deal more than anybody else in this House about boots and shoes, and about the leather schedule. Unfortunately to-night he is suffering from caucus lockjaw and so I bear the burden.

In passing I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to the duty of 10 per cent on glove leather. I am of the opinion that with a duty of 10 per cent on glove leather and with the provision in the free list that leathers in general shall enter free, many importers will invoice glove leathers as dressed kid and goat skins. Although I am not by any means sure that such will be the case, yet such is my opinion. As a matter of fact I telegraphed for information as to this point to a leather manufacturer in Mr. PHELAN'S district, to a leather manufacturer in my own district, and also to the Hon. Richard Young, a former Member of Congress. The answers which I have received contradict each other. I call the attention of the chairman to the matter, in case he should wish later on to consider it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I consulted several manufacturers of gloves in reference to the question of whether "glove leather" was a sufficient designation. One of these gentlemen of whom I asked the question was a former Member of this House and a well-known authority on the subject. He said there could be no question about that designation.

Mr. GARDNER. Still, as a matter of fact, there is a difference of opinion. The former Members of Congress whom the gentleman and I have consulted undoubtedly agree with each other as to the matter. The point is that other manufacturers do not take the same view.

In this bill you have put most leathers on the free list. Probably you desire to make some compensation to the shoe manufacturer for the loss of the duty on boots and shoes. Probably you feel that you are justified in your course because leather is exported in such very great quantities. It is true, of course, that we exported $40,000,000 worth last year, while only $7,000,000 worth was imported. From the Democratic point of view I can understand why you should put upon the free list the kind of leathers we export in quantity. What I do not understand is why you should cut the duty off practically all leathers, whether or not they are of the kinds which are exported. For instance, out of our $40,000,000 leather export, just about one-half is glazed kid. Half of the remainder is sole leather.

On the Democratic theory of lowering duties, I can understand your action on glazed kid and sole leather, but I can not understand why you removed all duties from patent leather and calfskins.

We export a small quantity of patent leather—perhaps to the amount of a million and a half of dollars. We import a trivial amount of patent leather. The fact is that patent leather manufacture in its present form is a comparatively new industry in this country. I doubt whether it has been oversuccessful. Patent leather to-day carries a protective duty equivalent to from 25 to 30 per cent. No one can claim that patent leather is a luxury. Even supposing that the negligible amount of importations indicates too high a rate of duty under the present law, is that any reason for cutting the whole structure away with an axe instead of lowering it with a jackscrew, as your chairman put it?

Now, as to calfskins. I understand that we export a few specialties, but that our great staple lines can not be exported. As a matter of fact, our calfskin leather export amounts to one million and three-quarters dollars' worth annually. A little calfskin leather is imported. The significant matter about calfskin leather is this: We used to be able to sell calfskins in the English markets, but the Germans have come along and driven us out.

There are likely to be serious results if you give the German calfskin manufacturers the free run of our market. Skins for morocco, tanned and unfinished. There are $2,000,000 worth of those skins imported. I do not criticize the Ways and Means Committee for putting them on the free list. As a matter of fact, those skins for morocco, tanned but unfinished, are what we call "India tan." They are raw material for our morocco factories. I doubt whether they compete with any American product of like sort. What I especially criticize is the free admission of calfskin leather and patent leather; perhaps also of sealskin leather, pigskin leather, colt, and kangaroo. I know mighty little about the last-mentioned leathers. Granting that it is right from the Democratic point of view to put leather on the free list, is it fair for you to require these leather manufacturers to purchase their raw materials in a protected market? To be sure, you have put bark tannages on the free list. You have also put indigo on the free list, but there are plenty of articles used in tanning and currying which are not put on the free list. In my district nowadays calfskins are tanned by the chrome process. It does not do the manufacturers the slightest good in the world to take the duty off of tan bark. Bichromates are used on calfskins to-day, bichromates of soda and potash being the largest item in tanning at present.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Of course the duties on bichromates of potash and soda are very much reduced, and as a practical question does the gentleman from Massachusetts know that to-day bichromates are selling cheaper in the United States than they are abroad?

Mr. GARDNER. No; I did not know it; but that would seem to require some explanation from the walking delegate of the husbands' union as to what the duty is retained for. Bichromates at all events are taxed at a rate equivalent to 15 per cent ad valorem. Dyes are largely used in the manufacture of leather. Ordinary dye woods are taxed at three-eighths of a cent a pound. Sulphonated oil is the next largest item, and that is taxed at 15 per cent ad valorem. Coal-tar dyes are taxed at 30 per cent ad valorem. Blue vitriol comes in free. Borax is taxed, bichromate of soda is taxed, sumac comes in free, linseed oil is taxed, sal soda is taxed, sponges are taxed, degras is taxed, sulphuric acid comes in free. Soda sulphite is taxed, bichromate of potash is taxed, soap is taxed, fusel oil is taxed, and sulphonated oil is taxed. So you see that while the upper-leather manufacturers are obliged to purchase in a protected market, you throw wide open to the world the market in which they are obliged to sell.

As I have pointed out to you, the foreigner to-day, even over a duty of 15 per cent on calfskins and over a duty of from 25 to 30 per cent on patent leathers, can send a certain amount of leather into this country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, all Members, after the briefest session since the tariff bill has been under consideration, recognize the futility of any amendment offered here being adopted unless it originates with the Ways and Means Committee, and so I shall withhold submitting any formal amendment covering the leather schedule. The briefest examination of this schedule proves the necessity of an expert, nonpartisan tariff commission to ascertain the difference in the cost of production here and abroad and conditions of manufacture generally in the different industries. Here leathers are reduced from ad valorem duties ranging from 5 to 25 per cent without any data whatever as to cost of production and placed on the free list. All that is at hand is the extent of exportations and importations, and this not as to the respective characters of leather. In fairness to a great industry, where competition is keen and prices are uncontrolled by any artificial agency, I claim that these duties should not be abolished entirely and leather put on the free list.

Considerable mention has been made in this debate from time to time of putting hides on the free list in the Payne Act and the increase in the price of hides that followed. But that was the result of an increasing demand for hides in the world's market and a want of a commensurate supply to meet that demand. Those of us who served here four years ago recall well the efforts of President Taft, as a result of placing hides on the free list, to secure the very lowest reductions in the leather schedule. The leather manufacturers reduced their schedules as a result of this reduction from 30 to 75 per cent in different items. Heavy leather, such as sole and belting leather, was reduced from 20 to 5 per cent ad valorem. As a result of that reduction, the importations of heavy leather have increased immensely, until during the last 12 months they have aggregated $2,000,000, where four years ago they were but $80,000. The manufacturers of heavy leathers will be handicapped if you admit this character of leather free of duty, because the tanning industry is fast developing in Canada, and the Canadian leather manufacturer has the advantage of the native hemlock bark, and not only of the native hemlock bark but of free chemicals which are necessary as a substitute in the tanning of leather. More than that, the committee in their first bill, and I take it that the schedule as found in H. R. 10 was the deliberate judgment of the distinguished majority of the Ways and Means Committee, included a certain character of leather carrying a duty of 15 per cent, namely, kangaroo, sheep, and other skins, but these skins were eliminated in the second bill, which is now before the committee. But in both

bills they failed to include patent leather, which has been referred to by my colleague [Mr. GARDNER], and which requires double the amount of labor than that employed in other kinds of upper leather.

Patent leather not only requires the tanning process which is necessary in other leathers, but it requires the japanning or enameling process. Though under the present tariff act that schedule has a tariff the equivalent of about 25 per cent ad valorem, that is all eliminated here. Now, the mere fact that we are exporting large quantities of these leathers is no absolute criterion, I maintain, that the industry is so established that we can compete with the world. There may be exigencies in the commercial world whereby there may be extraordinary demand for one character of leather which the manufacturers of the world may not be able to meet, and this country, being more able perhaps for the time being to produce that character of leather to meet the world demand, would export it for the time being. It is true we have exported one million and a half of patent leathers. But Germany is making fast inroads with their improved machinery into the manufacture of all kinds of leather and competing with the American leather manufacturers in the control of the world's trade. The distinguished chairman said to-night he does not wish to do anything to destroy legitimate industry. But with the cost of labor in Germany one-half of that which is required to produce leather in this country, with improvements going on rapidly in the industry there and in other countries, I claim there is continued need of a duty on leather, and particularly on the highly manufactured leather, such as patent and upper leathers. I ask the gentleman who has this bill in charge why it was that in this industry all tariffs were taken off and the industry exposed to the competition of the world? It is not sufficient to say that there has been large exportations before, because if the labor market is so much lower abroad than here, naturally it will be necessary to meet that by some compensatory tariff when the industry becomes established abroad, and the only available data we have shows that our exports are diminishing already, and those of other countries, particularly Germany, increasing. So, Mr. Chairman, representing a city which produces more leather than any other city in the United States, I feel constrained to raise objection to this radical cut in the schedules, which, while it may be justified, or the industry may be able to adjust itself to the changed duty so far as heavy leathers are concerned, as to the other leathers, places the manufacturer in an unfair position in meeting foreign competition here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the question that is raised as to glove leather, after hearing what the importers and the Treasury experts have to say about it, I am fully satisfied that this language fully describes the leather used for gloves. There is ordinarily no question about this leather, because ordinarily leather that is finished in the rough is not a domestic production, although there may be a small amount of glove leather that is made in this country. But the principal glove leather that is made in this country is a product that is not finished in the rough. The balance of it is an imported article that is not made here at all. I have no serious question in the world as to the effect of this paragraph.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

371. Bags, baskets, belts, satchels, card cases, pocketbooks, jewel boxes, portfolios, and other boxes and cases, made wholly of or in chief value of leather, not jewelry, and manufactures of leather, or of which leather is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section; all the foregoing, whether or not permanently fitted and furnished with traveling, bottle, drinking, dining, or luncheon and similar sets, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, again I am constrained to voice my feeble protest against the passage of this unfair bill, and by reading the following letter from a manufacturing establishment in my district I feel that I am appealing strongly for an amendment to section 371, which should provide at least the same rate of duty as is carried in the Payne Tariff Act:

APRIL 29, 1913.

Hon. WILLIAM J. BROWNING,
Representative First District, New Jersey.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of the 8th, in which you want to know the effect of the reduced tariff on our industry, we can see no bright prospects. We have this week had our first serious rebuff, which is only a forerunner of many more to come. We mention the following incident:

In a leading Philadelphia department store, which places orders for fall delivery in April, our representative approached the buyer of a certain department with a request for the usual order, and the answer was, "We have strict orders not to buy anything for future delivery until the tariff question is settled." Then he added: "You can not expect us to buy goods from you, when we will be able to get them so much cheaper from Europe."

The above goods consist of school bags and are now being imported in large quantities under the present tariff.

Very truly,

CAMDEN KNIT GOODS CO., INC.
LOUIS ENGLE, *Secretary.*

Mr. Chairman, I hope the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will offer an amendment that will properly protect this industry.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

372. Gloves, not specially provided for in this section, made wholly or in chief value of leather, whether wholly or partly manufactured, shall pay duty at the following rates, the lengths stated in each case being the extreme length when stretched to their full extent, namely:

373. Men's, women's, or children's "glacé" finish, Schmaschen (of sheep origin), not over 14 inches in length, $1 per dozen pairs; over 14 inches in length, 25 cents per dozen pairs for each additional inch in excess of 14 inches.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in this paragraph relating to "Men's, women's, or children's 'glacé' finish, Schmaschen (of sheep origin), not over 14 inches in length," the term "sheep origin" is new, and I take it that it is intended to take the place of the language formerly used, "lamb or sheep." Has there been any construction to the effect that the language "of sheep origin" covers lamb or sheep gloves? I ask that question because a number of people interested in the trade have asked me in reference to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the present law reads, "Women's or children's glacé finish, Schmaschen (of sheep origin), not over 14 inches in length."

Mr. MANN. The present law reads, "'glacé' finish, of lamb or sheep, not over 15 inches in length." Is that paragraph 455?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Paragraph 454.

Mr. MANN. I have not got that. Yes; paragraph 455 is "Women's or children's glacé finish, lamb or sheep, not over 15 inches in length." That is what I wanted to inquire, whether the term "of sheep origin" covers what is covered in paragraph 455, because this paragraph, I take it, is intended to cover it all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand it covers the whole proposition. It is an imported glove, as a matter of fact. There are no Schmaschen gloves manufactured in this country.

Mr. MANN. The point I was getting at was whether the term "of sheep origin" would cover gloves of lamb origin?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should think it would.

Mr. MANN. I make the inquiry because several gentlemen who are interested in the importation of these gloves on a large scale called my attention to this matter, and they were unable to say from the trade term whether that would be included or no. If not, it is quite important, and I did not know whether the Treasury Department had rendered an opinion or not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This amendment went to the Treasury Department, and I also talked over this paragraph with some of the leading glove manufacturers of the United States, some of whom are known to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I wish the gentleman would make an inquiry about this.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have already done so.

Mr. MANN. I doubt whether the gentleman has made the inquiry from the Treasury Department as to whether there would be any question that the term "of sheep origin" would include gloves made from lambskin.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I did inquire of a glove manufacturer, who stated that this proposition would cover it. And then, on the other hand, the amendment which has been submitted, changing the classification, has been submitted to the Treasury authorities and no comment made on that language.

Mr. MANN. On the other hand, I will say to the gentleman that several of the largest importers of gloves in Chicago—where they import large quantities—have expressed the opinion to me that it probably would not cover lambskin gloves under the ruling heretofore made. I am sure that the gentleman from Alabama does not want that construction put upon the bill, and if it is necessary to change the language, I would be glad to change it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sure that the gentleman understands that Schmaschen was originally supposed to be made from the stillborn lamb, but that there are now some other lambskins used in the manufacture of these gloves, although

originally that was not so. The orginal proposition was to cover the other class of gloves. So I am satisfied that the words "of sheep origin" will cover the Schmaschen glove.

Mr. MANN. But if the gentleman will note, in the existing law, paragraph 454, women's or children's glacé finish Schmaschen (of sheep origin) not over 14 inches in length, are $1.25 per dozen pairs, while women's or children's glacé finish lamb or sheep not over 14 inches in length are $2.50 per dozen pairs. The only difference between those is that in one place it says "(of sheep origin) $1.25 per dozen," and in the other it says "lamb or sheep, $2.50 per dozen." I think the first, "Schmaschen (of sheep origin)," probably only includes the stillborn lamb.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It originally did, but subsequently Schmaschen gloves, according to my information, included some leather that was made from other lambskins besides stillborn lambs.

Mr. MANN. That is true, but the present law makes the distinction. In the case where it is made from the skin of stillborn lambs, it says, "of sheep origin." Where it is made of lamb or sheep skins, it says, "lamb or sheep," and the rate is different in the existing law. The question is whether, under the language here, you do not confine your rate to the gloves made from the stillborn lambskins. I wish the gentleman would inquire about that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will make further inquiries into it; but I will say to the gentleman that I had already discussed the question with a man whom I considered was informed on the glove schedule.

Mr. MANN. The only reason I call it to the attention of the gentleman is that the people who wrote to me about this are as well posted as anybody in the country on the subject. I do not know anything about it, and they were not prepared to say definitely about this, but they were very much afraid of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

377. Harness, saddles, saddlery in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 377, lines 18 and 19, by striking out the words "not specially provided for in this section" and insert in lieu thereof the words "composed wholly or in chief value of leather."

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I submit restores the language of the existing law, and in terms provides for a 20 per cent ad valorem on leather goods such as harness and saddlery, which has been the rate for many years and under which a large business was developed. There seems to be confusion in your bill which I have endeavored to clear by my amendment.

Paragraph 377 provides as follows:

377. Harness, saddles, saddlery in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

While on the free-list paragraph 535 reads as follows:

535. All leather not specially provided for in this section and leather board or compressed leather; leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into boots or shoes; boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather; leather shoe laces, finished or unfinished; harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather.

Now, there is a possible inconsistency, and my amendment seeks to clear the difficulty by striking out the words in paragraph 377, "not specially provided for in this section," and hereafter I will offer one to paragraph 535, placing a period after the word "unfinished" in line 19 and striking out the words "harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather."

This will completely dispose of any possible confusion and will correct any possible injustice.

I know there is some confusion in the minds of others as to exactly what is the provision of the pending bill, but I have submitted the amendment in this form so that the rates now existing shall continue.

As a reason for the adoption of this amendment I have ventured to submit to the committee, and ask to have read from the Clerk's desk, a letter from one of the leading citizens of my city, Mr. William A. Hardenbergh. He is head of the firm of P. R. L. Hardenbergh & Co., and probably is the leading Democrat of my section. He is at present the Democratic member of the St. Paul police commission and may be selected to head the hosts of the Democracy in the next contest we will have in my city. He is a man of the very highest character, of the broadest intelligence, and highest standing, and I am sure that you will be proud of your leading representative in that part of the country when you shall listen to his letter, and I respectfully commend it to the serious consideration of my Democratic brethren. I have omitted all personal references.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *April 10, 1913.*

Hon. F. C. STEVENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEVENS: I note that the Ways and Means Committee have placed harness and saddlery on the free list in the tariff bill which they have introduced, and while I know from my experience of the past two years as a minority member of the St. Paul police board that a rank outsider finds it very difficult to help out any of his friends, I am nevertheless writing to you to solicit your good offices even if you are no longer of the dominant party.

When I went over this bill and found that the tariff on most of the schedules from which vast fortunes have been made during the past generation had been reduced, and in the case of saddlery had been entirely removed, it seemed to me that they had picked out our industry because it was so small in volume that it had no friends.

I have, perhaps, as wide an acquaintance with the conditions surrounding this industry as any one man in the country, and I ask you to accept my word for it that during the past 30 years in which I have been connected with it there has not been one single saddlery manufacturer who has retired from his business on a competency, nor is there now any one man engaged in it who might be called rich. With these two facts in mind it seems preposterous to me that only a portion of the protective tariff should be removed from other schedules while on our schedule the present tariff, which only represents the difference in the cost of labor here and abroad, should be entirely abolished.

The saddlery industry has not in the past fattened on a protective tariff, or, in fact, on anything else, and it does seem to me that even with the radical legislation which is now proposed our little industry is being made the goat.

With saddlery on the free list those cities near the Canadian border are going to suffer tremendously from competition from that country, and as far as the Twin Cities are concerned, which, taken together, is the largest saddlery manufacturing center in the United States, it is going to put some of us out of business. The largest saddlery manufacturer in the world is in Winnipeg, and the Canadian houses are already approaching the salesmen of ourselves and neighbors with a view of putting their men into Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana. If we could get into Canada without duty, this would be entirely satisfactory to us, but as it bids fair to be, Canada will dump a tremendous surplus of manufactured stuff into our territory and we will be utterly powerless to strike back.

Under the very best conditions our industry is suffering from the automobile and gas tractor development, and during the past year seven large manufacturers have voluntarily liquidated and gone out of business, and there is a country-wide movement to consolidate those remaining into a less number of units, as with the decreased volume of business the cost of distribution is becoming oppressive, and in every saddlery center in the country the manufacturers are working to cut down the number of houses, either by purchase or consolidation.

Anyone who has observed the growth of motor vehicles and motor tractors must appreciate that our industry is having a hard time, but what we have encountered in this respect is trifling when compared to the results that will follow the placing of our product on the free list. I would like to impress upon you—and if you can consistently bring the matter to the attention of any of your Democratic colleagues I will appreciate it—the one fact that during the past generation there has not been one man who has been made rich in the manufacture of harness, and that Canadian competition is going to seriously affect an industry which is already fighting for its life by reason of the development of power vehicles. I feel that this industry has been selected for slaughter because it is so small, and therefore has but few friends in Washington and its well-being is of interest to but very few people; but to me and my associates in the Twin Cities it is a tremendously vital matter, and I sincerely hope that you may be able to interest some of your Democratic friends so that we may have a good word spoken for us when the consideration of that schedule comes up.

With kindest personal regards and trusting that I have not consumed too much of your time,

Yours, very truly, W. A. HARDENBERGH.

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:

379. Manufactures of bone, chip, grass, horn, india rubber or gutta-percha, palm leaf, quills, straw, weeds, or whalebone, or of which any of them is the component material of chief value, not otherwise specially provided for in this section, shall be subject to the following rates: India rubber or gutta-percha, 10 per cent ad valorem; palm leaf, 15 per cent ad valorem; bone, chip, horn, quills, and whalebone, 20 per cent ad valorem; grass, straw, and weeds, 25 per cent ad valorem; combs composed wholly of horn or of horn and metal, 25 per cent ad valorem. The terms "grass" and "straw" shall be understood to mean these substances in their natural state, and not the separated fibers thereof.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 95, line 10, after the word "metal," strike out "25 per cent ad valorem" and insert "50 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in order to save time I propose to withhold several amendments to this schedule, for I realize that the gentleman from Alabama is under pressure. It seems to me that this amendment ought to be discussed briefly. In this instance it is proposed to restore the Payne rates on combs composed wholly of horn or horn and metal. There are very

few establishments engaged in this industry in the United States. They are all of limited capacity but give employment to a number of people. The product retails at from 5 to 10 cents, and the reduction of this duty threatens the entire industry. It would seem a hardship on the men struggling all these years to manufacture combs of horn to impair or destroy what they have done. What they produce is put on the market so low that it seems almost ridiculous to ask them to sell their commodity any cheaper than now. The influx of foreign combs would not result in reducing the cost price to the consumer. It is almost absurd to think of combs being put on the market at 3 cents or 2 cents. In this case there are three or four manufactories, one or two that have been in business for 60 years, and they say that the business is positively imperiled by the reduction of the duty from 50 to 25 per cent ad valorem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee 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.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, May 5, 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. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 4615) to amend the general pension act of May 11, 1912, as amended by act approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4616) to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States, to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto, and to promote safety at sea; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 4617) for the relief of tobacco growers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 4618) to increase the limit of cost for increased quarantine facilities at the port of Portland, Me.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRODBECK: A bill (H. R. 4619) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the old post-office building and the site thereof at York, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4620) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at a point in or near the city of Biloxi, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4621) for the erection of a military post at or near the city of Gulfport, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4622) providing for examination and survey of channel in Back Bay of Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 4623) to establish an agricultural experiment station in the fifth congressional district of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4624) for the distribution of the cotton-tax fund collected in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 4638) to provide for the erection of a public building at Pineville, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4639) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Marion, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY: Resolution (H. Res. 88) creating a standing committee of the House to be known as the Committee on Roads; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: Resolution (H. Res. 89) to print 1,000 additional copies of the Soil Survey of the Biloxi Area, Miss., for use in the House document room; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 4625) granting an increase of pension to John Brin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4626) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Dickson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 4627) granting a pension to Fred A. Hecker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4628) for the relief of N. Ferro; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4629) to reimburse Gaston R. Poitevin for property lost by him while assistant light keeper at East Pascagoula River (Miss.) Light Station, as recommended by the Lighthouse Board; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 4630) for the relief of Fred A. Emerson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4631) granting a pension to Sarah Haynes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 4632) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Osborne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 4633) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia J. Ames; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4634) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4635) granting an increase of pension to Melvina Bottles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4636) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Clayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) granting an increase of pension to Loretto Roland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4640) granting a pension to Mrs. A. H. Bryant; 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): Petition of Aug. G. Jabin and F. William Wiseman, of State of Missouri, against mutual life insurance in income tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring immediate change in banking and currency laws; to the Commitee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AINEY: Petition of Henry C. Miller, Edd Payne, and M. A. Hodgson, of Pennsylvania, against mutual life insurance in income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Workers of the Trade and Shoemakers, of Honesdale, Pa., against any change in tariff on boots and shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Steubenville, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for an immediate reform in the banking system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Charles A. Morgan, Paulding, Ohio, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of National Enameling & Stamping Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring reform in banking and currency laws at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Washington Millers' Association, of Tacoma, Wash., against tariff on grain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Eureka Hill Mining Co., of Salt Lake City, Utah, against reduction of duty on lead ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., against mutual life insurance in income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLANCY: Petition of Ernest Bohm and 101 citizens of New York, N. Y., protesting against admitting Philippine tobacco and cigars free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 42 citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Cigar Makers' Union, No. 6, of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the removal of the duty on all Philippine tobacco and cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of William F. Bidwell and one other citizen of New York, against mutual life insurance in income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Eureka Hill Mining Co., of Salt Lake City, Utah, against reduced rates of duty on lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Washington Millers' Association, of Tacoma, Wash., against duty on grain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to income-tax provision of the new tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Petition of business men of Steubenville, Bowerston, Carrollton, Brilliant, Sherodsville, Mingo Junction, and Toronto, Ohio, all favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, county, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GORMAN: Petition of A. G. Price and others, of Chicago, against the free importation of cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: 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. HINDS: Petition of Aroostook County, Pomona Grange, of Blaine, Me., against removal of duty on hay and potatoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Androscoggin Local, No. 15, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Lisbon Falls, and Pejepscot Local, No. 23, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Pejepscot Mills, Me., against removal of duty on paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Utah: Petition of Chapter of Utah of the American Mining Congress and from the Rocky Mountain lead-ore producers, favoring retention of tariff duty on lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of J. C. H. Steet and 1,335 residents of San Francisco, Compton, Anaheim, Marysville, Artesia, Hynes, Colusa, Pleasanton, Huntington Beach, Guadaloupe, Santa Maria, Santa Ana, Los Alamitos, Alvarado, Betteravia, Oxnard, Hueneme, Orcutt, all in the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction in the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petitions of sundry citizens of fifteenth Pennsylvania congressional district, against mutual life insurance companies in income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of Manufacturers' Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., against clause in sundry civil bill prohibiting use of any money appropriated for prosecution of any labor or farmers' organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of W. D. Wood, jr.; A. G. Brown; M. Mahoney; and 112 other employees of the Moehle Lithographic Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on lithographic work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Hyde Lestie, of Plymouth; L. W. Parker, of Chester; C. F. Boynton, of St. Johnsbury; Hon. Henry D. Holton, H. F. C. Toldt, Della M. Sherman, C. C. Crosby, E. C. Brigham, H. C. Brazor, E. C. Cook, W. M. Sanborn, D. Cowles, and Thomas W. Crosby, Brattleboro; G. B. Lamson, H. B. Salisbury, E. W. Tewksbury, D. E. Salisbury, H. M. Wires, C. O. Osha, M. A. Tewksbury, A. J. D. Tewksbury, Dr. Rumrill, J. W. Raymond, and L. H. Rumrill, of Randolph; A. C. Hooker, of Hardwick; A. T. Davis, of Marshfield; C. S. Andrews and D. J. Morse, of Barre; Allan W. Martin, of Hardwick; Byron L. Bogle, C. C. Bogle, Edwin Davis, and C. E. Bogle, of White River Junction; E. J. Hewitt, of South Royalton; Byron Parker, of Rutland; George M. Gibson, of East Thetford; A. H. Graves, of Waterbury; H. W. Sheldon, of Ascutneyville; A. G. Mausur, of Burlington; Byron Parmenter, of Bethel; H. C. Stoddard, of Bellows Falls; C. A. Smith, of Weston; W. T. Walker, of Lyndonville; W. J. Coates, of East Calais; Gen. F. G. Butterfield, of Derby Line; F. L. Brigham, M. D., H. B. Hawes, and E. H. Eaton, of Springfield; all of Vermont, and all protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of W. T. Franklin and A. T. Mist, against mutual life insurance in income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sherer-Gilbert Co., of Chicago, Ill., against duty on saffron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. P. Bryan, jr., Bound Brook, N. J., relative to tariff on horticultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Manufacturers of Steel Shears and Scissors, against reduction of duty on shears, scissors, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Welsbach Light Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., against reduction of duty on monazite, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Massachusetts, favoring repeal of clause for free tolls for American vessels through Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Cult-a-lap Co., of Somerville, N. J., against increase of duty on jute cloth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Isaac Prouty & Co., of Spencer, Mass., against reduction of duty on shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of New Jersey, against mutual life insurance in income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of citizens of Detroit, against reduction of duty on wheels for railway purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of Cigar Makers Union No. 290, of Oswego, N. Y., against free cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the United States, against free cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of city council of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation for the Government to acquire control and ownership of all telephones and telegraph systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York City, against free cigars from the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of citizens of the United States, against free cigars from the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *May 5, 1913.*

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed Senate concurrent resolution No. 1 for the printing of 6,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1,593, Sixty-second Congress, on the "Concentration of control of money and credit."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

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

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
General Assembly, January Session, A. D. 1913.

Senate joint resolution 40.

Resolution requesting Congress to propose to the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the election of the President and Vice President by a direct vote of the people.

Resolved by this assembly:

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to propose for ratification by the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States abolishing the office of presidential elector and substituting a mode of electing a President and a Vice President of the United States by the direct vote of all the electors in the several States, respectively; but providing that in ascertaining the choice of President and of Vice President, made by the electors so voting in all the States, the persons receiving a plurality of the votes so cast in any State for President and for Vice President shall be credited with the votes of that State for such offices; such votes of said State so credited to be the number of votes equivalent to the number of Senators and Representatives to which, at the time of such election, it may be entitled in the Congress.

SEC. 2. The governor is requested to send a certified copy of this resolution, under the great seal of the State, to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Passed the Senate April 9, 1913.

Passed the house of representatives April 29, 1913.