

I can not do so unless by unanimous consent. Will not the Senator move an adjournment, so that we can have a morning hour to-morrow?

Mr. McCUMBER. A good many Senators left the Chamber after unanimous consent was obtained that we would take a recess. That agreement has already been entered into; and having been entered into, and many Senators having left, there would not be a quorum at this time.

Mr. HARRISON. I have been staying around here very closely, so that if a request for unanimous consent was made I could object to it, unless I could get unanimous consent to take up this matter to-morrow.

Mr. McCUMBER. Unanimous consent to take a recess was granted.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator allow me to propose now a unanimous-consent request which will settle the proposition? I did so awhile ago, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] asked me to withhold the request until the Senator from North Dakota could be present. I made it some time during the afternoon.

I ask unanimous consent that on to-morrow, if the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate under the order of the Senate reports out the Gooding resolution, it shall be in order to be considered; and I couple with that the request that the resolution which I presented to-day and that is on the table may be considered to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make that request now, with only a few Senators present. I think there will be no disposition to interfere with either of those resolutions; but with the general understanding that there was upon this side and I think upon both sides of the Chamber that we were to take a recess, a great many Senators came to me and asked if anything further would come up, and I replied in the negative. I hope, therefore, that the Senator will not insist upon that request to-night but will present it to-morrow, if necessary, when more Senators can be present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, I am powerless to make a motion, because there is not a quorum present, and it would accomplish nothing if a unanimous-consent agreement to take a recess has been entered into; but I made that request to-day. I thought the Senator from North Dakota was on the floor at the time. There was quite a large attendance here; and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] said that while he did not think there would be any objection, he hoped I would wait until the Senator from North Dakota could be present. Of course, the Senator will aid me to-morrow in getting up the resolution, and I shall therefore desist.

Mr. McCUMBER. I certainly shall not object to their being brought up if they can be disposed of.

I now move that the Senate take a recess, the recess being under the unanimous-consent agreement, until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, August 4, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, August 4, 1922.

(Legislative day of Thursday, August 3, 1922.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. GOODING obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Curtis	Heflin	Nelson
Ball	Dial	Hitchcock	New
Borah	Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry
Brandegge	du Pont	Jones, Wash.	Nicholson
Bursum	Ernst	Keyes	Norbeck
Calder	Fletcher	Ladd	Oddie
Cameron	Glass	Lenroot	Overman
Capper	Gooding	Lodge	Pepper
Caraway	Hale	McCumber	Phipps
Culberson	Harris	McLean	Pomerene
Cummins	Harrison	McNary	Ransdell

Robinson  
Sheppard  
Shortridge  
Simmons

Smoot  
Spencer  
Stanfield  
Stanley

Sterling  
Trammell  
Walsh, Mass.  
Walsh, Mont.

Watson, Ind.  
Willis

Mr. DIAL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH] is detained on official business. I ask that this notice may continue through the day.

Mr. LADD. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are detained in a hearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

THE MUSCLE SHOALS PROJECT.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me a moment?

Mr. GOODING. I yield.

Mr. LADD. I desire to submit the views of a minority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 227) rejecting bids for the acquisition of Muscle Shoals, which I ask may be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The views of the minority will be printed as part 2 of Report No. 831.

Mr. LADD. The report I have submitted also gives the views of the minority on the bill (S. 3802) authorizing the acceptance of the proposal of Henry Ford for the completion and leasing of the dams and hydroelectric plants at Muscle Shoals, and for the purchase of nitrate plant No. 1, nitrate plant No. 2, the Waco quarry, and the interest of the Government in the Gorgas Warrior River steam plant, all in the State of Alabama, dated May 31, 1922, being the Henry Ford offer for the lease of Muscle Shoals; and the views of the majority of the committee on the bill (S. 3420) to provide for the manufacture of explosives for the use of the Army and Navy, to provide for the manufacture of fertilizer for agricultural purposes, to incorporate the Federal Chemical Corporation, and for other purposes, the so-called Norris Government ownership and operation proposal bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I inquire what was the order just made respecting the report from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD]. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that in this part of the Chamber we were unable to hear what he said.

Mr. LADD. I submitted the report for the minority of the committee on Senate bill 3802 with reference to leasing the Muscle Shoals property to Henry Ford and the majority report on the so-called Norris bill for the completion and operation of Muscle Shoals by the Government. This I did in accordance with permission which was granted a few days ago. I ask that the reports may be printed.

Mr. ROBINSON. I inquire of the Senator if he asked leave to have his report printed separately? That action was taken with respect to the report presented by the chairman of the committee. Several Senators on this side of the Chamber have suggested that the report of the Senator from North Dakota ought also to be printed separately, so that those Senators who desire to circulate that report or make use of it separately from the majority report may have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. LADD. I did not ask it, but I shall make that request at the present time. I ask that unanimous consent be given to print the minority report as a separate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to state that he is informed the Record shows that an order has already been entered for printing both reports.

Mr. ROBINSON. And there was also an order made subsequently for printing the majority report separately. A number of Senators desire that the minority report submitted by the Senator from North Dakota have the same privilege that the majority report had. I called attention, at the time the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] requested the privilege of having the majority report printed separately, to the fact that an order had already been made authorizing the printing of the two reports, the majority and the minority, in conjunction with each other. I now ask, if the Senator from North Dakota has not done so, that the report submitted by the Senator from North Dakota be printed separately.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Pablo, Mont., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of

Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the passage of a protective tariff act based upon American valuations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ASHURST presented resolutions adopted by the joint convention of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association and the Arizona Wool Growers' Association, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association and the Arizona Wool Growers' Association, in joint convention assembled at Prescott, Ariz., on July 7, 1922, That we advocate the passage by Congress of a bill looking to the establishing of a nonpartisan scientific tariff board, based on American production and conversion costs.*

*Resolved further, That a copy hereof be sent to each member of our delegation in Congress and to the National Wool Growers' Association. The foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted at the joint meeting of both associations and also at the annual meeting of the Arizona Wool Growers' Association.*

F. W. PERKINS,  
Secretary of the Arizona Wool Growers' Association.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CAMERON:

A bill (S. 3885) granting an increase of pension to Mathew Cavaness; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 3886) to authorize the closing of a part of Thirty-fourth Place NW., and to change the permanent system of highways plan of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3887) to amend the act of April 16, 1906, relating to the disposition of the proceeds of sales of town lots on reclamation projects; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 3888) to provide for the organization and establishment of stock corporations to engage in foreign trade or commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

#### TARIFF BILL AMENDMENTS.

Mr. SIMMONS (for Mr. KING) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. KING to House bill 7456, the tariff bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES IN UNITED STATES PORTS.

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2391) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

#### FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR CROW.

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 332), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of the Hon. WILLIAM E. CROW, late a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.*

#### INVESTIGATION OF INTERESTS IN TARIFF LEGISLATION.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. GOODING. Will it lead to debate?

Mr. HARRISON. It will lead to no debate. I am merely trying to ascertain the status of Senate Resolution 330. On yesterday the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] very courageously offered a resolution which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with instructions to report it back immediately. It has been some 24 hours since that was done, and the resolution has not yet been reported back. I notice that the chairman of the committee is here, and it may be that he wants to present the report the first thing this morning. It seems to me that under the order of the Senate he should do so before the Senator from Idaho proceeds, if he has the report ready.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, I shall refuse to yield any further or for a report on my resolution. I am quite within my rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho has the floor and will proceed.

#### THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, speaking to the resolution which I introduced yesterday, first I want to say that no man in this country has a higher regard for the press than I have. No citizens have rendered a greater service to the American people than those who edit and control our newspapers.

As a rule, it may be said that the newspaper men of the country are fearless in discussing public questions, keenly interested in advocating those principles which they believe are for the best interests of the people, always ready to safeguard the rights of the people and to protect and defend our principles of government.

I have known cases of heroic service on the part of the press in my own State. During the great murder trials of Haywood, Moyer, and Pettibone the Idaho Statesman courageously and fearlessly defended the State. It will be remembered that ex-Governor Steunenberg was assassinated for his enforcement of law and order when he was Governor of Idaho. Bill Haywood, the greatest criminal this country has ever produced, Moyer, and Pettibone would have paid the full penalty for the assassination of ex-Governor Steunenberg if others connected with the case had shown equal courage during those great murder trials. So I hope that anything I may say at this time will not be construed as a lack of appreciation of the great public press of America.

No citizen in this country, in my judgment, gives so much and gets so little in return as the editor of the country newspaper. I have seen him struggle along for years, making barely a living, and always defending the rights of the community and standing for those things that are for the best interests of the State and the Nation.

I have no quarrel, Mr. President, with the Democratic newspapers that believe that protection is unconstitutional and immoral. The platforms of the Democratic Party for nearly a hundred years have declared protection unconstitutional. They have a right to condemn this tariff bill and say anything they please, of course, so long as they tell the truth about it from their viewpoint. But in all lines of business and all classes of trade, and in society everywhere, there are those who do not measure up to the high standard of their profession, and I care not whether that be the humble and lowly profession of the farmer or what some people call the high profession of journalism. In other words, there are crooks in every trade and in every line of business, and I am convinced that journalism is no exception, although I am going to say that it is only found to a limited extent in journalism, for which the American people are truly thankful.

Mr. President, at first it was hard for me to understand why some of the great newspapers of this country should make such a vicious attack upon some of the members of the so-called agricultural tariff bloc. I was at a loss to understand why the New York Herald should be so bitter in its denunciation and quite willing to destroy a Senator's good name in order to create a prejudice against the tariff bill that is now before the Senate. Their viciousness excited my curiosity, and I concluded to investigate this man Munsey, who has been posing as a great American for so many years.

Mr. Munsey's attitude toward the Republican Party and the present tariff bill and the agricultural bloc is easily understood when his great interest in foreign countries is unmasked, and it will be easy for the Republicans of this country to understand why Mr. Munsey has turned a Democrat and a free trader when the mask is torn off.

Mr. President, last September there was organized in Paris a concern known as the General Real Estate & Trust Co., which was to take over and liquidate the \$400,000,000 estate of Archduke Frederick of Austria and his family.

I ask, Mr. President, that the Secretary may read the following articles, clipped from the New York Herald and cabled from its Paris bureau under date of September 11, 1921, and four articles which appeared in the New York Times on September 12, 13, 14, and 27, 1921, respectively.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

**AMERICANS ACQUIRE \$200,000,000 ESTATE OF ROYAL AUSTRIANS—ARCHDUKE AND SYNDICATE AGREE ON PLAN TO SAVE VAST HOLDINGS IN EUROPE—STATES TO BE SUE—THEY CONFISCATE VALUABLE PROPERTIES IN DEFIANCE OF TREATIES, SAY INVESTORS—FACTORIES TO BE OPENED—UNITED STATES METHODS TO BE APPLIED TO GREAT PROPERTY, INCLUDING STEEL MILLS, PALACES, AND ART MUSEUMS.**  
(Special cable to the New York Herald. Copyright, 1921, by the New York Herald.)

NEW YORK HERALD BUREAU,  
Paris, September 11.

Another chapter of one of the most dramatic and extraordinary episodes arising from the war was closed at a meeting in the drawing room of Samuel Untermyer, of New York, at the Ritz Hotel here yesterday.

What happened at this gathering was a culmination of negotiations between parties which have been meeting for two months in various places in Germany and Austria and in Paris. These were on one part Archduke Frederick, of Austria, and Archduke Albrecht, his son; Archduchess Isabella, his wife, who was Princess Croy, and the six daughters of the archducal family, with their counsel, Dr. Wilhelm Rosenberg, of Vienna, and Dr. Aurel Egry, of Budapest.

On the other side was an American syndicate, represented by Samuel Untermyer, and including such men as Charles H. Sabin, J. Leonard Replogle, Frank A. Munsey, Thomas J. Felder, William A. Honnald, Louis Cheverillon, and their associates.

#### \$200,000,000 ESTATE INVOLVED.

The story concerns the vast estates of the Archduke Frederick, who throughout the war was field marshal and commander in chief of the Austro-Hungarian armies and whose wealth generally was estimated before the war as well above \$200,000,000. From reports current for a year and accentuated in the last few months by meetings at Carlsbad, Kissingen, Vienna, and Paris, but which could not be verified, the facts are:

While the archduke is a member of the Hapsburg family, his lineage and connections extend back still further; also he is uncle of the present King of Spain, Alfonso XIII, whose mother is his sister. Another sister formerly was Queen of Bavaria.

The line goes back to Marie Therese, who reigned from 1740 to 1780. Her eldest daughter, the Archduchess Marie Christine, was married to Duke Albrecht of Saxe-Teschen, who was a member of the Saxonian house. Not having children, they adopted their nephew, Archduke Charles, a brother of Emperor Francis I, who was a grandson of Marie Therese, and who reigned from 1792 to 1835 and who himself had no children.

Charles was commander in chief of the Austrian Army in Austria's wars against Napoleon. It was he who won the Battle of Aspern-Essing in 1819. Archduke Albrecht was the eldest son of Charles, and was born in 1819 and died in 1893. He won the Battle of Kustozza in 1866 in the Austrian war against Sardinia. Albrecht had no children.

The present Archduke Frederick is the son of Albrecht's brother, Charles Ferdinand. The fortune inherited by the present archduke, largely from his uncle Albrecht, was increased by wise investments and returns from new enterprises.

#### ARCHDUKE'S HOLDINGS VARIED.

Prior to the war Archduke Frederick was generally regarded as one of the richest land and industrial owners in Europe. His holdings were distributed throughout Austria-Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, and Italy. They included the world-renowned steel works and mines at Teschen, which is now partly in Czechoslovakia and partly in Poland; vast working forest lands, amounting to hundreds of thousands of acres, scattered over several countries; and numerous other industries, including dairies which supply milk and butter to Vienna; sugar plantations and factories, palaces, apartment houses, and other private properties in Vienna and elsewhere, historic castles in various parts of the Continent, and the great Albertina Museum in Vienna, which is said to contain more valuable art treasures of its kind than any in the world, there being nearly 1,000,000 objects in the collection.

All his properties and art objects were acquired by private enterprise, and the funds of the archducal family were accumulated largely in industries. Its fortune was built essentially on saving and business sagacity. None of it was based on royal gifts or concessions. Before the war it yielded a yearly income in the millions.

At the close of the war the archduke found himself excluded from all of his properties in the countries for which he had fought. Some had been sequestered; others were alleged to have been confiscated, some by the reconstituted old governments and others by new states in whose jurisdiction they were put by peace treaties. This action was based solely on the archduke's almost unrecognizable and untraceable kinship to the ex-sovereign.

In none of these cases, except a small estate in Italy, could it be said that the archduke was the enemy of the country in which his property had been situated. On the contrary, he was the head of armies whose countries are now endeavoring to take away his property.

#### GETS AID OF AMERICANS.

In the summer of 1919 the archduke and his family were living in Switzerland, where he made the acquaintance of Thomas J. Felder, an American living in Paris. The bulk of the archduke's properties were mainly his own, although use of part of them had been for a time impracticable and the operation of various industries was paralyzed by the disorganization of the war.

An arrangement was made in October, 1919, whereby the archduke transferred his various properties and interests, except those in New Hungary, to a corporation organized in Switzerland to take over their administration. Mr. Felder was to form a syndicate in America to acquire substantial interests in the new company. He obtained the required capital, and interested some of the most prominent men in America in the enterprise.

When various governments enacted laws and took other measures to confiscate the properties internal differences arose between the archducal family and the American syndicate, and litigation in the Swiss courts followed. All of these differences have been adjusted by an agreement executed at the Ritz.

The American syndicate will proceed to enforce its rights against several governments which are withholding possession of the estate from the Swiss corporation. The syndicate is particularly anxious to get prompt return of the Teschen works and various lands and other industries, so as to resume their operation and introduce American methods.

#### DEFIANCE OF TREATIES.

Since the territory constituting Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Rumania was taken from the Austro-Hungarian Empire on the distinct treaty stipulations that private properties of citizens and subjects of the one-time Austro-Hungarian Empire could not be confiscated, it is explained by the syndicate and the archducal family that attempted action and laws enacted in these new countries to validate such action are a flagrant violation and defiance of the treaties.

Complaint accordingly is about to be lodged before tribunals established under the peace treaties. The new sovereign states will be required to appear, and the question of the right to confiscate these vast estates will be contested aggressively.

The new states seek to justify their action solely on the ground that the archduke is a member of the royal Hapsburg family, and that confiscation of his property therefore is sanctioned by the treaties. This construction is disputed by the archduke and the syndicate, who contend that the right of confiscation applies only to the state property of the former reigning family and not to the fortunes privately accumulated in industrial enterprises by citizens of the old empire merely because they happen to be members of the Hapsburg family.

#### NEW LAW AFFECTS PALACES.

Attempted confiscation of the Albertina Museum and of the palaces in Vienna likewise will be contested, although the attempted confiscation was based on a new law passed by the Austrian Parliament and predicated on the ground that the Archduke Frederick is a Hapsburg and that these estates are entailed.

Properties in Poland, regarding which that Government has taken no action, and in Rumania doubtless will be retained by the family without litigation in view of recently established precedents in the courts of those countries.

In connection with these contentions and actions of the new states it was pointed out that if they were permitted to confiscate private property put under their jurisdiction, although treaties creating their sovereignty said the owners should not be molested in their property rights, there was no reason why they should not with impunity disregard all the other conditions of the treaties. It is not believed any such action will be sanctioned or tolerated.

Archduke Albrecht refused to confirm, deny, or comment on the story, nor would any of the parties or counsel say anything, except that Mr. Felder admitted the substantial accuracy of the account. He declined to say anything further than that before the syndicate undertook the business it had communicated with the American Department of State and the French authorities and was assured that there was no possible objection to its proposed investment.

New and interesting questions regarding treaty rights and obligations of the new states are involved in the litigations about to be instituted, and developments may be expected soon.

[Special cable to New York Times.]

PARIS, September 11, 1921.—At the Ritz Hotel here yesterday an agreement was signed between representatives of a big American syndicate and the Archduke Frederick of Austria and his family, by which the American syndicate took over the whole of the archduke's estates in the dismembered Austrian Empire.

These estates include the rich steel works and mines at Teschen, vast forests, lands stretching across many miles of several new central European Republics, farms, factories, apartment houses, palaces, castles, and even the celebrated Albertina Museum, in Vienna, in which are housed about 1,000,000 articles of artistic and historical interest. The value of the property is conservatively estimated at \$200,000,000.

In the syndicate which is taking the control of this great and varied property are, it is understood, Charles H. Sabin, J. Leonard Replogle, Frank A. Munsey, Thomas J. Felder, William A. Honnald, and Louis Cheverillon. Their representative here, in whose suite at the Ritz the agreement was signed yesterday, is Samuel Untermyer, of New York.

The negotiations began in the summer of 1919, when Thomas J. Felder, an American whose home is in Paris, approached the archduke, who was then living in Switzerland, to see if any purchase could be made out of his large estates. During the war, it will be remembered, Archduke Frederick was for a time commander in chief of the Austro-Hungarian armies. He is a member of the Hapsburg family, but belongs to a branch which has been for centuries distinct from the reigning house. One of his sisters is the Queen Dowager of Spain and another was the Queen of Bavaria. The archduke himself married Princess Croy, and she, with her son, Archduke Albrecht, and six daughters, were present yesterday at the Ritz Hotel to witness the agreement as to the disposal of the family property.

When Mr. Felder began the negotiations with the archduke the property was mainly in his possession, though some had been sequestered. Between the two an agreement was made in October, 1919, whereby the archduke was to transfer his various properties and interests, except those in Hungary, to a corporation to be organized and which was then organized in Switzerland to take over, and which did take over, the administration of the estates. Mr. Felder further undertook to form a syndicate in America which would acquire substantial interest in the new corporation; and this he succeeded in doing, interesting the men whose names have been mentioned.

A period of trouble, however, shortly afterwards set in for the corporation. On the ground that the archduke was a Hapsburg, the Governments of some of the new Republics in which his properties were located legislated for their confiscation. This action raised difficulties between the archducal family and the American syndicate, which culminated in litigation in the Swiss courts. It was these difficulties and the differences which were ended by the agreement which was signed here yesterday.

The American syndicate has been freed from complications and ambiguities, and its directors now propose to proceed to enforce their rights against the several Governments which are withholding possession of the estates from the Swiss corporation. Especially they are anxious to secure prompt return of the Teschen works and the forests and farm properties so as to resume their operation on American lines.

The ground on which they will claim restoration of the lands is the stipulation in the treaties of peace concerning the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire that the private property of citizens and subjects of the former Empire could not be confiscated by the new States. Under an interpretation of the treaties that will be advanced, it will be claimed that the Governments of the new States are violating their treaties in legislating for the confiscation of the former archduke's estates on the ground that the archduke is a member of the royal family and that his property is therefore liable to confiscation. The interpretation of the treaty in this respect which will be advanced by the syndicate and the archduke is that the right of

confiscation applies only to the State property of the former reigning family and not to private fortunes, such as the estates of the archduke are represented to be.

This legal contest, involving a discussion of the peace treaties between the Governments of the new central European States and the representatives of this purely American syndicate, will be the next step in this interesting attempt by American interests to secure so large a measure of industrial control of central Europe.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1921.

The management of the estate of the Archduke Frederick of Austria and his family, in which a group of American capitalists has obtained an interest, will be operated by the General Real Estate & Trust Co., recently incorporated in Geneva, Switzerland, with a capitalization of \$500,000. Two-thirds of the stock of this company is owned by the Hapsburg family, while one-third is owned by the American syndicate. Rene Viviani, former premier of France, has been retained to obtain a release of the properties which have been confiscated by the various Governments. These details were divulged yesterday by J. Leonard Replogle, who heads the American interests.

Mr. Viviani has been intrusted with the task of bringing the matter before the mixed tribunal of the League of Nations on the ground that the confiscation of some of the estates was a violation of the treaty of St. Germain.

Negotiations for the control of this vast estate started two years ago, when Mr. Replogle, on one of his visits abroad, negotiated with Eugene Schneider, the French steel manufacturer, to obtain an interest in the Bergunhuten steel plant, located at Teschen, Czechoslovakia. This deal went through, and Mr. Replogle is one of the directors of this company. Following this, the parties interested were approached on the matter of taking over additional properties, and finally the deal reached such large proportions that the assistance of other Americans was solicited.

The Teschen steel plant is said to be modern in every detail. It employs approximately 20,000 men at the present time, according to Mr. Replogle, and is operating at about 85 per cent of capacity. It has its own by-product coke ovens, coal mines, bar and plate mills, and, besides, is one of the lowest-cost producers of steel compared with any of the large plants in this country in equipment. Mr. Schneider will continue to operate the plant.

The properties of the Hapsburg family taken over by the General Real Estate & Trust Co. include approximately 1,200,000 acres of land, of which 60,000 acres are in Italy, 120,000 in Rumania, 290,000 in Hungary, 200,000 in Austria, and 200,000 in Czechoslovakia. It includes from 12 to 14 beet-sugar factories, several coal mines, apartment houses in the larger cities of Austria and Hungary, palaces, and the Albertine Museum in Vienna. The value of the art objects in this museum alone is estimated at \$100,000,000. The Hapsburg family before the war was considered among the wealthiest in Europe, comparing with the Czar of Russia and the Rothschilds.

It is the intention of the trust company, which is headed by H. S. Endsley as president, to liquidate the landholdings and other property as soon as possible, but as about 50 per cent of this property has been confiscated by various countries it is believed that realization on them will be a long drawn-out affair. The manufacturing plants, however, will be operated as heretofore by the trust company, which is to be managed by Charles H. Sabin, president of the Guaranty Trust Co. of this city; Mr. Replogle, president of the Vanadium Steel Co.; and Frank A. Munsey. Mr. Endsley was president of the Replogle Steel Co. during its period of reorganization. Rene Viviani is general counsel of the General Real Estate & Trust Co., and Samuel Untermyer represents the American interests.

Associated with Messrs. Sabin, Replogle, and Munsey are Thomas J. Felder, William A. Honnald, Louis Chevrillon, and Dr. Hugh Young, of Johns Hopkins University. Mr. Felder has been interested in the negotiations from the start and was associated with Mr. Replogle in securing an interest in the Bergunhuten steel plant. He is a son-in-law of the late Milton Smith, president of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad.

The investment in the General Real Estate & Trust Co. has been completely financed and there will be no offering of securities either in this country or abroad. The investment is a personal one on behalf of the individuals in the American group. As the holdings of the Hapsburg estate are liquidated by the trust company, dividends will be distributed in proportion to the holdings of the Hapsburg family, which is two-thirds, and to the American syndicate, which is one-third.

Mr. Replogle has made two visits abroad investigating the property, one last year and one this year. The plans call for Mr. Replogle making an annual visit to Europe in behalf of the local syndicate.

SEPTEMBER 14, 1921.

Charles H. Sabin, president of the Guaranty Trust Co., will not be one of the managers of the General Real Estate & Trust Co., which was organized in Geneva, Switzerland, to liquidate the \$400,000,000 estate of the Archduke Frederick of Austria and his family. Mr. Sabin will be one of the partners of the American syndicate associated with J. Leonard Replogle and Frank Munsey.

NEW YORK, September 27, 1921.

Samuel Untermyer, counsel for the American syndicate which obtained a one-third interest in the \$400,000,000 estate of the Archduke Frederick of Austria, branded as false yesterday reports that the archduke and archduchess were dissatisfied with the agreement and had started proceedings to withdraw. The estate is scattered over seven countries and consists of more than 1,000,000 acres of lands, coal mines, steel plants, sugar-beet factories, much improved real estate, including modern apartment houses, and the famous Albertine Museum in Vienna. The American syndicate, which is being managed by J. Leonard Replogle, Charles H. Sabin, and Frank A. Munsey, undertook to liquidate the estate. Mr. Untermyer said, in connection with the report:

"The story is a silly fabrication from beginning to end. There is perfect harmony, sympathy, and understanding between the archducal family and the syndicate. Since I left there, and within the last 10 days, the directors of the trust company that holds the property met in Geneva, and by unanimous vote ratified the contracts that were executed in Paris the day before my departure. The interests are now together working out the many complicated problems involved in the administration of the vast estate, and are in constant and harmonious communication and cooperation to that end. Somebody has fooled Mr. Von Weizsacker, for whom I have a high personal regard, and whose good faith in cabling this foolish yarn I do not doubt."

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, these articles show very plainly why Mr. Munsey has turned his hounds loose on those Senators who are trying to protect American industries and American labor.

With Mr. Munsey's interest in one of the greatest steel plants in the world, employing from twenty to thirty thousand men and running 85 per cent capacity, owning its own iron mines, its own coal mines, and all the rest of the by-products that go into the making of steel, his interest in one and a quarter million acres of forest and fertile lands, his interest in glass factories, pottery plants, 12 or 14 sugar-beet factories, and other industrial institutions in foreign lands, it is not hard to understand why Mr. Munsey has turned his hounds loose on those Senators who are trying to protect American industries and American labor, nor is it strange that he has singled out the members of the tariff bloc of the Senate; for without the steadying influence of the tariff bloc this propaganda that has been going on by Munsey, Goldman, and the international bankers and their kind would have defeated any attempt to pass a protective tariff measure at this session. So I say again to Mr. Munsey and his hounds, let them come on. I will take my chances with the American farmer, the American manufacturer, the American laborer, and the American people, regardless of what occupation they follow, while he hobnobs with royalty and exploits the poorly paid labor of Europe.

No reason is ascribed in any of these articles as to why Mr. Munsey, owner and publisher of these New York papers, should have been selected as one of those to become engaged as a member of this syndicate which holds such vast properties, many of which are producing tremendous quantities of goods which enter into competition of like products of American industries. It may be, in this connection, that it would be well to investigate the well-defined rumors which circulated in Washington, Baltimore, and New York during the years immediately prior to the outbreak of the European War and during the early period of that war.

It was commonly reported in banking circles in those cities, so I am reliably informed, that Mr. Munsey had tremendous holdings of bonds and securities of the Austrian Government. It is a matter of common public knowledge that every year for a number of years previous to the outbreak of the war in Europe Mr. Munsey spent several months at the famous watering places located in the Austrian Empire. In fact, he was married in the Austrian Empire when the war suddenly burst over Europe on August 1, 1914. His automobile was confiscated by the Austrian Government, and other personal property which he had with him was held up. He had considerable difficulty, as did hundreds of other Americans traveling abroad that year, in getting out of Europe, and was put to many inconveniences in so doing.

Although he eventually arrived in this country with a safe skin, Mr. Munsey's Americanism, even at that time, was of such a thin veneer that when he returned home, instead of being thankful for his safe arrival he proceeded to use the editorial columns of his papers to denounce the American Government for being so grossly negligent as to permit so great an American as he to have been inconvenienced and discommoded by a world-wide upheaval.

It was commonly reported in banking circles in 1912, 1913, and 1914 that upon his return from Europe each of those years Mr. Munsey brought with him hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of Austrian Government bonds, part of which he attempted to sell to his friends and part of which he attempted to market to the public through his trust companies located in Washington and Baltimore. A greater part, however, he was supposed to have kept because he regarded them as gilt-edge investments.

Mr. President, I will leave the people to pass upon the action of an American who invested vast sums in foreign properties; who takes the money he earns from American people and places it in factories, mines, farms, and other industries abroad for the purpose of building up foreign countries and adding to their prosperity, while at the same time through exploiting their poorly paid labor he is able to reap extortionate profits; but it is certainly in poor grace for such a one to criticize, through columns of newspapers which he owns, those Americans who have accumulated properties in this country and who have invested what properties they have legitimately earned in American enterprises which build up America.

Mr. President, in view of Mr. Munsey's great newspaper holdings in America and his effort to prejudice public opinion against American legislation in the interest of his foreign investments, the people of the United States have a right to know all the facts relating to Mr. Munsey's foreign holdings in European industries, stocks, bonds, and other securities.

If the Senators who have stood for protection to American industries and American labor are to be blackmailed in the in-

terest of Mr. Munsey's foreign investments, then I want to know about it.

Let us examine further the attitude of the New York Herald. This newspaper is frequently referred to as a Republican newspaper. It has consistently and persistently fought any legislation by this Congress which was in the interests of this country whenever American interests came into conflict with foreign interests. The managing editor of the New York Herald is a Democrat. He was trained and educated in the principles of the Democratic Party by the late Joseph Pulitzer. He spent the greater part of his newspaper career as the managing editor of the New York World. About two years ago Mr. Charles M. Lincoln left the World to direct the policy of the New York Herald for Mr. Munsey. He is now the managing editor of that newspaper. The Washington correspondent of the New York Herald, Mr. Louis Seibold, was, like Mr. Lincoln, schooled in the principles of the Democratic Party by the late Joseph Pulitzer. He was for many years the Washington representative of the New York World. During the past two years he has been in charge of the Washington bureau of the New York Herald.

Thus the two responsible officials of the New York Herald who are in charge of its political news and policies are dyed-in-the-wool Democrats, who have always been and always will be the willing agents of the Democratic Party. I heard with more than passing interest the eulogy passed upon Mr. Seibold on the floor of the Senate the other day by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, who pronounced Mr. Seibold one of the greatest writers in America. This is the opinion of all Democrats. Under the direction of Mr. Seibold and Mr. Lincoln the New York Herald has been definitely aligned against the Republican Party and the Republican administration for more than a year. The tariff is not the only administrative policy which the New York Herald is opposing or has opposed. Through its news and its editorial columns it has persistently, consistently, and most bitterly taken issue with the Republican administration upon all policies. It has not had a Republican impulse since this administration began to exert its influence in public affairs. Senators who quote from the New York Herald, and ascribe to it Republicanism, offer an insult to public intelligence and make a laughing stock of themselves among newspaper men.

The New York Herald is not the only newspaper which is frequently quoted upon the floor as Republican. The record of the Senate proceedings of August 1 shows that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] had inserted a large number of editorials from papers which he labeled Republican. Among them was the New York Evening Post. It is well known that the New York Evening Post for at least a generation has been Democratic. It gained national reputation by its support of Cleveland. It has been critical to a degree of every Republican administration for the last quarter of a century. Under its ownership by Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, of the Morgan banking house, in 1920, it was conspicuous for its support of Mr. Cox, Democratic candidate for President. Since that time Mr. Lamont has disposed of his interest to a syndicate, among which are such distinguished and well-known Democrats as Cleveland H. Dodge, who financed President Wilson's first campaign; Frank Polk, who was Undersecretary of State under the Wilson régime; and other leading Democrats.

Other newspapers are quoted and credited as being Republican which are no more Republican than the New York Evening Post and the New York Herald. A paper's policy is determined not by its ancestry but by the utterances of its editorial columns and the slant of its news columns. In this connection I ask that the Secretary read the following article which appeared in the Boston Herald of July 29, 1922. It was written by Mr. Whiting, the Washington correspondent of the Boston Herald, who contributes to that paper one column of editorial matter a day under his own signature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read, without objection.

The reading clerk read as follows:

KNUTE NELSON, United States Senator from Minnesota, who has been one of the supporting members of IRVING LENROOT'S tariff rebellion in the Senate, could hardly be classed as a rebel by nature. He has had a long political career, in which irregularity has not been conspicuous. He is convinced that the Finance Committee's ideas on the wool tariff, or the ideas which the Finance Committee is supporting, are not good from any reasonable point of view. Thus he joins his voice and vote to those of LENROOT, and thus finds himself one of an aggressive minority among the majority Members of the Senate. NELSON is one of the veterans, both in service and in years, in the Senate. LENROOT is one of the youngsters. NELSON'S support of LENROOT'S position now removes from it any suspicion of brashness. NELSON is a cautious man.

KNUTE NELSON looks so much like a Yankee he ought to be one. Visitors to the Senate gallery often pick him out as a "typical New England Senator." He is short of stature, a trifle roly-poly but not too much so; he wears a short, white chin beard and he shaves his

upper lip. It is this method of treating his whiskerial equipment which gives him his Yankee appearance. He is no Yankee, not even an ex-Yankee, of whom the Middle West and West have many. He has no claim to New England residence or association. He was born in Norway in 1843, but as he came to this country when he was 6 years old he is native enough for all practical purposes. He is a very good American. He went to Chicago first, but by the time he was 7½ years old he reformed and went to Wisconsin. He stuck it out there until 1871, when he moved to Minnesota, thus escaping future political association with BOB LA FOLLETTE; but maybe Wisconsin memories operate to incline him to friendship now with LENROOT, the better exhibit of Wisconsin politics.

New England interest is now drawn, but with little promise of a thrill, to another western Senator, FRANK R. GOODING, of Idaho, also foreign born. Local interest in GOODING is stirred by a letter he wrote to Conrad Hobbs, of Boston, in which he expressed a low opinion of those who import wool. As we interpret the easily interpreted cerebral spasms of the junior Senator from Idaho he believes that those who grow wool on the backs of sheep are of a much higher moral character than those who import it from sheep born, reared, and sheared in an alien country. It is probably the Gooding idea that there is something in the placid and moderate intellectual equipment of sheep which subtly imparts to its human associates an incapacity for evil, a disinclination to sordidness, and a fitness for service in the United States Senate. Thus far Mr. GOODING has not founded a bloc on this basis, but when the sheep are enfranchised he will have it.

FRANK GOODING is a new Senator, who takes himself with an intense seriousness. He was born in England, but left that country in 1867, his parents coming to America and young Frank deeming it expedient to accompany them, being in youth. We do not know what England lost by his migration. Over here we gained a Senator. Young Mr. GOODING was educated in the public schools of that succulently named place, Paw Paw, Mich., thus imbibing through the avenues of scholasticism a sweet regard for the appealing voice of native sheep, whose cry in joy and sorrow manifests an alliteration not dissimilar to that of the Michigan town. At the age of 15, or by other accounts 17, he moved to California, but soon moved again, to Idaho, where he was for many years a contractor for mining companies and where during the past 20 years he has been engaged in the stock and farming business, with the emphasis on the woolies. Few, if any, in Idaho own more sheep than FRANK GOODING. For his sheep, and the hair upon their backs, he would sacrifice every wool merchant in Boston and surrounding territory. Judging by his letter to Mr. Hobbs, he would even sacrifice courtesy.

As accurately as our judgment will allow us to estimate the representation from Idaho in the United States Senate, there is enough statesmanship therein to provide two high-grade Senators. The division, however, is uneven, which is unfortunate for the junior Senator.

The Senate and the wool tariff, however, are not the only things in life. We are reminded by a reader, apropos our recent publication of what has been called the oldest story in the world, that Wendell Phillips in his lecture on the "Lost arts," first delivered in 1837 (Speeches of Wendell Phillips, 1892, p. 371), says:

"There is one story which it is said Washington has related, of a man who went to an inn and asked for a drink from the landlord, who pushed forward a wine glass about half the usual size, and said, 'That glass out of which you are drinking is 40 years old.' 'Well,' said the thirsty traveler, contemplating its diminutive proportions, 'I think it is the smallest thing of its age I ever saw.'"

"That story as told is given as a story of Athens 375 years before Christ was born.

Or, we might add, possessing later information than that available to Wendell Phillips, 2,294 years before the adoption of our own eighteenth amendment.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, I admit the charge contained in this article that I was born in a foreign country under the British flag. The publisher and responsible editor of the Boston Herald is Robert J. O'Brien, a very distinguished and honorable gentleman, but who, as his name indicates, came from foreign-born ancestry of the same country which gave me birth. I now ask the Secretary to read the following article, which appeared in the Boston Herald of June 13, 1922.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

PAPERS TO AID FOREIGN TRADE—AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS COMBINE TO ASSIST FIRMS TO "SELL AMERICA"—OPEN OFFICES IN LONDON AND PARIS.

Announcement of the organization of the Associated American Newspapers brings to public notice the newest and one of the most comprehensive plans yet devised to assist European manufacturers and merchants to develop their business in America through the mediumship of newspaper advertising.

The association has been formed as a result of a constant and growing demand in the American market for European merchandise to make an intensive effort to assist in this market development, and success is assured in advance, as each newspaper member of the association is a tremendous force in its market or selling zone, and the field covered by these newspapers comprises the wealthiest, most populous, most concentrated, and most easily developed markets in the United States.

The Associated American Newspapers comprises the following widely known newspapers: The Boston Herald and Traveler, the Chicago Tribune, the New York Times, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, the Washington Star, the Pittsburgh Post and Sun, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and the Minneapolis Tribune.

Through this association of representative newspapers is placed at the disposal of European advertisers and advertising agents the highest development of newspaper merchandising service to assist European firms in planning to "sell America."

Two European offices already have been established and are now functioning—the London office at 125 Pall Mall SW., in charge of Mortimer Brydams, as representative for Great Britain, and the Paris office at 5 Rue Lamartine, with R. A. Washburn in charge, as representative on the Continent. Both offices are equipped with telephone and cable connections and with every other facility to aid the prospective advertiser in properly preparing his publicity message to the American public.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, evidently the main distinction between Mr. O'Brien and myself is that, although both of

us are of foreign-born ancestry, I am devoting myself to American interests and the protection and development of American industry, while Mr. O'Brien is using his publication, to quote from his paper, "to assist European manufacturers and merchants to develop their business in America," which, of course, must be done, and will be done, at the expense of American manufacturers and American labor.

When the Senate committee undertakes this investigation I shall insist that all the facts relating to Mr. Munsey's foreign investments be probed to the bottom in order that the American people may learn why Mr. Munsey is to-day the champion of foreign industries and the enemy of American industry and labor. The charge of the New York Herald against Members of the Senate is a poor camouflage for the concealment of Mr. Munsey's exploitation of the workers of central Europe and his investments in other foreign industries.

While we are investigating Mr. Munsey, Mr. President, we should also investigate the financial interests of other newspapers, such as the Boston Herald and those which it advertises as its associates in the plan to sell America to European manufacturers and merchants. The newspapers which it lists as engaged in selling America to foreign manufacturers and merchants compose those which have been most critical of the pending protective tariff bill, namely, the Chicago Tribune, the New York Times, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and the Minneapolis Tribune. Let us ascertain, Mr. President, why these publications are so interested in the defeat of a protective tariff.

Let us settle for all time whether it is a crime to stand for the protection of American industries, but a virtue and an exhibition of patriotism to work for the destruction of American industry.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to say a word?

Mr. GOODING. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I happened to hear what the Senator said in regard to Mr. O'Brien, editor of the Boston Herald. I merely wish to say, in justice to Mr. O'Brien, that he was born in this country and is a graduate of Harvard. He was educated here and is as good an American as I know, although I differ with him on some tariff points, no doubt.

Mr. GOODING. My statement was that he was of foreign ancestry, the same as myself.

Mr. LODGE. We are all of foreign ancestry if we go back far enough.

Mr. GOODING. I understand that.

Continual reference is made upon the floor of the Senate that manufacturers, farmers, and others who have investments have no right to advocate a measure which would afford protection to those investments. A great deal has been said regarding the selfishness of those who are interested in the passage of a protective tariff bill as a whole. What I propose to do by my resolution is to investigate the selfishness of those who would profit by the defeat of proposed schedules and who would put large sums of money into their pocket by the defeat of the tariff bill as a whole. I do not make the charge that Members of this body have voted for the defeat of rates proposed by the Senate Finance Committee because by defeating the rates they would profit greatly thereby. But I ask the question whether or not Members of this body have not voted against protective rates because they were stockholders in corporations that wished the defeat of such rates? I ask the question whether there are not Members of this body who are heavily interested in newspapers who have indicated their opposition to proposed tariff rates on print paper and wood pulp because it is to their financial interests to do so?

If it is a crime for a United States Senator to vote for protection because he might safeguard his own investments it is also a crime for a United States Senator to vote for free trade or a smaller measure of protection in order that he may protect his investments. You can not make fish of one and fowl of the other.

I am willing to be judged by the same standard by which other Senators are judged. If it has become a crime in the United States for a man with property and investments in this country to seek public office and sit in legislative halls, then we have reached the level of Russia. If it is a misdemeanor and a violation of public ethics and morals for those who have accumulated something to assist in framing legislation, then I am willing, along with other Senators in this body who own property and have investments, to resign.

Let us walk out together who are in that class and leave the Senate in the hands of those who are without property. That is what happened in Russia. One of the provisions of the Bolshevik constitution is that in the Soviet government no man who owns property is permitted to vote or hold office. The

whole world is witnessing the result of such a policy. But if it is the judgment of this Senate that a man can not legislate honestly because he has property that may be favorably affected by such legislation I am willing, along with all other Senators who have property and investments, to step down and out and let the people send those who are without property to legislate for them.

But, Mr. President, whether I remain in the United States Senate or depart from it, I for one intend to continue for the rest of my life to fight for the protection of American people, for the protection of American industry and American labor, for the men and women of this country who believe that our prosperity depends upon our ability as a people and a nation to secure and protect the rights of property and to maintain a living wage and constant employment for the working people of the United States. Mr. Munsey and his associates may continue to be the enemies of American manufacture, the American farmer, and American labor. He and his mouthpiece upon the floor of this Senate may continue to denounce those of us who own property, but that will not deter me from continuing my fight for American rights, American standards, and the American Nation.

Mr. President, I have here a statement of the investment of American bankers in foreign government bonds, foreign railroads, and other foreign industries. It shows that the American bankers have invested in Europe since the World War \$1,530,400,000. This statement gives the rate of interest, it being in some cases 8 per cent. Such loans have been made in practically every country on earth. I ask that the statement may be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement referred to is as follows:

*Partial list of loans to foreign governments; foreign municipal bonds; industrial, steamship, and railway bonds, made by American bankers and floated in the United States since the war.*

(Totals by years.)

FOREIGN GOVERNMENT LOANS.

European countries:		
1919	-----	\$305,000,000
1920	-----	254,000,000
1921	-----	144,800,000
1922	-----	69,000,000
South America:		
1921	-----	171,500,000
1922	-----	78,000,000
Canada:		
1919	-----	65,000,000
1921	-----	6,000,000
1922	-----	106,000,000
		\$1,199,900,000
Queensland and Dutch East Indies:		
1921	-----	12,000,000
1922	-----	110,000,000
		122,000,000

FOREIGN MUNICIPAL BONDS.

European countries:		
1919	-----	\$60,000,000
1920	-----	21,000,000
1921	-----	6,000,000
1922	-----	7,500,000
South America:		
1919	-----	8,500,000
1921	-----	3,500,000
1922	-----	23,000,000
		\$129,500,000

INDUSTRIAL, STEAMSHIP, AND RAILWAY BONDS.

European countries:		
1922	-----	\$75,000,000
South America:		
1922	-----	4,000,000
		79,000,000

Grand total..... 1,530,400,000

*Industrial, steamship, and railway bonds.*

Name.	Country.	Date and maturity.	Rate.	Amount.
<b>EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.</b>				
French-American Industrial Development Corporation (Steel Works).	France.....	Jan. 1, 1922-1942...	Per ct. 7½	\$10,000,000
Paris-Mediterranean Railroad Co.	.....do.....	Feb. 15, 1922-Aug. 15, 1958.	6	40,000,000
United States Steamship Co. (Ltd.).	Scandinavia...	May 1, 1922-1937...	6	5,000,000
Holland-America Line....	Holland.....	May 1, 1922-1947..	6	18,000,000
Anton Jurgens United Margarine Works.	.....do.....	June 1, 1922-July 1, 1947.	6	12,000,000
Tota.....				75,000,000
<b>SOUTH AMERICA.</b>				
Paulista Railway Co.....	Brazil.....	Mar. 15, 1922-1942.	7	4,000,000

Approximately.

Foreign government (including departmental) loans.

Country.	Date and maturity.	Rate.	Amount.
EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.			
Swedish Government	June 15, 1919-1939	Per ct. 6	\$25,000,000
Switzerland	Aug. 1, 1919-1929	5½	30,000,000
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland	Nov. 1, 1919 (\$101,620,900 due Nov. 1, 1922; \$148,379,100 due Aug. 1, 1929)	5½	250,000,000
Belgium	Jan. 1, 1920-1925	6	18,600,000
Italy	Feb. 1, 1920-1925	6½	25,000,000
Belgium	June 1, 1920-1945	7½	46,000,000
Switzerland	July 1, 1920-1940	8	25,000,000
French Republic	Sept. 15, 1920-1945	8	95,000,000
Norway	Oct. 1, 1920-1940	8	20,000,000
Denmark	Oct. 15, 1920-1945	8	25,000,000
Belgium	Feb. 1, 1921-1941	8	30,000,000
Danish consolidated municipal loan	Feb. 1, 1921-1945	8	14,800,000
French Republic	June 1, 1921-1941	7½	100,000,000
Denmark	Jan. 1, 1922-1942	6	30,000,000
Department of the Seine (France)	Jan. 14, 1922-1942	7	25,000,000
Czecho-Slovak Republic	Apr. 1, 1922-1951	8	14,000,000
Yugoslavia	May 1, 1922-1962	8	25,000,000
			798,400,000
Queensland (Australia)	Oct. 1, 1921-1941	7	12,000,000
Dutch East Indies	Jan. 1, 1922-1947	6	40,000,000
Queensland (Australia)	Feb. 15, 1922-1947	6	10,000,000
Dutch East Indies	Mar. 1, 1922-1962	6	60,000,000
Total			122,000,000
SOUTH AMERICA.			
Chile	Feb. 1, 1921-1941	8	\$24,000,000
State of Sao Paulo (Brazil)	Mar. 14, 1921-Jan. 1, 1936	8	10,000,000
Brazil	June 1, 1921-1941	8	50,000,000
Uruguay	Aug. 1, 1921-1946	8	7,500,000
Argentine Republic	Oct. 1, 1921-1923	7	50,000,000
Chile	Oct. 1, 1921-1926	8	9,500,000
Rio Grande do Sul (Brazil)	Oct. 1, 1921-1946	8	10,000,000
Chile	Nov. 1, 1921-1946	8	10,500,000
Argentine Republic	Feb. 1, 1922-1927	7	27,000,000
Brazil (Coffee Loan)	Apr. 1, 1922-1952	7½	2,000,000
Bolivia	May 1, 1922-1947	8	24,000,000
Brazil (Central Railway Electrification Loan)	June 1, 1922-1952	7	25,000,000
Total			249,500,000
CANADA.			
Newfoundland	June 1, 1919-July 1, 1939	5½	\$5,000,000
Dominion of Canada	Aug. 1, 1919-1929	5½	60,000,000
Newfoundland	June 1, 1921-June 30, 1936	6½	6,000,000
Newfoundland	Mar. 1, 1922-July, 1942	5½	6,000,000
Dominion of Canada	May 1, 1922-1952	5	100,000,000
Total			177,000,000

Foreign municipal bonds.

City.	Country.	Date and maturity.	Rate.	Amount.
EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.				
Copenhagen	Denmark	July 1, 1919-1944	Per ct. 5½	\$15,000,000
Bordeaux	France	Nov. 1, 1919-1934	6	15,000,000
Lyons	do	do	6	15,000,000
Marseille	do	do	6	15,000,000
Christiana	Norway	Oct. 1, 1920-1945	8	5,000,000
Zurich	Switzerland	Oct. 15, 1920-1945	8	6,000,000
Berne	do	Nov. 1, 1920-1945	8	6,000,000
Bergen	Norway	do	8	4,000,000
Soissons	France	Nov. 14, 1921-1936	6	6,000,000
Prague (Greater City)	Czechoslovakia	May 1, 1922-1952	7½	7,500,000
				94,500,000
SOUTH AMERICA.				
Sao Paulo	Brazil	Nov. 1, 1919-1943	6	8,500,000
Porto Alegre	do	Dec. 1, 1921-1961	8	3,500,000
Sao Paulo (City)	do	Mar. 1, 1922-1952	8	4,000,000
Rio de Janeiro	do	Apr. 1, 1922-1947	8	13,000,000
Montevideo	Uruguay	June 1, 1922-1952	7	6,000,000
				35,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Approximately.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, for more than two years now the international bankers of this country, who have loaned a billion and a half dollars to foreign countries have, through public speakers and the press, been making a campaign against the pending tariff bill. Statements have been made to the effect that this is no time to enact a new tariff act; that economic and industrial conditions throughout the world are upset. For that reason they have indulged, all over this country, in a propa-

ganda of denunciation of the pending tariff bill and opposed its passage at this time as a protective tariff measure. The time will never come when these international bankers will favor a protective tariff measure. They are internationalists and have lost interest in America.

I am wondering, Mr. President, if Senators on this side of the Chamber have forgotten how bitterly the Democrats denounced the emergency tariff bill. How well I remember the statements of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. He insisted that we were handing the farmer "a gold brick." In a voice full of throbs, with crocodile tears apparently streaming down his cheeks, he said, "The farmer asked you for bread, and you gave him a stone." The little Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]—little in stature only, but a giant in intellect—followed a day or two afterwards with exactly the same words. After working himself up to a pitch of excitement, as he does when he is in earnest, of course, he said, "The farmer asked you for bread, and you gave him a stone."

Now, Mr. President, all at once that stone is turned into gold. For the first time, to my knowledge at least, we have had the admission by the Democratic Party that a protective tariff law has benefited the American farmer. Through their hypocritical policy on the tariff they have always denounced every protective tariff measure. The junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] only a few weeks ago was so sure that no farmer had been benefited by the emergency tariff law that he introduced a resolution demanding a report from the Tariff Commission as to the benefits accruing from the operation of the emergency tariff act. That report, like almost every other report that comes from the Tariff Commission, did not announce any definite conclusion except along certain lines.

Now, Mr. President, after ridiculing and almost insulting the Senators on this side who voted for the emergency tariff bill, Democratic Senators propose to investigate in order to ascertain how many millions of dollars certain Senators may have made out of it.

It is true, Mr. President, that the emergency tariff law has proven a blessing to the American farmer. Every protective tariff law has always brought prosperity and happiness to the American people, while every free trade measure which has ever been passed by the Democratic Party has brought ruin, disaster, poverty, suffering, and distress, and soup houses in all the great cities, and even the farmers have not escaped the universal cataclysm.

Let us see about this. Who may vote for a protective tariff measure under the doctrine now promulgated? I agree with the great Jeffersonian principle that a man should not vote for any measure from which he is to be benefited if it be special legislation; but protection has been a great principle of the American people from the very foundation of this Government.

The first law to be enacted by our Congress was a protective tariff measure. Jefferson lived and died a great protectionist. Who may properly vote for a protective tariff measure or for any measure, if you please, or for any revenue law? Every man is benefited in some way or other; it can not be otherwise. There can not be any legislation if Senators are to be debarred from voting for legislation which means prosperity to the American people. Under that policy a farmer could not sit in this body and vote for an appropriation for agriculture, for he might be growing cotton, and the Government spends millions of dollars in trying to destroy the boll weevil. If a Senator owned live stock he could not vote for an appropriation for agriculture, for the Government spends millions of dollars in eradicating contagious diseases among live stock.

I have here a list of agricultural products which our Democratic friends put on the free list for the farmer. I will read the list and I will ask Senators on the other side how they are going to vote on the pending bill?

First, however, let me say that the Democratic Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] yesterday refused to vote on the question of wood pulp; but in looking up their record I find that they did not hesitate to vote for the bill of 1913. It is not on the schedule which may be under consideration or which finally becomes a part of the law where a Senator's vote counts so much, but it is the final vote that he casts on the bill. That is what Mr. Jefferson had reference to. Yet these Senators, though they were interested in newspapers, voted for the tariff bill of 1913, which put wood pulp on the free list. Oh, they almost made hypocrites out of themselves in the eyes of every honest man.

When was this new-found virtue called to their attention? Not until the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] introduced a resolution to investigate a few woolgrowers be-

cause they had voted for a duty—an honest duty—on the product of the woolgrowers of this country. I presume those Senators, in order to be consistent, will vote against the pending bill before they get through. They are two great Senators, I may say, too. But it is strange, Mr. President, when great men such as we have in this body—and I say that in all seriousness and earnestness—can permit themselves to be carried so far and to do such ridiculous things in the interest of dirty politics. Dirty politics never won anything for any political party. That is all there is to this matter.

Here is the article of wheat. The Underwood-Simmons law put wheat on the free list, while the rate of duty proposed to be imposed on wheat in the pending Senate committee bill is 30 cents per bushel, and the equivalent ad valorem duty is 28 per cent. Of course, the doctrine which is sought to be invoked is an attack on the American farmer, and the American farmer accepts it as an attack on him. No farmer can sit in this body and, I think, no property holder can sit in this body and vote for any revenue law, I care not what that law may be, whether it is a tariff law or an internal-tax law or any other kind of law, if the doctrine now promulgated shall be upheld.

But let me proceed with the wheat story. If there is a Senator here who owns land and grows wheat he can not vote for the proposed duty on wheat, if the Democratic position is correct. If there is a Senator who eats bread, he can not vote for the duty on wheat or vote against it, because he would be voting in his own interest and in favor of cheaper bread. So the interest is both ways. Senators vote against protection because they believe at times, at least, such action will tend to make food products cheaper. They tell the laboring man—

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. GOODING. I do not think I desire to be interrupted at this point. They tell the American laboring man in this country how much the articles that go on the breakfast table are going to be increased in price, and then they go to the American farmer and tell him that the tariff was a gold brick; that it never did benefit him; that protection is of no benefit to him at all. Years in the past when there was no communication in this country, they always played a double tariff game; they advocated free trade in the South and protection in the North. They have never been honest in discussing the question before the American people. That is why I was so keenly interested in having the minority leader fairly and squarely—and he is always fair and square—say that he believed protection was unconstitutional and that he would go further and say it is immoral or morally wrong. I want to see this issue squarely drawn. Let us go before the American people and fight it out, because it is the greatest crime possible to conceive of or to think of that the great business interests of the American people must continue to be made the football for the selfishness of political parties. I ask again, how is any Senator going to vote for free wheat, if he eats bread?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, does the Senator ask that as a question?

Mr. GOODING. No; not at this point. There will be plenty to follow, and the Senator will have an ample chance before I get through to express his views.

I wish to read from the free list under the present Democratic tariff law and show what a friend the Democratic Party is to the farmer.

Under the Underwood law corn is on the free list. The Republican Party have imposed a duty of 20 cents a bushel on corn, which is equivalent to an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent. Under the Underwood law eggs are on the free list, while in the bill pending before the Senate a duty of 8 cents a dozen is imposed, the equivalent ad valorem duty being 33 per cent. Buckwheat is on the free list under the present law, while a duty of 10 cents a hundred pounds is provided in the bill as reported to the Senate. Cotton is on the free list in the present law, while on long-staple cotton a duty of 7 cents a pound is provided in the Senate committee bill. Beef is on the free list in the Underwood law, but in the bill now pending before the Senate there is a duty proposed of 3½ cents a pound. Veal is on the free list in the Underwood law, but the pending bill provides for a duty of 3½ cents a pound. Mutton is on the free list in the Underwood law, and is to bear a rate of 2½ cents a pound under the pending bill. Lamb is on the free list under the Underwood law, but bears a duty of 5 cents a pound under the pending bill. Pork is on the free list under the Underwood law, while a duty of three-fourths of 1 cent a pound is provided in the pending measure. Bacon is on the free list in the Underwood law, while in the bill now pending

a duty of 2 cents a pound is provided. Ham is on the free list in the Underwood law, while under the pending bill a protective duty of 2 cents a pound is imposed. In the Underwood-Simmons law wool is on the free list, while under the pending bill a duty of 33 cents a pound on the scoured content has been provided. Milk was on the free list in the Underwood law, while the pending bill proposes a duty of 2½ cents a pound. Potatoes are on the free list in the Underwood law, while a protective duty of 58 cents a hundred is given in the bill now pending before the Senate. Cream is on the free list in the Underwood law, and a duty of 22½ cents a gallon is provided by the pending bill. Flax is on the free list in the Underwood law, while a duty of a cent a pound is imposed in the Finance Committee bill. Hides are on the free list in the Underwood law. We have not as yet reached the paragraph dealing with hides in the pending bill, but it is to be hoped that the Republicans on this side of the Chamber will, as they have all the way through so far as agriculture interests are concerned, provide a sufficient duty on hides. Let us try to develop the several branches of agriculture which are not developed up to the requirements of the American people. Unless we do develop them, unless we pick out and seek out all of those industries which are not developed up to the requirements of this country, we will never find employment for the three and a half million men who are now out of employment, although it is midsummer with the harvest in full swing.

Let Mr. Munsey and his people have their way and defeat this tariff measure and you will have six or eight million people out of employment when the winter comes, and nothing can save us.

Lard is on the free list in the Underwood bill. It carries a duty of 1 cent a pound in the Senate bill.

Rye is on the free list in the Underwood bill. It carries a duty of 15 cents a bushel in the Senate bill.

Swine are on the free list in the Underwood bill. In the Senate bill they have a duty of one-half cent a pound.

Sheep are on the free list in the Underwood bill. They are dutiable at \$2 a head in the Republican protective tariff measure.

Soya beans are free in the Underwood bill. There is a very small duty, I am sorry to say, on soya beans in the Finance Committee bill—four-tenths of a cent a pound. I have some information that I want to turn in to the committee with the hope that they will reconsider that duty. The raising of soya beans is becoming a great industry in America, and it is vitally needed in the interest of bringing back the fertility of the soil.

When we get down to rice, we find that the Underwood bill has a duty of three-eighths of a cent a pound on rough rice, equal to 4 per cent ad valorem duty. The Republican protective tariff bill has a duty of a cent a pound on rough rice.

Straw has a duty of 50 cents a ton in the Underwood bill, an equivalent ad valorem duty of 5 per cent. In the Senate Finance Committee bill it has a duty of \$1.50 a ton.

Oats have a duty of 6 cents a bushel in the Underwood bill, an equivalent ad valorem duty of 16 per cent. In the Senate bill they have a duty of 15 cents a bushel, an equivalent ad valorem duty of 39 per cent.

Flaxseed carries a duty of 20 cents a bushel in the Underwood bill, an equivalent ad valorem duty of 11 per cent. In the Finance Committee bill flaxseed has a duty of 40 cents a bushel, an ad valorem duty of 22 per cent.

Honey has a duty of 10 cents a gallon in the Underwood bill, an equivalent ad valorem duty of 8 per cent. In the Finance Committee bill it carries a duty of 3 cents a pound, or 27 per cent ad valorem duty.

Hops are dutiable at 16 cents a pound in the Underwood bill; 24 cents a pound in the Finance Committee bill.

Peanuts are dutiable at three-eighths of 1 cent a pound in the Underwood bill; 3 cents a pound in the bill before the Senate.

Barley carries a duty of 15 cents a bushel in the Underwood bill, an equivalent ad valorem duty of 30 per cent. This is the highest duty given to any farm product in the Underwood bill.

I am not going to take up the time of the Senate by reviewing at greater length this remarkable showing of the generous impulse that the Democratic Party must have felt toward agriculture when they gave it the magnificent protection of a little better than 4 per cent ad valorem duty on farm products, 250 per cent lower than any Democratic free-trade measure ever gave to the farmers of the country.

I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks the table to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the table referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Article.	Rate in Underwood law.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Rate in Senate bill.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Rate in Fordney bill.
Wheat.....	Free.....	Free.....	30 cents bushel	28	25 cents bushel.
Corn.....	do.....	do.....	20 cents bushel	25	15 cents bushel.
Eggs.....	do.....	do.....	8 cents dozen.	33	6 cents dozen.
Buckwheat.....	do.....	do.....	10 cents hundredweight.	30	30 cents hundredweight.
Cotton.....	do.....	do.....	7 cents pound (long staple).	30	Free.
Beef.....	do.....	do.....	34 cents pound	22	2 cents pound.
Veal.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	22	Do.
Mutton.....	do.....	do.....	24 cents pound	25	1 1/2 cents pound.
Lamb.....	do.....	do.....	5 cents pound.	27	2 cents pound.
Pork.....	do.....	do.....	2 cent pound.	10	1/2 cent pound.
Bacon.....	do.....	do.....	2 cents pound.	20	2 cents pound.
Ham.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	10	Do.
Wool.....	do.....	do.....	33 cents pound	28	25 cents pound, not to exceed 35 per cent ad valorem.
Milk.....	do.....	do.....	21 cents pound	10	1 cent gallon.
Potatoes.....	do.....	do.....	58 cents hundredweight.	37	42 cents hundredweight.
Cream.....	do.....	do.....	22 1/2 cents gallon	6	5 to 10 cents gallon.
Flax.....	do.....	do.....	1 cent pound.	1	1 cent pound.
Hides, cattle.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Free.	Free.
Lard.....	do.....	do.....	1 cent pound.	1	1 cent pound.
Rye.....	do.....	do.....	15 cents bushel	20	10 cents bushel.
Cattle.....	do.....	do.....	1 1/2 to 2 cents pound.	20 to 30	1 to 1 1/2 cents pound.
Swine.....	do.....	do.....	1/2 cent pound.	10	1/2 cent pound.
Sheep.....	do.....	do.....	\$2 per head.	33	1 cent pound.
Skins, raw.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Free.	Free.
Soy beans.....	do.....	do.....	1 cent pound.	17	1 1/2 cents.
Poultry.....	1 cent pound.	3 per cent.	6 cents pound.	12	1 cent pound.
Rice, rough.....	1/2 cent pound.	4.24 per cent.	1 cent pound.	12	Do.
Hay.....	\$2 ton	7 per cent.	\$3 ton	10	\$4 ton.
Straw.....	50 cents ton.	5 per cent.	\$1.50 ton	15	\$1 ton.
Oats.....	6 cents bushel.	16 per cent.	15 cents bushel	39	10 cents bushel.
Flaxseed.....	20 cents bushel.	11 per cent.	40 cents bushel	22	25 cents bushel.
Onions.....	do.....	8 per cent.	1 cent pound.	20	75 cents hundredweight.
Honey.....	10 cents gallon.	do.....	3 cents pound.	27	2 1/2 cents pound.
Hops.....	18 cents pound.	26 per cent.	24 cents pound	39	24 cents pound.
Peanuts, unshelled.....	1/2 cent pound.	4.22 per cent.	3 cents pound.	30	3 cents pound.
Barley.....	15 cents bushel.	30 per cent.	20 cents bushel	40	15 cents bushel.
Apples.....	10 cents bushel.	9.6 per cent.	30 cents bushel	30	25 cents bushel.
Beans.....	25 cents bushel.	8 per cent.	2 cents pound.	33	1 1/2 cents pound.
Beets.....	5 per cent.	5 per cent.	17 per cent.	17	17 per cent.
Horses and mules.....	10 per cent.	10 per cent.	20 per cent.	20	20 per cent.
Butter.....	2 1/2 cents pound.	6 1/2 per cent.	8 cents pound.	25	8 cents pound.
Eggs, dried.....	10 cents pound.	20 per cent.	18 cents pound	30	15 cents pound.
Eggs, frozen.....	2 cents pound.	7 per cent.	6 cents pound.	17	4 cents pound.
Grapes.....	25 cents cubic foot.	2 per cent.	25 cents cubic foot.	2	25 cents cubic foot.
Raisins.....	2 cents pound.	11 per cent.	24 cents pound	17	2 cents pound

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, the cardinal principle of the Republican Party has been protection to American industry. If there is one thing that we have advocated more than any other, it is a tariff which shall represent the honest difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. Experts of the Tariff Commission have found that 33 cents is not the honest difference in the cost of producing a pound of scoured wool in America and a pound of scoured wool in the Argentine, and yet I am to be blackmailed and denounced as a criminal for voting for a principle that the Republican Party has advocated since its birth. The experts of the Tariff Commission find that it costs 34.4 cents a pound more to grow a pound of wool in America than it does in the Argentine. There are 700,000 wool-growers in America; and if a Senator from an agricultural State can not come here and vote and plead for protection for the American farmer, we may as well have a soviet government, and then we will have nothing better than they have over in Russia to-day, where they are destroying womanhood and motherhood and Christianity—everything that is worth living for, everything that is worth fighting for, and everything that is worth dying for.

Come on with your investigations. I want the report of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. No honest man in the Senate ought to fear an investi-

gation, and I think they are all honest. I have not found any crooks in the United States Senate. I have a very high regard for the Members of this body; but I do think it is unfortunate, just for the dirty politics that is played to too great an extent in this country, that Senators will go so far as to question the honesty of Members of this body in charging that they have not any right to vote for protection to the industries of their States.

If I had done anything less than I have done in this body in the way of fighting for protection for the industries of my State, I would not be worthy of representing the great Commonwealth of Idaho. I think every member of the Finance Committee will bear me out in the statement that I have said less and done less for protection on wool before the Finance Committee than for any other one of the important agricultural industries. Again, I want to say that the hardest fight I have made before the committee—and I am still fighting for it—is for protection to vegetable oils, of vital interest to the cotton growers of the South, and I never saw a cotton plant growing in my life. Not only have I fought for protection for vegetable oils, but for protection for the dairy interests of this country. I have taken up a great deal more of the time of the committee in pleading and asking for protection to that great industry than for protection to any other. So I ask for the report, Mr. President, on my resolution.

Mr. HARRISON obtained the floor.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CALDER. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution No. 330, which provided for an investigation of certain charges appearing in the press reflecting upon Members of that body, reports the same back adversely and recommends that it do not pass.

The majority of the committee believes that the Senators referred to in these publications are men of integrity, whose votes in this body have never been influenced by any improper motive. All of them have frankly stated on the floor of the Senate their interest in the tariff bill under consideration, and the committee is of the opinion that the investigation would fail in bringing to light any additional information. The inquiry would take the time of Members of this body, and would cost a large sum of money, resulting in no benefit to the country.

Speaking for myself, I regret the intimation in the resolution that Frank A. Munsey, the owner of the New York Herald, was influenced in his opposition to the tariff bill because of some personal interest he may have in its defeat. I do not agree with Mr. Munsey in his position on this measure, but I am confident that his opposition to it is based upon what he believes to be in the best interest of the country. Mr. Munsey is one of the Nation's representative citizens, and I trust when the bill is finally passed, and all of its provisions are understood, he will come to believe that he was mistaken in his position toward it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat? I understand, then, in view of the utterances of the Senator, that the committee in making an unfavorable report upon this resolution repudiates the charges that were made by the Senator from Idaho as to the allegations of the Herald and other newspapers of the country?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is not going into that question. The majority of the committee reports the resolution adversely. The Senate can do as it wishes with it.

Mr. HARRISON. But I understood the Senator to say that the committee to which this resolution was referred does not believe that there is any foundation for the charges that were made in the Gooding resolution.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the committee does not go into that at all. The committee reports the resolution adversely.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I have the floor, I believe.

Mr. GOODING. Will the Senator yield to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I think the Senator from Idaho is entitled to a quorum while this matter is being discussed. I yield for that purpose, but I do not want to lose my right to continue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	McCormick	Ransdell
Ball	Glass	McCumber	Robinson
Borah	Gooding	McKlaley	Sheppard
Broussard	Hale	McLean	Shortridge
Bursum	Harrell	McNary	Simmons
Calder	Harrison	Myers	Smoot
Cameron	Heflin	Nelson	Spencer
Capper	Hitchcock	New	Stanfield
Caraway	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Stanley
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Nicholson	Sterling
Cummins	Kendrick	Oddie	Trammell
Curtis	Keys	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Ladd	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Dillingham	Lenroot	Phipps	Watson, Ind.
Ernst	Lodge	Pomerene	Willis

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HARRISON. The action of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in making an unfavorable report on this Gooding resolution is perhaps without precedent in this body. I am quite sure that not only did it stun the Senator from Idaho, whose integrity has been challenged, but it no doubt bewildered other Senators, even those on the other side of the aisle.

A Member of this body says, in his capacity as a Senator, that certain charges against him and his colleagues are false, charges which have been published in the public print from one end of this country to the other, to the effect that they are interested in wool, interested in sheep, interested in chemicals, interested in mines, interested in oils, and because of their interest in those investments and various things which are manufactured or produced in this country that they are championing high rates against the interests of the American people.

So the Senator from Idaho, in order at least to remove that stain upon his character and the fair name of his State, and the names of other States whose Senators have been likewise charged, offers this resolution, and asks simply that five of his colleagues be appointed to make an investigation of the matter. Now, we find the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate reporting unfavorably upon the resolution and asking the Senate to adopt that report which would deny the investigation, and in the same report the chairman defends a certain publisher of his own city. That is strange politics, indeed.

What is there behind all this that moves Senators? The resolution of the Senator from Idaho in simple language makes this charge, which a committee composed of his colleagues, for the most part of the same political faith he holds, turns down. The resolution reads:

Whereas charges have been made by the New York Herald that Members of the Senate engaged in the sheep industry have thereby been financially interested in the wool schedule of the pending tariff bill—

Then there are other whereases, and it continues:

Resolved, That the financial interests of Senators in the wool and sheep industries be investigated.

For what purpose? So that they can lay the facts on the table and remove whatever impression may have been wrongly created, and which has been charged in the public press. It has not been confined to any one paper. The New York Herald is not alone in saying, in its editorial columns, that Senators, in order to promote their own private welfare—add to their own pocketbooks—entered into this agreement to have their colleagues unite in the imposition of these high rates on wool.

I have before me a paper from even as far away as the mountains of the "Volunteer" State, an editorial in which makes similar charges. With such charges as these made, which no doubt the Senator from Idaho has read, I submit that he and his colleagues are entitled to an investigation that the country may know the real facts. Perhaps the committee which considered this resolution, from which the Senator from Idaho pleads for a favorable report thereon, did not see even in a Nashville paper such charges as this:

Under a Salt Lake City date line appeared this item:  
"The Shoshone, Idaho, wool clip has been sold by a pool, headed by Senator FRANK B. GOODING and his brother, at an average price of 30 cents a pound, to the B. Harris Wool Co., of St. Louis and Salt Lake City. The clip consisted of 1,000,000 pounds. The prices paid are more than 100 per cent higher than last year, it was stated."

Last year was when the emergency tariff bill was passed by the Congress. With such allegations as that in the public press, confined to no city or no State, which people by the millions have read, not only about the Senator from Idaho but other Senators; with common rumor afloat in every hamlet and village in this land, I submit that the Senator from Idaho is entitled to a favorable report on this resolution.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I will not yield just for the present. I want to get through with this proposition. Then, when I have finished, I will be glad to yield for any question.

The Senator from New York submitted this report; and my information is that only a majority of the committee joined in this unfavorable report. The Democratic member of that committee is the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES]. I will ask the Senator from New York if the Senator from New Mexico did not vote to report the resolution favorably?

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from New Mexico indicated his willingness to have it reported favorably.

Mr. HARRISON. The two Republican members of that committee, or all the Republican members of the committee who were consulted, agreed to report it out unfavorably; in other words, to quash it, to smother it, to kill it, so that the reports which are rampant throughout the country can not be verified or disproved to the people, and the fair names of the Senator from Idaho and others, as well as of the States they represent in part, can not be cleansed.

So the Republican members of this committee, to which the resolution was referred, ask the other side of the Chamber, as well as this side, to kill the resolution, to strangle it, not to let this investigation come about. I say it is unprecedented in the whole history of the United States Senate.

Of course the resolution was not exactly fair to all parties concerned. It did ask for an investigation as to charges touching certain Senators having interests in wool and sheep who have voted for these high rates, which necessarily impose greater burdens upon every person in the country who uses or needs woolen clothes or woolen blankets. But there would have been many modifications to the resolution proposed, in the form of amendments, and will be, if we can vote down this unfavorable report and have the Senate consider the resolution. There will be amendments offered to it which will provide that the investigating committee shall go into an investigation such as the American people would desire, and which we should have.

Let me point out a few things left out of the resolution. It may be that the Senator from Idaho left these out inadvertently, it may be that he intentionally left them out, or it may be that because he wanted to draw the resolution quickly and get it in, so that at the earliest possible moment his skirts might be cleared, he omitted some things, and took it for granted that certainly the Senate would amend the resolution.

The first resolve indicates that one of the things to be investigated is the financial interests of Senators in the wool and sheep industries. Of course charges have been made in regard to the chemical schedule, and mining, and sugar, and other industries, which should be added to this resolution; and if this report of the committee is voted down I assure Senators that we will have an opportunity to vote on an amendment to this investigation resolution which will permit an investigation into the activities of certain sugar interests, chemical interests, mining interests, and manufacturers who are receiving benefits from the high rates imposed in this bill. Now, why the Senator should restrict it to such an extent I know not.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I merely want to say to the Senator that if he will read it all—

Mr. HARRISON. I am going to read it all.

Mr. GOODING. He will find there is nobody left out.

Mr. HARRISON. I am going to read it all and I am going to show the Senator that persons who should be included were left out. I take it from the remarks of the Senator that he omitted them through oversight and not intentionally. I am glad to have the interruption, because I would dislike to think, indeed it would be humiliating to me as one who has a very strong and warm affection for the Senator from Idaho to think that he would draft the resolution and intentionally and deliberately leave out so many other interests that should be investigated.

Now, let us go further. I am going to analyze the entire resolution. Second, the Senator from Idaho wants to investigate "the financial interests of Mr. Frank A. Munsey in European industries which compete with American industries, the amount and percentage of his income derived from advertisements placed in his newspapers by the importing department stores," and so forth. That is the part to which the Senator from New York objects. Well, we can not blame the Senator for objecting. He has on his hands now one of the hardest political fights of his long and eventful political career. Mr. Frank A. Munsey is a political strong arm in his State. He wields an influence hardly second to any in that State. The Herald, I imagine, is friendly to the distinguished Senator from New York, and he does not want to bruise the feelings of either Mr. Munsey or the New York Herald. So it is good politics,

and I congratulate the Senator from New York on being candid about it and so frankly stating as his reasons for his action his selfish political instinct. But it is so illogical, so unreasonable, so unfair, and unjust to the Senator from Idaho and other Senators against whom charges have been made. Rumors are floating thick and fast all over the country, which will be handed down to their children and their children's children, blotting the escutcheon of the States which they represent, simply because the Senator from New York was a friend of Frank A. Munsey and the New York Herald and should, therefore, deny the right of the Senate to investigate all the other allegations.

The Senator from New York and his committee could have stricken from the resolution the second paragraph, if you please, which applies to Frank A. Munsey and the New York Herald. The Senator would receive just as much warm approbation from Mr. Munsey and the New York Herald by performing that gracious act as he probably will receive by reporting unfavorably upon the resolution. Indeed, Frank A. Munsey is a man of wisdom. He is a patriot and has a reputation of being fair and just. The Herald is a great newspaper with a reputation all over the country. If the Herald should indorse editorially the action of the Senator from New York and the procedure he has taken here to-day, that simply in order to help Mr. Munsey and retain his political friendship he would smother all the other investigations that are sought in the other provisions of the resolution, the people would say in New York that the Senator from New York is not the kind of man that New York is entitled to have representing her in part upon the floor of the United States Senate. They would say, "Indeed, we need a bigger man than he." They would say, "We want one who will overlook his little selfish political interests for the common good and general welfare of all the people. We will want one there who, when the fair name of the Senate of the United States is dragged in the mud will help to raise it and provide the opportunity to blot out those accusations, if untrue, which the Senator from Idaho alleges certain interests have brought against Senators upon this floor."

Now, let me go further. I would offer an amendment to strike out the name of Frank A. Munsey. I would not employ all of my guns against him. He is not the only one in this fair land who has brought these charges. Why should he be sought after and picked out among all the editorial writers of the country and publishers who own Republican papers? Was it simply because his editorials may have been stronger than others, simply because he may have put it perhaps more clearly than others?

But from Massachusetts, the home of the leader of the Republican Party in this Chamber, away out to the golden West, where my distinguished and handsome and dignified friend from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] resides, the Republican papers have denounced editorially this infamous bill, and they have charged that Senators upon the floor were voting these high rates, pressing down upon the people, in order to promote their own private good. So I say it would have been fair and more in keeping with the practice and wisdom of this august body if we would strike out the name of Frank A. Munsey and merely let him be investigated with all the other Republican papers and Democratic and independent papers throughout the country with reference to the charges which have been made against certain Senators and Members here.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I would rather not yield now. I shall yield presently when I get through.

Mr. LENROOT. I merely want to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HARRISON. I can not yield for that just at present.

That is the second subdivision of the resolution, and I would amend it in that respect. The committee of the Senator from New York could have amended it or they could have reported it back favorably and asked that certain amendments be adopted. But now, if the Senator's motion prevails, if Senators on the other side of the Chamber stand by the side of the Senator from New York and vote with him for his motion, they will vote to smother this investigation that is rife from one end of the country to the other. When they do it they know the investigation is dead; they know that the "fair name" of the Senator from Idaho and the names of other Senators will retain the blemish that certain papers are alleged to have placed upon them. It is unfair, Senators. I am in hopes that before I shall have finished the Senator from New York, hard-hearted though he is, will yield, will see the error of his way, and I shall yield for the privilege of the Senator, upon his own motion, moving to have the resolution referred back to his committee to take favorable action upon it.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from New York has made no motion. The Senator's committee reported the resolution unfavorably, and that is all.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the Senator propose to make the motion?

Mr. CALDER. No; I do not.

Mr. HARRISON. Then the motion will be made, and I am going to ask unanimous consent, when I finish, that immediate consideration of the resolution be entered into, and I shall make the motion that the Senator's unfavorable report be turned down. After that is done, if the Senate so decide, we can change the many erroneous statements and incorrect assumptions contained in the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I do not care to yield now.

Mr. LODGE. I rose to the parliamentary question which the Senator himself has raised.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not raise it.

Mr. LODGE. I simply make the point that under the rule the report has to go over for one day in any event.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, yes; the Senator can employ all the little parliamentary technicalities he wants in order to delay action, in order to assist in smothering the proposition. But I say to him, and I say to his party on the other side of the aisle, that the American people will never stand for the employment of technicalities to sidetrack this resolution, because he knows, adroit and long-experienced legislator that he is, that unanimous consent can be entered into here for the immediate consideration of the proposition. If the Senator wants to object, I am going to give the Senator from Massachusetts an opportunity to do so. The country is entitled to action upon the Gooding resolution. They are going to have it to-day if there is any way to have it. If it is defeated, the defeat will come from the other side of the aisle and not from this side.

Now, let me go further with the resolution. The Senator from Idaho wants to investigate—

3. The number of Senators owning or controlling or financially interested in newspapers, the amount of revenue obtained by these newspapers from importing department stores—

And then he uses this significant language:

which will benefit financially by the defeat of the pending tariff bill.

Assuming that the newspapers will be benefited by the defeat of the pending tariff bill! Nowhere in the resolution does the Senator ask for investigation of any interest or any person who will be benefited by the increased tariff rates proposed in the bill. Ah, but he wants to take up three certain Senators on this floor—the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]—because, forsooth, they are interested in newspapers, and because of that interest he has asked that they be investigated. God bless you, if some of you on the other side of the Chamber would follow in the footsteps of those distinguished Senators, who, because of their interests, on yesterday demanded the right not to vote on the paper schedule, you would be vastly better off. I congratulate the splendid Senator from the great State of Nebraska; I congratulate my colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], as well as the distinguished Senator from the progressive State of Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] on excusing themselves when an item was voted upon in which they felt they might be financially benefited.

They thought well enough of themselves, in the interests of the American people, not to vote upon that paragraph, rather than have their skirts tainted and smeared, even though the American people who want to read were crying out for cheap paper and their position was in thorough accord with the views of the American people. Oh, that their virtuous example might be followed by some other Senators on the other side of the aisle! And yet because of the way they acted yesterday, which will meet the approval not only of their constituents but fair and right thinking people throughout this country, they must be brought before the committee and investigated, while all the sugar and chemical and mining and manufacturing interests, and those here who might stand for them, demanding increased rates that will bear down upon the American people—and yet they are not to be heard. Senators who may control stock in great manufacturing interests, who will reap untold and unlimited benefits from the increased tariff rates here proposed, can do likewise, but the resolution of the Senator from Idaho does not provide how they shall be investigated. But the Senators

from Nebraska and Kansas and Virginia, who said they did not think it was proper and right to vote when the rules of the Senate and the precedents of both bodies provide that when a Senator is interested in the question or the measure coming before the Senate for consideration they may be excused from voting upon the proposition, are nevertheless to be investigated under the resolution of the Senator from Idaho. They shelter themselves behind that provision; yet under the Gooding resolution they are to be investigated, and others who are voting for the increased rates to benefit so many interests, at the expense of the great masses of the American people, may sit over in their offices, and they will not be bothered by the investigation.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I will yield to both Senators. However, I first yielded to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. GOODING. The Senator from Mississippi spoke so beautifully of the high position taken by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] in reference to wood pulp in refraining from voting on the proposition to place a duty on that article that I was wondering if he knew that the Senator from Nebraska used his great influence upon the floor for free pulp when the schedule was under consideration. I will read this for the Senator's information—

Mr. HARRISON. No; I do not want it read in my time. The Senator has made his statement. I thought he desired to ask me a question.

Mr. GOODING. I shall be very glad to read it to show that the Senator from Nebraska said that wood pulp should be on the free list.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator from Nebraska on yesterday refused to vote upon the proposition; and that is the statement I made. I will take long enough now—for the Senator from Idaho would not yield to me; he was not so courteous to me when he was on the floor when I asked to interrupt him with a question as I am to him—I shall take this opportunity—

Mr. GOODING. I am sure the Senator wants to be right and not to make any mistake.

Mr. HARRISON. I have not made any mistake, because all I have said is that the Senators to whom I have referred, on yesterday, when the wood-pulp provision came up, refused to vote because they said they were interested in newspapers in this country. I want to ask the Senator from Idaho now does he indorse their action or does he disapprove it?

Mr. GOODING. I do not indorse it.

Mr. HARRISON. Then that is enough.

Mr. GOODING. When they voted for it in 1913, as they did, and when they refused to vote for it yesterday, after the part that was taken by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], they were very inconsistent, to say the least.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, here I am trying to defend the Senator, and he is being uncomplimentary to my colleagues.

Now let us see about this. A part of clause 4 of the Gooding resolution provides for the investigation of:

*Resolved further*, That the investigating committee be empowered to summon witnesses and examine them under oath, including Mr. Frank A. Munsey and officials and attorneys for or representatives of the General Real Estate & Trust Co., or any other company or companies which may have been organized to operate other foreign mills, mines, and factories engaged in competition with American producers and workers and which will benefit financially by the defeat of tariff legislation by this Congress.

The Senator from Idaho wants to investigate witnesses whose interests will be affected beneficially by the defeat of the pending bill; in other words, he does not want to investigate those whose interests will be promoted by the passage of the bill. So throughout are these little discrepancies that were mere oversights on the part of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. When the motion is made for the consideration of this resolution by the Senate, amendments will be offered to cure those defects, so that not only those who are interested in wool and sheep may be investigated but those who are interested in chemicals and sugar and mines and also manufacturers will be investigated, and those who will benefit by the passage of the bill carrying increased rates, the same as those who will be benefited by the defeat of the bill. Now I yield to my distinguished and pleasant friend from New Mexico.

Mr. BURSUM. I simply desire to say, for the enlightenment of the Senator from Mississippi, that if those who are to be benefited by the passage of the pending tariff bill are to be investigated it will be necessary to investigate the whole

Nation, the whole American people, for they will all be better off as the result of the passage of this measure.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I heard when I was a tiny boy that when the hunters began to pursue the she bear and they got close with their hounds the bear was accustomed to throw down the little cub in order to distract their attention in order that she might escape. Senators may apply that to suit themselves. Mr. President, let me proceed, now, along one other line.

Mr. LENROOT. Before, the Senator from Mississippi does that, will he yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator from Mississippi state why he says that the resolution of the Senator from Idaho does not provide for the investigation of those who are interested in manufactures and industries who are affected by the passage of the bill, but only provides for an investigation of those who are affected by the defeat of the bill?

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Wisconsin will understand that paragraph 4 of the resolution applies to Members of the Senate; that it does not apply to any special interest of the country, such as the mining interest or the manufacturing interest or the wool interest or to Frank A. Munsey, who is in the newspaper business. The Senator's resolution merely proposes to investigate the newspaper interest, Frank A. Munsey particularly, who, it says, will benefit by the defeat of the tariff bill; but the resolution says nothing about these great manufacturers whose lobbyists have swarmed around the Capitol to such an extent that a Senator could not get in or out of his office.

Mr. LENROOT. Is the Senator from Mississippi in favor of an investigation by the Senate in order to ascertain what industries in the United States will be benefited by the passage of the tariff bill?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, I will tell the Senator what I think. I think that every Senator upon this floor ought to consult his own conscience when he casts a vote here upon a paragraph in the pending bill in which he is personally interested, and if his conscience tells him that it is wrong to vote on the proposition he should recuse himself. I do not think investigations get anywhere, so far as that is concerned. I know, with the temper on the other side of the aisle, and from the way Senators on that side have voted on the pending tariff bill, that they are going to protect every special interest in the country in the committee investigation the same as they have done in the pages of the bill. Of course, nothing will come out of it, because they will stack the cards.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator has asked for an investigation, and I am willing to give to him that which he seeks. I hope it will be fair. The Senator does not provide for any Democratic Senators on the committee; he merely provides for the appointment of five Senators; but I hope that the Presiding Officer—and I know that if the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who now occupies the chair, has a hand in it, that will be done—will appoint at least two Senators from this side of the aisle on the committee. If that shall be done, the dome of this Capitol is not secure.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] yesterday performed a curious stunt. I recall that for almost three months under the assaults from this side of the aisle and under the eloquent pleas of Members over here to him personally to get into this scrap over the tariff bill he even got cotton and closed up his ears, so that he could not hear the appeals; his voice was as silent as the tomb; but when the American people became aroused under the splendid fight made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] and others on this side who took care of the different schedules the Senator from Wisconsin almost overnight woke up, turned a somersault, and began to fight certain paragraphs of the bill—

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Not only that but the Senator was so interested in holding the phalanx over there that I remember several times when we were trying to expose the iniquities of the paragraphs the Senator would ask, "Well, why do you not permit us to vote on this bill?" I remember on one occasion he told us how many hours and how many days it would take to pass the bill at the rate at which we were then going, and I think he said the bill would hardly be passed until doomsday at the rate at which we were then traveling. I have the many statements of the Senator here in the RECORD before me. I do not want to trespass at too great length on the patience of Senators or the time of the Senate, but if my assertions are contra-

dicted I shall read from the Senator's remarks. Yet, despite that position of the Senator, when this side yesterday submitted a request for unanimous consent, which was agreeable to every other Senator, I dare say, in this body, to vote upon the pending bill not later than the 17th of the present month, the Senator objected to it. I do not want to keep the Senator standing and I will yield to him presently; I will tell him when I want to yield, so that if the Senator will bide his time in patience he will have an opportunity later on—

Mr. LENROOT. Very well.

Mr. HARRISON. So yesterday when the Senator made that objection, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] made certain utterances which were significant to me, there was borne out what some of us charged two months ago, that the majority party had no idea of enacting this bill into a law before the November election.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], whose political existence is soon to pass into history, does not care now, and he is sincerely interested in the passage of the bill; he wants to go down into history—God knows why—as the co-author of a tariff bill, although I would rather have my name attached to an indictment in the criminal courts of the District of Columbia than to have the proud honor which apparently the Senator from North Dakota desires. So the Senator from North Dakota evidently is ready for us to pass the bill; but that astute and shrewd manipulator—and I do not say that offensively, for, God bless him, I like him—the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] knows what he is about. The only trouble yesterday was that he showed his hand a little bit too much. Ordinarily he does not make such tracks as he walks along, and yet—

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I will not yield just yet, but I will be very glad to yield when I finish; I do not want the Senator from New Mexico to spoil the little figure of speech which I was about to utter or to interrupt the statement of facts.

Mr. BURSUM. I merely desired to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not yield at this time to my friend from New Mexico, although he is the most pleasant gentleman in the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi declines to yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not yield yet; I will reach wool presently, and then I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana, I say, made tracks yesterday a little plainer than ordinarily. He said yesterday that there would be committee amendments offered up to the last minute on August 11, when, under the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, no further committee amendments could be offered; that the committee were meeting every morning. I will read just what he said:

Let me say to my friend from Arkansas—

Says the Senator from Indiana—

that the committee meets every morning at 9.30 to keep ahead of the Senate's work and take up the schedule which we are to consider next. That is to say, we come down to sundries and take up sundries, and the committee itself doubtless will propose a number of amendments to that schedule.

That is an admission upon the part of one of the distinguished leaders of the other side, one of the smartest and ablest members of the Finance Committee, that the provisions covering sundries are all wrong or many of them are wrong, because he says, "doubtless the committee will be meeting right up to the last minute and changes and modifications and alterations will be made in it." He goes further and says:

It is utterly impossible for us to be up here and down there at the same time.

Why have they not acted like the Finance Committees of the Senate throughout the history of this Government? Heretofore when they finished framing tariff bills they brought them here and made them their handiwork. Goodness knows in this instance the Finance Committee were a long time in framing the bill, for it took them 12 months or more, and yet they are not satisfied with it. By the utterances of the Senator from Indiana and the action of the Finance Committee they admit their incompetency to write a tariff bill, and they are forced to resort to bringing in changes up to the last minute.

There are no two men on the other side of the Chamber more closely allied and who understand each other better than the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. They walk arm in arm; they think alike on many matters; they politically conspire together; they oftentimes try, and too frequently succeed, in "putting over" their political schemes together. They never are found at

cross-purposes; and so the Senator from Wisconsin on yesterday was playing one end, the Senator from Indiana the other, but unfortunately the Senator from Indiana let the cat out of the bag.

Ah, the Senator from Wisconsin was wise. He was doing that which we feared might be done. We have believed, some of us, that you did not want the bill to pass; that you would come to your senses after a while and recognize that the American people would condemn you in the election if you did.

The Senator from Wisconsin realizes it, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] realizes it, and for that reason they are trying to save the Republican Party from itself. Yes, they know, and I hope the Senator will tell me when he follows me that he knows, because he has said it in his speeches, that if this bill passes in its present form the Republican Party will go the way that it has always gone following the passage of its iniquitous tariff measures—to defeat. So the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] are working in behalf of the Republican Party when they seek to prolong this discussion, to withhold from the statute books the enactment of this bill, so that the American people can not get such a good whack at them in November. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] understands it, and he comes to the Senator's rescue, and he says, "Why, the Senate Committee on Finance are working every morning and every night. We can not be up here and down there at the same time, and we are bringing in amendments up to the last moment."

I am through, Mr. President. In a moment I shall ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution reported by the Senator from New York. Before making that motion, I yield for interruptions. I promised to yield to some of these distinguished Senators.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, at this point in the Senator's remarks I want to call his attention to the words of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] upon the floor when the wool-pulp schedule was under consideration.

Mr. HARRISON. I prefer that the Senator put that in his own time. I will yield for any question.

I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution reported by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. I think the resolution ought to go over under the rule.

Mr. HARRISON. Then there is objection?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. HARRISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. That is out of order, of course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion is not in order.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, just a word.

This resolution was introduced yesterday by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING]. Then, on motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; and a further motion was made by the Senator from Mississippi, and agreed to, directing the committee to report the resolution forthwith.

The committee, during my chairmanship of it, has followed the practice, believing that that was the rule under which we were operating, that it was our business to report resolutions of this character without change, either for them or against them. After deliberation the majority members of the committee determined, because of the way in which the resolution was drawn and the fact that it referred to an individual not a member of this body, to report the resolution as we did. That is the reason for our action. We have not believed that we had any right to alter or amend a resolution of this kind.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CALDER. I have concluded my statement.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to ask a question of the Senator. The Senator would be willing, then, to vote down this report, would he not, so that we can amend the resolution in such respects as may be thought desirable and pass it?

Mr. CALDER. If a vote is taken, I shall vote against the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and I have been very close and intimate friends for a great many years. We are still, and shall continue to be; but I want to say in defense of the Senator from Mississippi that his many inaccuracies of statement are excusable from the

fact that his eloquent voice is in demand all over this country; wherever there is a Democratic political convention of any kind, the Senator from Mississippi is appealed to. There is a demand for him upon the Chautauqua platform; and the Senator from Mississippi must be excused in his inaccuracies from the fact that he has been absent from the Senate for so great a portion of the time during which this bill has been under discussion.

I want to say, however, that during the early consideration of this bill, until the Senator from Mississippi absented himself for so long a period of time, 99 per cent of the discussion of this bill on the other side of the Chamber was piffing discussion, without any endeavor upon the other side of the aisle to discuss rates in this bill that were of importance to the people of the country.

Senators on the other side of the aisle occupied hour after hour, and sometimes days, with the discussion of amendments in the chemical schedule relating to articles the names of which they could not pronounce, and the importance of which to the country amounted to practically nothing. The Senator from Mississippi may not have been here, so he may be excused for not knowing that fact; and so it went on until it was clearly a filibuster against this bill upon the other side of the aisle. Finally, however, we came to some important items in the bill. The Senator may not have been here, so he does not know, but my first discussion of this bill happened to be in connection with the first schedule of the bill, the chemical schedule; but it happened to be upon an item that was of importance to the country. That is the attitude that the Senator from Wisconsin has occupied from the first consideration of the first schedule of the bill to the present time, and that is the attitude that the Senator from Wisconsin proposes to occupy until the bill is concluded.

However, when we came to important schedules of the bill this filibuster upon the Democratic side suddenly ceased. Why? Because the Committee on Finance day after day brings in amendments reducing the excessive rates in this bill, and in the cotton schedule the Senate was successful in lowering excessive rates where the committee had not agreed to do so. We had the support of the Democrats, but I am very sure that the action of the Senate was not to the liking of the Senator from Mississippi. The Senator from Mississippi would like to have the rates in this bill even higher than they are. He would rather have an issue with his eloquent appeal to the American people concerning the enormities of this tariff bill than to have a bill which the American people would approve, and what is true of the Senator from Mississippi is true of many other Senators upon the other side of the aisle.

Mr. President, I am a Republican. I wish to go with the organization, but I propose to exercise my independent judgment. I have done so in the past. I have not been playing cheap politics, as the Senator from Mississippi is doing to-day; but I have tried to have in mind the interest of the American people in the consideration of these questions.

What were we confronted with yesterday, Mr. President? This sudden change of attitude on the Democratic side. They saw that this bill was being improved from day to day. They came to the conclusion that it would be to their political advantage not to have further reductions in this bill; that it would be to their political advantage to have high rates, so-called bounties, voted in on an important schedule without a word of discussion. They believed that without discussion those rates would be voted into the bill; and so we suddenly find the Democratic side, after all they have been saying about the freedom of discussion and all the discussion they have been giving on unimportant items of the bill, suddenly willing to forego any discussion whatever upon the most important items in this bill remaining undisposed of.

The country will not be deceived by the attitude of the Democratic side. The country will understand that the Democratic side of this aisle would rather have a political issue for the November elections than to legislate for the welfare of the American people.

Mr. President, I exercise a right which I have, and which I propose to exercise, to object to any unanimous-consent agreement which will not accord an opportunity of at least uttering a protest over any rate which may be before the Senate that is of importance to the American people. The Democratic side is willing to forego that. The Democratic side is willing now that any rate shall be written into this bill, no matter how high, content with voting against it; but they do not want any further discussion, because they fear that discussion will improve the bill.

Now, a word with relation to this resolution. The Senator from Mississippi waxes eloquent about Senators not voting upon schedules or upon items in which they have a personal interest.

We very shortly will have up the question of free hides, and I wonder if the other side of the aisle will take the position which the Senator from Mississippi insists ought to be taken by this side of the aisle? I wonder if every Senator on the other side of the aisle who is interested in cattle will refrain from voting upon the question of free hides? When the time comes for a vote on that item I do not believe we will hear my genial friend from Mississippi condemning his Democratic colleagues for voting upon the question of free hides, although some of them may be interested in cattle.

Then there will be the question of tobacco. Will the Senator as eloquently condemn any Democratic Senator who may be interested in tobacco who votes upon that question?

Upon this question of a Senator voting upon a matter in which he has a personal interest, it so happens that I am free to vote upon any question, because I have no financial interest, so far as I know, in any schedule or any item in this bill. But it seems to me that the line of demarcation is very clearly drawn as to where the duty of a Senator lies in voting upon a matter in which he has a personal interest. In regard to the question of free pulp, I think it eminently proper that Senators who own papers should not vote upon that question, because their interest is a special interest, distinguished from the general interest of the States which they are here to represent.

If a Senator owns a mine producing a rare mineral, and there are only a few other such in the country, and his interest is not the common interest of his State, I do not believe such a Senator ought to vote upon a question involving the products of that mine.

But when we come to the question of sheep, which is really the subject matter of this resolution, I very sharply disagree with the Senator from Idaho and the other Senators from the woolgrowing States. I have done my best to secure lower duties and been defeated; but I want to repeat here what I said during that debate, that, sharply as I disagree with the Senator from Idaho, I do not believe that his personal interest in wool affected one iota his position upon this bill. The same applies to the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators. This is how I believe the line should be drawn. Does anybody question that the Senator from Idaho or that the Senator from New Mexico, in the attitude they took upon wool, reflected the attitude of the people of their States? The answer must be that of course they reflected the attitude of the people of their States. The people of their States were entitled to representation upon that all-important subject, and therefore, in my judgment, where the interest of the Senator is exactly the interest of his State, there is no duty and no obligation upon his part to refrain from voting upon any duty that is the subject of controversy.

On the other hand, if a Senator's interest be special and not the interest of his State, I say, without hesitation, that I do not believe he ought to vote upon any question which affects his own pocketbook.

With regard to this resolution, what do we find the Senator from Mississippi insisting upon? While he criticizes the committee for not making a favorable report upon the resolution, knowing that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate never do consider the merits of a resolution with reference to amendments of the same, except as it affects expense, he would not vote for this resolution to-day as it was reported from the committee, would he?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I would vote for it in its present form. I would rather amend it, however.

Mr. LENROOT. Then let us see what the Senator from Mississippi is willing to do, and let us see how consistent the Senator from Mississippi is. The Senator from Mississippi then indorses this allegation in the resolution—

Mr. HARRISON. No; I do not indorse allegations—

Mr. LENROOT. If he would vote for it, of course he indorses it.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is too smart to say that.

Mr. LENROOT. I am not, and the Senator is too smart to say otherwise.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not indorse anything in the resolution, but a Senator on the other side says he wants an investigation of charges which have been made against him and his colleagues; he states it in his allegation, and he is entitled to it. The whereas, of course, do not amount to anything, but I think the resolution ought to be changed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not yield for any such purpose. I am going to hold the Senator to his statement. He said that he was willing to vote for this resolution as reported by the committee.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator reiterates that.

Mr. LENROOT. When he is willing to do that, he indorses everything in the resolution, and let us see what he is willing to vote for, then, and how it squares with the professions which the Senator from Mississippi has been making. He says he is willing to vote for this declaration, that "the importing department stores have financed a campaign of defamation against the pending tariff bill." That is what the Senator from Mississippi says he is willing to vote as true; that the department stores have financed a campaign of misrepresentation against the pending tariff bill.

The Senator from Mississippi can crawl out of that hole as best he can, but he can not in a thousand years, if he should live that long, square that declaration with the other assertions he has made upon this floor.

The Senator from Mississippi says that the fourth paragraph is not sufficiently strong, because it does not call for an investigation of every factory, of every industry, in the United States which would be benefited by the passage of the bill or injured or benefited by its defeat. Does the Senator think that anyone will take him seriously, that he would have the Senate enter upon an investigation of every manufacturing industry in the United States, of the cotton industry, of every other industry in the United States, a committee of five Senators to ascertain how those industries, separately and in the aggregate, are going to be affected by the passage of a tariff bill?

I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi wants this investigation made and concluded before we vote upon the tariff bill? If he does, how does that square with his position in criticizing me for preventing a vote on the final passage on August 19?

The Senator knows that the investigation which he proposes for political purposes could not be completed by the Senate inside of two years, and would cost millions of dollars. Oh, the Senator from Mississippi is not entirely sincere. I do not wish to reflect upon him in making that statement; I mean that he is thinking of politics when he makes that statement. He is not thinking of legislation, he is not thinking of his position as a Senator of the United States; he is thinking of himself only as a Democratic politician—and he is one of the best they have in their party.

I am not going to discuss this matter further, but while I am on my feet I am going to propose a unanimous-consent agreement—and I want to say, in that connection, that we will test the sincerity of the other side of the aisle—as to whether they are willing to agree to a limitation of debate which will permit of some discussion of every amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. May I suggest to the Senator that he wait until the Senator from North Carolina may be notified?

Mr. LENROOT. I am not going to ask for immediate action upon it. We will test the sincerity of the other side as to whether they are willing to vote for a limitation of debate which will permit of some debate upon every question, or whether they stand upon the proposition made by the Senator from North Carolina, that he now wants the most important items in this bill to be voted upon without one single word of debate.

I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent to have read, this proposed agreement, and I will ask then that it temporarily lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). If there is no objection, the Secretary will read the proposed agreement.

The reading clerk read as follows:

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT.

It is agreed by unanimous consent that whenever the bill H. R. 7456, "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States," is before the Senate until the final vote is reached, debate shall be confined to the bill before the Senate, and no other business or irrelevant question or motion shall be entertained by the Chair unless, after a statement of the question, the unanimous consent of the Senate is given therefor.

That from and after the hour of 11 o'clock a. m. of the calendar day of Friday, August 11, 1922, no Senator shall speak in the aggregate more than one hour upon the bill and any amendment or amendments offered thereto and motion or motions that may be made respecting the same.

That the Senate shall immediately proceed to the consideration of committee amendments to paragraphs 1427a and 1582 relating to hides and 1431 relating to leather and manufactures thereof. That upon the disposition of said amendments the Senate shall next consider committee and individual amendments to Schedule 5 relating to sugar, molasses, and manufactures thereof.

The Senate shall next consider committee amendments to paragraph 1636 relating to potassium nitrate, and when disposed of the Senate shall consider the committee amendment designated as section 315.

After the disposition of the foregoing the Senate shall next proceed to the consideration of remaining committee amendments, and after the same have been disposed of individual amendments to the bill shall be considered and disposed of.

All questions of order under this agreement shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be printed and lie upon the table.

Mr. STANLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Wisconsin presented the unanimous-consent proposal. I do not understand that he desires immediate action on it.

Mr. LENROOT. No; I asked that it be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to say that I shall be very glad, together with my associates on this side of the Chamber, to give consideration to the proposition presented by the Senator, and some time during the day I hope to be able to answer, if we do not agree to his proposition, by the presentation of a counterproposition.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I have been somewhat surprised at the nature of the reply to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. The charge that he has been absent from the Chamber or was an absentee from the Chamber is, in the face of the record, in my humble opinion, unwarranted, if not gratuitous. The yeas and nays of this body, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the knowledge of Members of the body, all bear evidence to the fact that few men have given the same personal attention to public affairs or have participated more actively or more effectively in the deliberations of this body than the accomplished and diligent Senator from Mississippi. It is true that at times his talents have been demanded by the national committee. He has served his party, both in and outside of the Chamber, with signal ability.

Mr. President, it is an odd sort of a claim that one must believe everything, all the whereas and every other loose statement contained in a resolution of inquiry, before he can vote to report it favorably. If all the surplusage and irrelevant matters contained in such a resolution of inquiry are to be taken as absolutely true, there would be no necessity for the inquiry. What is the use of having an inquiry to investigate into the truth of certain statements if the statements are to be taken in advance as true? The votes of the Senate, not the investigation of the committee, would establish the truth or falsity of the assertions. The Senate does not propose, by reporting the resolution, to say whether or not the various and sundry statements of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] are true. It votes to give the Senator from Idaho and others a chance to establish the truth or falsity of those statements. That is all there is in the resolution of inquiry.

Mr. President, nothing has occurred in the last few months, no sign so propitious, as the very significant statement of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. It will be remembered that the junior Senator from Wisconsin but a few months ago stood here and led the fight for cloture, stood here and led an unprecedented fight to gag and tie the Senate of the United States in the discussion of the schedules of this very bill, voted to make us take that nauseous dose like a sugar-coated pill, voted to deny the Senators the right to discuss the amendment. At that time the Senator believed that the bill would be stomached by the American people. At that time he did not dream that the integrity and the intelligence of an outraged Republic would anathematize the bill, that the great organs of known Republican leaning and which had been a tower of strength in the party for 20 years would join with the Democratic press of the country in a practically unanimous denunciation of its abominations and of its indefensible rates.

Now the same Senator, who but a few months ago proposed to shut off debate, makes the startling statement that if the bill should now be passed under a unanimous-consent agreement, which would have the effect of the very cloture he sought—preventing debate or the improvement of the bill—that if what is left of it should pass unchanged, it would damn the Republican Party. If what is left of the bill untouched is so iniquitous that it would ruin the Republican Party unless the patriotism and the wisdom of the Senator from Wisconsin and others were called instantly to the relief of this bungling thing, what, oh what, would have been the fate of the party and the country if this agglomeration of blunders and abomination had been passed at the time the Senator from Wisconsin demanded cloture?

I am surprised that this self-constituted expert, who lectures the Senator from Mississippi about his absence from the Senate, should have hurled this challenge at this side of the Chamber, "Where, oh where, will the tobacco Senator stand, where will

the southern Senators and the Democratic Senators stand when we propose to vote for a duty on tobacco?"

My State produces more tobacco than the same area anywhere, so far as I know, on the habitable globe. At one time, and until very recently, we produced one-third of all the tobacco by weight produced in the United States. I will say to the Senator that he may introduce an amendment to put tobacco on the free list—with the exception of a few high-priced tobaccos that are used for cigars and the like and which are not produced in my State and which ought to bear a duty because they are luxuries—and I will vote for it. There is not a Senator from Virginia or South Carolina or North Carolina or Tennessee or Kentucky who knows enough to tell a tobacco plant from a head of cabbage that cares a bawbee about a duty on tobacco. A duty of \$1,000 an ounce on all the tobacco raised in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina would not benefit the tobacco growers one one-thousandth of a red cent. It might all be put on the free list and it would not reduce the price of those tobaccos by the price of a red herring.

Mr. President, I had hoped that the resolution introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] would be reported and acted upon notwithstanding its absurdity. It is true that the resolution provides for a most rigorous investigation of every concern, of every Senator, of every newspaper, of every broker, of every merchant, who has a direct or a special interest in the reduction of rates or in lifting any character of ban or embargo from the commerce of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Idaho is a man of ability. He is a thoughtful and serious man. Like all of that illustrious race, the Englishmen, he is not inclined either to tell or see or hear a joke. He is nothing if not serious. He is not inclined to frivolities or to satire. When he proposes to spend the thousands and tens of thousands of dollars which the Senator from Wisconsin says must be spent to probe into these iniquities and find out whether or not Frank A. Munsey has a material interest in opening the ports of the United States to the importations of manufactures abroad in which he was interested—when he proposes to spend the money of the United States to find out how much the debit and credit sides of the great ledgers of the department stores would show of direct benefit from the opportunity to buy abroad as cheaply as they bought at home, he admits or charges that to use the taxing power of this country, to use the strong arm of the law, to use the collection of revenues, for the purpose of benefiting a special interest, instead of collecting revenue for the discharge of public duties and the conduct of the Government economically administered, is a serious offense.

And yet by some strange oversight, with the exception of the woolgrowers, there is not a hole in that resolution big enough to hide a gnat. There is not a sentence, not a word providing for a like investigation of the enormous concerns whose profits will be multiplied a hundredfold by a tariff and by an embargo. If it is a crime to enrich Frank A. Munsey by lowering the tariff, it is a crime to enrich some Munsey by raising the tariff. If it is an offense for a newspaper, because it has a direct interest in the price of newsprint paper, to advocate the placing of that commodity upon the free list, what will we say of the offense of a Senator who advocates a duty, not as a publisher, not as a citizen, but by the exercise of his high prerogative as a Senator in the United States of America?

Ah, I do not mean to intimate that the Senator from Idaho or any other Senator on the floor of this body has a direct and pecuniary interest in the price of wool; that he is either a vast owner of sheep and expects to profit thereby or that he has been a purchaser or broker in that commodity whose value is affected by these schedules; but it is a shame, it is a scandal; it is a piece of indefensible and purblind political cowardice, when the charge is made from one end of this country to the other that Senators are investors, that Senators are speculators, that Senators are personally profiting by the schedules they manipulate, to place some Maxim silencer upon that charge and snuff it out and to sneer at the press which has discharged a great and wholesome public duty.

Senators can not in this matter muzzle or censor the press; they can not stop it with a solemn sneer; they can not turn their hardened faces from the wrath, not of the press but of public sentiment that finds voice in that press, without finding a day of judgment on the Ides of November. Already every living human soul upon whom responsibility may be placed for this iniquitous thing has the seal of death upon his face or lies stark upon the field of political conflict. No man can proclaim his authorship of it or his approval of it in its entirety and not be pilloried by an intelligent and outraged press now and by an intelligent and outraged public in the near future.

Mr. GOODING. My thought or my hope, at least, in submitting the resolution is to learn whether I can remain in the United States Senate from the State of Idaho without the violation of my oath of office and without violation of my own conscience. Has the Senator from Kentucky concluded?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. GOODING. I thought the Senator had concluded. I beg pardon.

Mr. STANLEY. No; I am just getting a good start.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. GOODING. I will listen to the Senator with much interest.

Mr. STANLEY. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I can say for the Senator from Idaho that he is the best Republican on the face of the earth. He runs truer to form, truer to all the evil traditions of his party, than any known exemplar of that organization now alive.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President—

Mr. STANLEY. I am as proud of my poverty as the Senator is of his wool.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky let me correct him? I did not cast any reflections on the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. I will not yield for corrections. When I am through the Senator may make corrections. I yield now only for questions.

Mr. GOODING. I did not make any reflections on the Senator because he was without money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. STANLEY. I will yield for questions, but for corrections it would be almost too long a job. The RECORD shows what the Senator from Idaho said. Underlying it all was that fine scorn of the man who speaks of property rights here but who has no property. That has been reflected by any number of Senators upon the other side of the Chamber. The Senator from Idaho is not personally to be blamed for that; that is not his personal opinion; he acquired that sentiment in the atmosphere he breathes over there on the other side of the Chamber. That is a Federalistic tradition, as dear to the heart of Republicanism as is plunder under a tariff. The great father of Republicanism was Alexander Hamilton; the greatest Republican organization on this continent bears his name. There is nothing in common to-day between the humanity and the democracy and the love of personal liberty and the idealizing of mere man that characterized and glorified the life and thought of Abraham Lincoln and the present-day Hamiltonian organization of the Republican Party. You have abandoned Lincoln. Down with Lincoln and up with Hamilton! Down with moneyless men and up with the gray wolves of the Senate.

Hamilton argued and Hamilton fought all his life, until he fell before the revolver of Burr at Weehawken, for a property qualification. Under him the Senate was to sit in secret session; no man was to occupy a place here and no man was to vote for a Senator who did not have \$1,000 in fee simple in real estate or its equivalent; and to-day his dutiful followers would impose a like qualification if they dared.

Mr. President, there is a close psychological relation between that mental attitude and the protective tariff. Senators speak here of men voting in their own interests as if it were a light matter. It has been argued on the floor of the Senate that, while a judge, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] has well said, is disqualified by a material interest or a direct interest, and while a juror is disqualified by a material interest or a direct interest, a Senator is under no such disqualification in acting upon matters that materially affect his purse, that the material interests of a legislative body can not possibly affect legislation. Why, Mr. President, the material interests of judges have here and there perverted justice; the material interests and the special interests of jurors have here and there secured a conviction of the innocent or an acquittal of the guilty; but the history of oppression, the history of greed, the history of the most polluted despotisms that the world ever saw reek with the same old story of legislative bodies enacting laws in the interest of a particular and privileged class of which they were a part.

More than 2,000 years ago Tiberius Gracchus raised his voice against a landed aristocracy, against special privileges to men holding vast estates—and the great majority of them, by the way, were woolgrowers—and they tore up the benches in the forum, they beat him to death, they mangled his body, they burned it, and hurled his ashes to the winds, and from the ashes of the Gracchi sprang Marius and Sulla.

Mr. President, there was a time in France, as in the Roman Empire, when one justice was meted out to the man without money and another justice was meted out to the man with wealth. For a thousand years men were forced to come before a court, and the first question asked was, "Are you one of the wealthy or one of the poor?" If he was a man of property, he could not be put to the torture; he could not be crucified; the lash could not be laid upon his proud body; but if he were a moneyless man, if he were one of the poor, they could break his bones and stretch his tendons, and crucify his quivering body because he was a "free-trade hobo," because he was a moneyless man.

Mr. President, for 500 years in France a poor man could not own a pigeon; he had to wear a certain dress; he could not hunt in the woods or fields; meat was practically denied him, and yet he bore the entire burden of the expenses of the State. Three-fourths of the property of France under the Bourbons was in the hands of a king and a nobility; one-fourth was owned by the remainder of the people, and they bore all the taxes, in humiliation, in ignorance, in destitution, until at last the mob took fire and the tattered flag became a banner; in fury they rose and destroyed their oppressors in blood and horror. It was because the Chamber of Deputies were landed aristocrats and there was no place until they heard the thunders of Mirabeau for a moneyless man in the French Parliament.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, does the Senator imply that we ought to have a revolution in this country and divide up the property between all of the people of the country—take away from those who may have too much that which they have and divide it up? Is that the attitude of the Senator?

Mr. STANLEY. Is the Senator through?

Mr. BURSUM. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I am as much of an individualist as the Senator from New Mexico is a Federalist. I believe that the right of personal liberty and the right to personal property never came from any government on earth; that they are the inestimable blessings of God. I believe, with old Thomas Jefferson, that all men are created equal and have an equal right to life, liberty, and happiness, and that they are endowed by their Creator with these rights. I believe with him that this is self-evident. I believe that every man in the world is entitled to be the master of his own home, to have all the property he can acquire honestly, and I believe that the rate of taxation should be in proportion to his ability to pay. I would be the last man on earth to give one jot or tittle to those who would turn over to the Federal Government the right to invade a home by search and seizure, the right to lay your hands upon my person, my papers, my property, my house, without due warrant of law. I believe that it is no part of this Government's business to regulate how I make money if I make it honestly, to regulate my diet, to regulate my food, or to interfere with my right to a free market.

Your protective idea that every business is entitled to be coddled and milk-fed by the Government, to come like a beggar whenever it thinks it is a loser in a game it can not play, for every improvident business, whether it be farming or manufacturing or what not, to come here with a sick mouth and a crippled leg and to say, "I want the privilege of plundering some prosperous business in order to insure me the cost of production and a fixed income"—that is socialism. That is the nose of the camel. That ends at last in Lenin and Trotsky, or it ends in a Bourbon despotism. The democracy of Thomas Jefferson believes that it matters no more about a man's wealth than the color of his eyes; he has the same rights whether he is a millionaire or whether he is a pauper, and among those rights is his right to see that this Government is economically administered, and that we are not hounded to death by spies and informers, and that money taken by the process of taxation is not used surreptitiously to enrich you or anybody else.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BURSUM. I suggest that the Senator from Kentucky is entitled to his views as to free trade; he is evidently a free trader; but notwithstanding the so-called despicable policy of protection which this country has had a good part of the time during its existence for more than a hundred years, it has not resulted in the destruction of the country. It has not resulted in depriving the citizens of their liberty. It has not resulted in lawlessness. It has not resulted in impoverishing the country. On the contrary, during all of these years under a system of protection this country has been built up until it is the greatest country, the most powerful country, the most wealthy country, the most idealistic Nation, on the face of the earth.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I have heard that argument so often that I can repeat it backwards. We have had protection; we have had a prosperous country; therefore the prosperity of the country is due to protection. We have had protection; we have had a great number of twins born during that time; therefore the prosperity of the country is due to the twins.

Why, Mr. President, that argument has been made in favor of every political heresy and every religious heresy that ever cursed mankind. For a thousand years, because Christianity had increased, because every day there were more converts to religion, because vast domains of barbarians had been brought to the cross, and vast regions once peopled only by the savage and tainted by the smoke of human sacrifice were now filled with populous communities, and church spires were everywhere, they said that civilization demanded union of church and state; and when men arose to denounce it, they said: "Will you deny that France and England and Italy have emerged from the poverty and the destitution of the Dark Ages until to-day they are the beacon lights of the prosperity of the world? They advanced as they did advance under a union of church and state." But they forgot that the union of church and state had made of sweet religion a rhapsody of words. They forgot that the union of church and state had changed temples of holiness into chambers of horror. They forgot that the union of church and state had put a ban upon human intelligence. They forgot that the thumbscrew and the rack and the auto-de-fé were resorted to by Protestant and Catholic alike when a king was the head of a church.

Mr. President, that argument has been advanced in favor of other things. The Senator forgets that the greatest progress this country ever knew was in the 20 years just preceding the Civil War, when there was no iniquitous protective tariff, when duties were reduced to a minimum. The Senator forgets that under Jefferson and Jackson and Madison and Monroe, for 50 years and over, between the inauguration of Thomas Jefferson and the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln, the Democratic Party never lost but three elections, and lost no two in succession. He forgets the progress that the country made then by leaps and bounds. Yes; this country has advanced—advanced notwithstanding a protective tariff. In the language of another, it has been the march of a giant, but a giant manacled. It has been the flight of an eagle, but an eagle weighted and trammelled. I would break the shackles of the puissant limbs of American industry; I would take the trammels from the eyes of the American eagle, and allow her to renew again her eternal sight in the effulgence of the noon-day sun. Give me an America with its intelligence, with its industries, with its resources, and an intelligent Democratic administration like that of Woodrow Wilson, and America will dominate and direct the destinies of a distracted world.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that there were 7,000,000 majority in this country in 1920 who disagreed with the views of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. Yes; that is true. Christ was crucified, and the majority was all against Him. Oh, that is the beauty of the Democratic Party! You could no more stand a defeat like that than a tallow dog could penetrate the labyrinth of hell. That would be the end of him.

Mr. BURSUM. I suggest that that is to be seen. The day has not yet arrived when the Republicans have failed to rally after defeat. They have been defeated a great many times through the demagogism and misrepresentation of the Democrats, but they have always come back.

Mr. STANLEY. Yes; and we suffered accordingly; but I do not believe that the Lord, in His mercy, is ever going to inflict it on us again. Why, you talk about coming back. The Republican Party is a mere babe compared with the Democratic Party. We were alive, kicking, and dominant and ruled the country longer before this country ever politically turned away from the Lord and the Republican Party was born than it has been in existence since. Your party has been in existence only about 60 years, and we have been here nearly a century and a half, and to-day, notwithstanding your extreme youth, you show all the signs of infantile paralysis.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that the Democratic Party which the Senator mentions and of which he feels so proud has long ago ceased to exist. It is no longer the party of Jefferson or the party of Jackson. We now have a new party still masquerading under the name of the Democratic Party, which is more of a socialistic party than the Democratic Party of Jefferson or of Jackson.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, if socialism is not evidenced by the attitude of the Republican Party upon the tariff, what is socialism? What is the state socialism of Germany to-day?

The socialist maintains that the Government should insure the prosperity of great industrial concerns by operating them and owning them for the benefit of all the people. The Republican Party maintains that it is incumbent upon the Government to subsidize and fatten and regulate markets for the benefit of great organized enterprises, not for the benefit of all the people but for the benefit of a few fat-frying beneficiaries. Why, protectionism is the first cousin of socialism. The only thing that is eternally abhorrent to it is individualism, democracy, and a tariff for revenue only.

Mr. President, as indicative of the attitude of the press on this important subject, I wish to have incorporated in the RECORD, in the same type in which my remarks will be printed, a number of editorials commenting favorably upon the resolution of the Senator from ARKANSAS [Mr. CARAWAY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News.]

SETTING AN EXAMPLE.

Senators CAPPER, Kansas; HITCHCOCK, Nebraska; and GLASS, Virginia, have set an example which it would be well for the six wool Senators—WARREN and KENDRICK, Wyoming; BURSUM, New Mexico; STANFIELD, Oregon; GOODING, Idaho; and CAMERON, Arizona—to emulate when the individual amendments are offered to the wool schedule.

CAPPER, HITCHCOCK, and GLASS are all newspaper publishers, and as such purchase the product of wool pulp. While they have no direct interest in paper manufacture, they feel their indirect interest is great enough to justify them to decline to vote on that schedule of the tariff.

These three Senators announced they will observe the rule in Jefferson's Manual, which provides:

"When the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question, he is to withdraw, and where such an interest has appeared his voice has been disallowed, even after division. In a case so contrary not only to the laws of decency but to the fundamental principles of the social compact which denies to any man to be a judge in his own cause, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to."

The fact that CAPPER is a Republican and a supporter of the bill and the other two are Democrats and opponents to it shows that there is no politics in the move, but an intelligent respect for political ethics.

[From the Philadelphia Record.]

In view of the Caraway resolution for an investigation of the wool Senators, Mr. GOODING, of Idaho, offers to resign. That would be an empty form; just a "gesture," as our French friends say. The opulent flockmasters would reelect him quick enough; it is quite worth while for them to keep him in the Senate. The wool duty is no worse than several other things in the tariff. But the spectacle of all the Senators from the very limited woolgrowing regions supporting unprecedentedly high duties on wool can hardly fail to afford the people considerable education in the way tariff laws are made. There is a Tariff Commission, created by the Republicans, but it was invited to mind its own business and keep its hands off the wool tariff; the wool Senators would see to that.

[From the New York Times of July 31, 1922.]

JUDGES IN THEIR OWN CAUSE.

The indignation stirred in the Senate by Senator CARAWAY'S resolution to inquire whether any Senators have a direct pecuniary interest in the tariff rates they are voting for is natural. If there has been any impropriety, Senators have not been aware of it. Long years of tariff legislation have destroyed any delicate sensitiveness on that subject. The protective system being frankly one of logrolling duties so as to put money in various favored pockets, why should a Senator hesitate simply because he finds some of it going into his own? That anybody should be squeamish about it came evidently as a great surprise to the sheep-raising Senators. To them in their innocence it seemed that the fact that they stood to gain by higher duties on wool simply showed that they were skilled experts in advising what the duties should be. If they were satisfied, from the accounts of their own flocks, that 33 cents a pound would be profitable, the argument was strong that other growers would also make money. What could there be wrong about that? The idea that some fastidious persons might blame him was so

startling to Senator GOODING, of Idaho, that he nearly resigned on the spot.

Ordinarily, a public man would shrink from even appearing to act as a judge in his own cause. There are parliamentary rules against doing so. There are, in some cases, statutes forbidding it. Legal and judicial precedents are heavily opposed to it. Some of the Senators, touched on the raw, resented the comparison between them and judges. Yet, as Daniel Webster when a Senator clearly pointed out, there is a sense in which a Senator ought to think of himself as a judge. He is to think not merely of what is good for his constituents or his section, but of what is good for the whole country. He must decide judicially between local claims and the interest of the entire people. This principle, if carried out, would be the death of most protective tariffs; and if it should be fatal to the present friendless and unloved bill, popular grief would be able to contain itself.

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 31, 1922.]

"BAA, BAA, BLACK SHEEP, HAVE YOU ANY WOOL," AND WHOSE IS IT TO BE?

The United States Senate became really interesting Saturday, and it became so because one of its Members introduced a resolution implying that Senators might actually be influenced in tariff or other legislation by their personal financial interests. Senator CARAWAY'S proposal to probe the personal relation of senatorial votes to tariff schedules created an angry hubbub at once, and its prompt adoption was barred by the sympathetic objection of Senator WADSWORTH, of New York.

The Senate heretofore has never shown any reluctance to investigate anything that might come up. In fact, investigation has been its long suit, and nothing has been so rare as a day in June or in any other month in which the Senate has not had one or two committees at work trying to show up the devilry of somebody or something.

But when it comes to investigating Senators the gods on this legislative Mount Olympus become horror-stricken and indignant. The suggestion that a Senator could commit any wrong is almost blasphemous; the insinuation that a Senator could be influenced in his attitude toward the tariff or any other public question by sordid considerations of gain is inexpressibly shocking and preposterous. When a man gets into the Senate he is immediately purged of all human weaknesses, of all human prejudices and influences. His mind at once assumes a judicial impartiality beyond the reach of hot or cold waves of human passion or human selfishness. Such a divinity doth hedge a Senator around that it is profane to question him. That's the way, at least, that some of the Senators seem to regard themselves, if we take Saturday's debate on the Caraway resolution as a key to their self-appraisal.

Unfortunately for this view of senatorial impeccability, there have been quite a number of incidents in recent years which have shaken public faith in this theory. Most persons at an earlier period did believe that Senators were what it was said Caesar's wife should have been, and most of us would like to believe it now if we could prevail on ourselves to shut our eyes to facts. We hate to recall the case of Senator Lorimer, of Illinois, who was finally expelled because of gross misconduct, and we hate to remember how many of his colleagues defended him and tried to persuade the country that he had been guilty of no serious offense. And it is painful to remember that most of those who are now so vehemently protesting against the insult contained in the Caraway resolution were among those who voted to add NEWBERRY to the senatorial family.

In these circumstances it would seem that the opponents of the investigation do protest too much. Their assumption of outraged virtue is not likely to produce a very strong impression upon the public. Indeed, quite the contrary impression will be produced if they continue to oppose the investigation and put themselves in the position of appearing to want to hide the facts. Some of those mentioned as being large sheep raisers, and therefore interested in a high tariff on wool, deny that they own any sheep. Others admit it, but impudently ask what has that got to do with it? Senator WARREN, of Wyoming, who during the debate on the Payne-Aldrich bill in 1909 was referred to, says the New York Times correspondent, as "the greatest shepherd since Abraham," was especially wroth at CARAWAY'S presumptuous reflection upon the 100 per cent purity of high-tariff Senators and denounced it as "a damn fool resolution."

Very likely it will be made "a damn fool resolution" by any investigation the Senate may hold, if those interested in the Fordney-McCumber bill can make it so. But no stalling, no evasion, no finespun arguments can break the force of Saturday's debate in the Senate. What was revealed on the part of some of the participants in that debate was the curious lack of

a sense of delicate honor, a strange failure to perceive the relation between their official action and personal profit, which ninety-nine ordinary men out of a hundred would perceive at once. Senator GOODING, of Idaho, in "denouncing" the Caraway resolution as "politics" declared that if it could be shown that he had violated any law, "by the eternal gods" he would resign his seat. But no one supposes he has violated any written statute by supporting an unprecedentedly high tariff on a commodity in the production of which he is engaged. The question is whether he has violated a higher unwritten code of ethics which would control men of sensitive feelings. That is the moral point involved. Ought senatorial sensibilities to be blunted and more callous than those of the man on the street?

This is the situation presented: A high tariff bill is evolved from somewhere which offers to woolgrowers the highest bonus ever proposed. Certain Senators who are engaged in sheep raising are among the strongest supporters of that bonus. Senator SMOOR says that when Grover Cleveland was elected he (Senator SMOOR) sold all his sheep and has not owned a head since—which, by the way, is rather a tribute to old Grover as an admission that special interests could expect no favors from him. Now, if the sheep Senators who voted for the present wool bonus had sold or offered to sell their flocks and herds, they would have proved they were not voting for their own pocketbooks. But have they done so, or are they going to do so? And what do they stand to make out of this wool deal if it goes through?

The question involved is not a question of Republicanism or of Democracy, of wealth or poverty. No Senator can be expected to divest himself of every business interest. But the size of the interest and its direct connection with proposed legislation are important factors in determining the proper course for a Representative or a Senator. The following rule from Jefferson's Manual, quoted by Senator CARAWAY, seems to furnish a guide for any man who wants one:

"When the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question, he is to withdraw, and where such an interest has appeared his voice has been disallowed even after division. In a case so contrary not only to the laws of decency but to the fundamental principles of the social compact which denies to any man to be a judge in his own cause, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to."

Senator CARAWAY's resolution declares that the charges made are "hurtful to the honor of the Senate." The question to be determined is how much honor the Senate has left.

[From the New York Tribune of July 31, 1922.]

STRAINING PATIENCE.

In so far as the Caraway resolution implies that a Senator may not participate in the making of a tariff if financially interested to any degree in any of its schedules, the resolution is, of course, absurd.

Senators do not exist in vacuums any more than other persons. They are human beings, like the rest of us, and as such are touched in their several businesses by fiscal legislation of universal effect. Farmers are not expected to be inactively neutral when measures of consequence to their class are under consideration, nor may supineness be demanded of manufacturers or wageworkers or other elements of the population.

The rule that a man may not be a judge or determiner when his own interests are at stake is to be applied with common sense and not pressed to an illogical extreme. Impropriety enters only when the interest is special, direct, and so preponderating as to cloud perception of and regard for the general welfare. The issue sensationally thrust on the Senate thus boils down to the practical question whether the so-called "wool" Senators are honestly pursuing what they deem a public end or are controlled by thoughts of personal profit. The matter is not whether they own sheep, but how many; not whether they are woolmen, but whether they are wool kings.

As to this the information as far as it goes is gravely disturbing. In the Congressional Directory Senator STANFIELD, of Oregon, describes himself as "America's largest producer of wool and mutton." Senator GOODING, of Idaho, the leader of the so-called agricultural bloc, says that the raising of sheep has been his life work—acknowledges that his flocks cover many hills. Senator BURSUM, of New Mexico, is also a shepherd, but the extent of his fold he does not state. Senator SMOOR, who probably has had more to do with writing the wool schedule than any other man, is no longer an owner, although formerly he was one.

The conclusion that the average person, dismissing thought of the extreme virtue that Senator CARAWAY emphasizes for obvious political ends, is that the wool Senators have been

rather indecently conspicuous in behalf of Schedule K. A 60 cents per pound duty is obviously high. Their activity has not lessened public suspicion of the tariff bill. Protection will be in danger, as Senator WADSWORTH remarked the other day, when the public becomes convinced that a measure embodying it represents successful grabblings. The members of the agricultural bloc have strained the patience of the country, which has 100 buyers of wool to each producer. Not because they are corrupt but because they should show more sense the wool Senators may be asked to take a seat further in the rear.

[From the Fort Wayne, Ind., Gazette of August 1, 1922.]

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT IT?

Once in a while a dynamic thought is let loose in the Senate Chamber. One was given wing the other day when the courageous and honest CARAWAY, of Arkansas, took cognizance of the everyday comment of the American press on the financial benefits to fall to certain Senators personally interested in the woolen industry by the criminally high tariff proposed on woolens.

He seemed to feel that the facts should be known.

Thus his resolution calling for an investigation of the relation of Senators to industries being given astonishing tariff rates that will greatly increase cost to the consumers and put money in the private purse of Senators who are financially interested.

When he asked for immediate consideration for the resolution it was refused—the son-in-law of John Hay objecting. This worthy was quite sure that it is not permissible to permit the public to know such things.

The debate was interesting.

Senator GOODING, who is charged as being one of the men to financially profit by the increase in the price of woolens this winter, and who has devoted his statesmanship to this one topic, was outraged. He declared dramatically, "By the gods" that if he had "violated any law" he would resign. He meant any statute. Sometimes there is a law of propriety that ought to be, and is not, the law of the land.

Senator WARREN, dubbed by Dolliver "the greatest shepherd since Abraham," said it was a "damn fool resolution." Any resolution that would prevent special interests, Senators or no Senators, from "getting theirs" would be a "damn fool resolution" to this incurable reactionary.

Senator BURSUM, of New Mexico, who will also gain financially, was sure the resolution is "ridiculous."

It is interesting to note that the Senators who are personally interested in the wool rate in the tariff have been in the front rank of the fighting on this one schedule—and in the rear ranks on all else.

This is explained by Senator STANFIELD, of Oregon, who describes himself in his autobiography as "America's greatest producer of wool," on the ground that a personal interest in the subject makes these men just the men to say what the American people shall pay for woolens.

Senator CARAWAY put the other side forcibly enough in the following:

"If I believed that the laws were bought and sold, I would owe no allegiance to that kind of law or the kind of government in which that thing could happen. It would become the duty of every self-respecting citizen to rise up, not only in protest, but if necessary in rebellion, against a government where the laws were bought and sold.

"This is a charge made by reputable Republican papers; it has been reiterated here on the floor of the Senate; it was charged yesterday afternoon by a Member on your side, whose honor and whose acute sense of honor nobody questions, that it was an outrage.

"Is it wise to let the impression go abroad that legislation is being framed by selfish interests, by men directly profiting by the legislation?"

The Senate will not permit that investigation.

Why?

The Senate is not impressed—but what about the people who pay the piper?

Once upon a time one Henry Lippitt became the master lobbyist of the cotton industry. That was his principal work for years. He did his work well. Later he became a Member of the Senate—and as a Senator he remained as he had been, a lobbyist—active on cotton.

These are matters that may amuse Senators, but how do you feel about it?

Would you want a judge financially interested in the result of a suit to sit on a case in which your interests were on the other side? We believe that a judge thus sitting would be open to impeachment. He would feel disgraced.

What is the moral difference between a judge financially interested in a case sitting as judge, and a Senator financially interested in the making of a tariff rate voting on the making of the tariff?

Perhaps there is a difference that escapes us—and we put it up to you. What do you think about it?

We submit that if there is no hard and fast law prohibiting Senators and Congressmen from voting taxes out of the people's pockets into their own there ought to be.

[From the Springfield Republican of July 31, 1922.]

"ROBBER TARIFFS."

The resolution of Senator CARAWAY calling for an investigation of the financial and business connections of Senators in their relation to the pending tariff bill is not so partisan as it may seem. There are Democrats as well as Republicans in that body who might be discredited by the disclosures of the inquiry.

Repeatedly while this tariff bill has been pending Democrats have voted for high duties in opposition to the majority on their own side, and among their number some may have been influenced by their personal interests as well as by the pressure from their own constituents. If Senator CARAWAY planned his stroke for party advantage, he might not be entirely satisfied with the outcome of an investigation.

It is no new thing to find in the Senate men who are deeply interested financially in certain tariff schedules. Senator GOODING, of Idaho, who owns great flocks of sheep, has become notorious mainly because of his aggressive insistence in the Senate upon wool duties that seem outrageous in their effect on the prices of clothing, but even his brutal disregard of the consumer's interest and his cave man's theory of protection as synonymous with embargoes and absolute monopoly are by no means unprecedented. We had the "Senators from Haverly" when the sugar schedule was fought over in Mr. Cleveland's second administration. Only a very few years ago Rhode Island had one of the largest textile manufacturers in the country, Mr. Lippitt, as one of its Senators. There has not been a time in 50 years when the Pennsylvania iron and steel makers did not virtually own the Senators from the Keystone State when tariff duties on iron and steel were under consideration, whether or not those Senators personally owned shares in steel companies.

Moral standards in legislation have risen in some directions, but not in others. It is no longer "ethical," in the public view, for legislators to own stock in a railroad that is the subject matter of a pending bill. A selfish interest in a franchise can not safely be exposed to popular scrutiny by a member of the body that grants it. The late Senator Foraker was driven out of public life after it had been shown that as a lawyer he had acted as counsel for the Standard Oil Co. Not so many "railroad attorneys," actually under retainers, now sit in our lawmaking bodies. Senator Bailey, of Texas, expired as an influence in politics after his connection with Southwestern oil companies became known. When President Roosevelt wished to embarrass Senator Tillman, of South Carolina, who had been attacking him, he made public the fact that Mr. Tillman had had some connection with certain investments in the far Northwest and might be trying to make money out of the public lands.

It is singular that the public conscience has not grown equally sensitive to the personal interests of Members of Congress in tariff legislation. It is absurd to brand a Foraker or a Bailey and then virtually license FRANK GOODING, of Idaho, a wool-grower, to fix in the United States Senate the prices of the clothes we buy through his dictation of the duties on raw wool. Possibly the people are now waking up to this iniquitous aspect of tariff legislation, which gives reality to "robber tariffs." If they really are, a "scientific tariff" may not be so far away as the higher cynics have believed.

[From the Boston Globe of July 31, 1922.]

MUCKRAKING AGAIN.

Senator CARAWAY, of Arkansas, is earning a name as "the bad little brother" of the Senate. It is the little brother who really gives the bride away by spilling awkward words just when the festivities are at their height.

The Caraway resolution for an investigation of the charges that certain Members of the National Upper House are interested financially in the pending tariff bill was outlawed by the objection of a single Senator. Mr. CARAWAY is a Democrat, of course; but it is the feeling of many on the Republican side that his allegiance to another party is not an excuse for giving currency to such horrid charges as those which have been made, especially those against wool-growing Senators, who are

patriotically trying to do their bit to cover the backs of their fellow citizens with fleeces from home-bred sheep.

It is small wonder that Senator WARREN, who was called by the late Senator Dolliver "the greatest shepherd since Abraham," should have been driven to strong language, or that Senator STANFIELD, of Oregon, described in the Congressional Directory as "America's largest producer of wool and mutton," should have argued that the very fact that he is interested in wool enables him "to vote more intelligently."

Even though the Senate has shut off the investigation by its system of senatorial courtesy, the public has been made to believe that the cat is out of the bag, the sheep out of the pen. The result will be many unofficial investigations. This Caraway resolution has opened the gates to muckraking of the sort which was so popular a dozen years ago, when a man's public conduct was judged in the light of his private interests. Even now an army with rakes is threatening the sanctity of the most expensive club in the world.

[From the New York Globe.]

SENATORS FROM THE WOOL RANCHES.

Senator CARAWAY has proposed an investigation of what every Senator and everyone familiar with Washington affairs already knows, namely, the relations between certain Senators and the wool industry. Neither Senator GOODING, nor Senator WARREN, nor Senator STANFIELD, nor Senator BURSUM has made any secret of their peculiar interest in the wool schedules. The case of Senator SMOOT is superficially different, for although he is a prominent banker and investor in a State in which sheep raising is important, he has not owned sheep directly for some 30 years.

Still other Senators are bound by personal, political, or business affiliations to support this or other schedules in which they have not a direct pecuniary interest. The whole tariff bill has been written primarily on the showing of those who expect to benefit by it, for although there was a public hearing on most of the items the producers who wanted the tariff were always better organized and more adroitly represented than the consumers who stood to lose by it. There is an element of corruption in every protective tariff made as protective tariffs have always been made in this country.

There are, however, degrees of corruption which public opinion can not tolerate. One of these is reached when a business man in Congress takes an active part in forwarding legislation which will put money into his own pocket. This is exactly what several of the wool Senators have been doing, and their action can not be excused by the specious argument of Senator STANFIELD that their personal interest in wool fits them "to vote intelligently; more intelligently, perhaps, than many others who are opposed to the principle of a protective tariff." The political experience of mankind showed long ago just how untrustworthy "intelligence" of this kind is. The principle is firmly established with regard to judges; it ought to be established with equal firmness with regard to legislators. The wool Senators know, and everyone else knows, that they are taking the Federal pay for serving their own interests. An ordinary sense of decency would lead them to withdraw from the debate. In the present condition of American politics it is too much to expect that they should abstain from voting on schedules in which they have a financial concern, but a high sense of honor—an honor to which American legislators may yet attain—would demand even that.

Senator CARAWAY is to be thanked for turning the spot light upon the Senate at the very moment when the spectacle it revealed was most instructive. If other legislators would more frequently forget "senatorial courtesy" the upper House might be purged of some Members who have no moral right to sit there.

[From the New York World of July 31, 1922.]

THE WOOL-TARIFF SCANDAL.

The scandal of the wool schedule can not be suppressed by shelving the Caraway resolution. It can not be brushed aside as of no importance. It can not be dismissed as being inspired by partisan politics. For it goes to the root of the system of tariff making for which the Republican majority in the Senate stands responsible.

The issue is as plain as it can be. It is a question of common honesty. If individual Republican Senators or a group of Republican Senators as woolgrowers are financially interested in the rates of the pending tariff bill, in decency they should be barred from voting. No protests of rectitude and no specious pleas of service to industries of their sections can be made to justify their using their official position to vote money into their own pockets. Men in places of trust are regularly sent to

jail for doing that very thing. The Senator who does not hesitate to misuse his power to raise money from the public not for the public but for himself must be wholly insensitive to the moral quality of his acts or defiant of public opinion.

The audacity of the woolgrowing Senators of the West during the debate on the Caraway resolution was astounding. They have gone too far to be capable of showing any shame. They are too sure of the profits of tariff legislation to give up anything that they have been promised. In the bargaining in duties with other Senators who have special interests to care for they have obtained advantages which they intend to hold; otherwise the whole tariff bill would go to smash.

So Senator WARREN, a Wyoming woolgrower, denounces "these damn-fool, nonsensical investigations." And Senator STANFIELD, of Oregon, who boasts in the Congressional Directory of being "America's largest producer of wool and mutton," professes indignation that any Senator, "because he happens to be interested in wool," should be criticized for "voting for this woolen schedule." And Senator BURSUM, of New Mexico, a woolgrower, complains that "this whole proceeding seems to me an undue capitalization of a matter which is unimportant for the reason that it is of daily occurrence." And Senator GOODING, of Idaho, another woolgrower, who wrote the wool rates, explains that if every Senator followed the rule of not voting where he had invested in something, "there would not be a quorum on the tariff question at all." And Senator WADSWORTH, of New York, farmer and live-stock grower by profession, trails along with the remark that the Caraway resolution is uncalled for and objects to its consideration.

It is a revealing picture of the methods by which a Republican tariff bill, not merely the woolen schedule, is prepared and put through the Senate. It exposes the party of moral ideas at its highest point of efficiency. And not a Republican voice from the side of the high protectionists is raised in condemnation.

It was shown in the Newberry case that with the approval of the Republican majority seats in the Senate may go to the highest bidder. Is it now to be a matter of record that with the approval of the Republican majority Republicans holding seats in the Senate may without dishonor use their official position and power for their personal enrichment; that it is their private privilege to lay an outrageous tax on the American people for their own immediate profit?

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, I understand that under the rules of the Senate the resolution goes over until to-morrow. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no resolution before the Senate at this time. The tariff bill is before the Senate.

Mr. GOODING. My understanding is that the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate reported unfavorably the resolution which was submitted yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report of the committee has gone to the calendar in accordance with the rule.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a wool pool has been referred to in which it was said that I was interested, I want to say that I never bought a pound of wool in my life. It has become the custom in this country to organize wool pools. That custom exists not only in the Western States but in practically all the Eastern States. This has been brought about by the fact that those who buy wool divided up the territory, and there was no longer any competition between those who were in the wool trade. The woolgrowers of the West were at the mercy, if you please, of men in the business who combined together, as I have said, and divided the territory so that there was no competition at all in the wool market; and for that purpose they organized these wool pools, sometimes having wool auctions, gathering the wool into large warehouses, and trying to get somewhere near the market price.

The wool pool that was organized at Shoshone, Idaho, and in which the press say that I was financially interested, was a wool pool that I understand covered about a million pounds of wool of the different woolgrowers. I likely was one of the very smallest sheep owners in that pool. I knew nothing about it. The wool sold for 30 cents a pound, and the next day another pool was formed in the neighborhood where the few flocks I had were feeding, and that wool was sold for 31 cents a pound.

I made this statement before, but, in view of the fact that I have been referred to as being interested in making so many millions out of this wool business, I wanted to repeat it—that the wool pool in which I was interested got the smallest price paid for wool in the West this year; that through the pooling they finally succeeded in receiving as high a price as 38 cents a pound on wool, and I was unfortunate, through the kindness

of a brother who thought he was doing me a good turn, to have my wool go in with his pool in a neighborhood practically 50 miles away from where my sheep were being ranged, and I lost something like \$700 or \$800.

For two years I was out of the sheep business. I thought I was through owning any live stock, as far as that is concerned. Then came the great crisis which swept over the country, brought about largely by free wool and a Democratic administration, who never made an effort to bring the country down by stages, as England did her agricultural interests and as was done over in Australia; but with a smash and a bang they took off all control they had of farm products, and did everything they could to deflate the farm prices, with the result that it practically broke and paralyzed the live-stock industry of the country. I was unfortunate enough to have to take back the sheep in which I am now interested. I am charged with having sheep on a thousand hills. I have a half interest in 8,000 sheep, which ranks me as a small live-stock grower in the West.

I am not offering this as an excuse for having voted for a duty on wool that is less than the difference in the cost of production between this country and foreign countries. I want to say to the Senator that my conscience is not hurt at all by the charges which have been made. I am not so sensitive or ignorant that I do not know that I have only done my duty in a manly way, and I am going to continue to do it and fight to protect the industries of my State as long as I have a seat in the United States Senate.

I want to say that, as far as the present duty on wool of 33 cents on the scoured basis is concerned, the cost of production to-day is even greater than 33 cents on the pound of scoured wool. The freight charges alone, the commission charges, and the scouring charges, after the wool leaves the farm in the West, all of which the woolgrower must pay, amount to 8½ cents on a pound of clean wool. The cost of handling and running sheep to-day is a dollar a head more than it was before the war. The sheep of the West shear somewhere near 2½ pounds of clean wool. It is going to cost something like 48½ cents a pound more to lay a pound of clean wool down in Boston than it did before the war. So, unless there is an increase in the price of wool, the industry can not live even with a duty of 33 cents on the scoured basis. That is the lowest duty that has been placed on wool by the Republican Party, or as low a duty, for a half a century, and the only difference, if you please, is the fact that the duty is placed on the clean content of a pound of wool. It is possible for the woolgrower to come nearer getting the full duty on wool than he did when it was based on the grease content of the wool, but there is nothing certain about it, for to-day, with 45 cents on the scoured basis, some classes of wool are selling in Boston for less than the duty of 45 cents a pound. The American manufacturer is the only market for American wool. He is the sole master and he beats the price down to the lowest point. Just how much the duty would benefit the woolgrower nobody knows, but if the Finance Committee had accepted Schedule K, something which gave the manufacturers a hidden duty, I would not have been attacked as I have been by the Boston newspapers and other newspapers of the country and charged with having violated my oath of office.

I am not going to take up any more time of the Senate. I merely say that when my resolution comes up I am at least going to speak upon it, and I hope the resolution I have introduced will be accepted, because I know it covers in a very fair way all that everybody who is interested in the pending tariff bill wants, and I have confidence that the Presiding Officer will appoint a committee consisting of men of judgment, integrity, and honesty, and he will not have any trouble finding that kind of men on both sides of the Chamber in the United States Senate.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, on last Saturday I introduced a resolution which sought to ascertain what, if any, financial or professional interest Senators had in rates of the various schedules of either the pending tariff bill or the emergency tariff law. Quite a number of Senators, who elected to imagine they were being accused, entered denials that they were interested, and others undertook to justify their votes in the interest of their people's interest.

As I said before, and say again, it is not my province to determine whether they had a right to cast such votes. I think, following the interpretation of others who have discussed the provision of Jefferson's Manual, that if one's personal interest is large, if it is the main thing in his life, if it is of such predominance that it might lead people who are not familiar with his high character to suspect he may have been influenced by his private interests and not the public good, he ought to refrain from voting. After all, it may be that it is a question for each individual Senator to determine for himself.

I sometimes can not tell whether the mannerisms of the Senator from Idaho indicate anger or intensity of interest and purpose, but he was deeply stirred, and, using his own swear words, "by the eternal gods," he announced he was going to have an investigation. He repeated that declaration on at least two occasions on the floor, and I have also read similar statements in print, and I thought that "by the eternal gods" he meant it.

Yesterday there was a chance to introduce a resolution. I refrained from reintroducing the one I had previously introduced, and which had been objected to by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], because I presumed that a man who was the self-selected head of the farmers' tariff bloc would do whatever he said he would, and I necessarily presumed we would have an investigation. I feared I could not get it. I knew, or at least I was told, that if the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] were absent from the Chamber, other Republican Senators had been posted to object to any resolution I might offer. But a powerful Senator, or a Senator who is credited, whether rightly or wrongly, with having written the whole schedule dealing with wool, having said so confidently that "by the eternal gods" he would have an investigation, I naturally refrained from offering any resolution, content that the mighty Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] should take the laboring oar and bring about an investigation.

The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse, according to the opinion of the Republican colleagues of this great Senator from Idaho. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which his resolution was referred, promptly reported it back with this statement, if I may be permitted to translate it, without giving offense: "There is nothing in the Gooding resolution but foolishness, and we are not going to help the Senator from Idaho make a fool of the Senate, and therefore we report his resolution adversely."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] said it would take two years and hundreds of thousands of dollars to carry out the investigation suggested by the Senator from Idaho; and the Senator from Wisconsin, who I understand from the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], represents practically the entire unadulterated intelligence of the Republican Party, took the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to task for admitting he would vote for that resolution.

That is the view which the "intelligent" Members of the Senate on the Republican side entertain of the resolution offered by the great Senator from Idaho. I will not charge it, because I do not know, but it may be that it was intended to be a joke, and be laughed out of court. That is what has happened to it, anyway.

The only real charge in the resolution of the Senator from Idaho dealt with Mr. Munsey and the New York Herald, and the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], who is the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, took occasion in his report to say that the charge was unfounded and unjustified.

The committee prejudged the case and said there was nothing in the charge; that Mr. Munsey and his paper were guilty of no wrongdoing nor of any impropriety, as charged by the Senator from Idaho.

The Senator from Idaho protests his innocence, and I am going to permit him to do it. It is nothing to me; I have never made a charge against him. I never knew he had 8,000 sheep until to-day. I had never heard the number mentioned. But the Senator thinks it is reprehensible—and in that opinion the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] concur—for a newspaper to accept an advertisement from an importer, and that if it does, that importer will influence its editorials, will control the editorial policy of the paper. The Senator from North Dakota so charged, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] agreed, that papers which accepted these advertisements were controlled by their advertisers; that, in other words, they sold their editorials to their advertisers.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want the Senator to correct his statement so far as the Senator from Utah is concerned. The Senator from Utah has never stood upon this floor and said one word about the advertisements in papers in any part of the United States.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am awfully glad to know that.

Mr. SMOOT. Not one word.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator does not believe they were controlled by their advertising columns?

Mr. SMOOT. The only question that was ever asked was by Senator ROBINSON—

Mr. CARAWAY. I say, the Senator does not believe that they were controlled by their advertising columns?

Mr. SMOOT. I could not say the papers were. I do not know a thing about it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Has the Senator any opinion?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I have not; because some may be and others not. I could not say a word about it. I know nothing about it.

Mr. CARAWAY. And yet the Senator knows as much about it—

Mr. SMOOT. I do not propose to stand upon the floor of the Senate and make a statement about something I know nothing about.

Mr. CARAWAY. I commend the Senator for that. I have for him a very high opinion. Evidently, with all the facts the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Indiana together had, he does not believe there was evidence to convict the newspapers.

The Senator from Idaho, who wants to investigate the newspapers, especially to investigate Frank Munsey, does believe that private interests control the great dailies in the discharge of their public duty, because we all know that a newspaper owes a public duty to report correctly the news and, as far as possible, reflect in their editorials a high moral sentiment. He believes those papers were controlled against the Republican Party by the importing houses that advertised in their columns. Now is it any wonder that the papers say that Senators who are directly financially interested in the production of articles on which unjustifiable duties have been levied were influenced by their private interests? One is no more reasonable than the other. When he makes the charge in his resolution and in his statement, the Senator admits that people are influenced and controlled by their private interests, and that is what the newspapers said about Senators, that they were interested and, therefore, were controlled by their private interests.

Of course I am perfectly willing for the Senator to turn State's evidence. That seems to have been his intention. He seems to admit that he and those who had been charged by the New York Herald were guilty, but seeks by his resolution to show that all other Republicans are no better than they. If that is all he expects to disclose, there is not much use, I think, in spending several thousand dollars in investigations to ascertain that fact. It will be admitted that he is correct about it.

But, Mr. President, it is amusing to watch the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], for whose intelligence I have a very high regard, differentiate. He would not do what the Senator from Idaho did. He would not charge the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] with being a hypocrite because he did not vote for a reduction of the rate on pulp. He did not charge that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] were hypocrites. He said they were to be commended for their course, that it was proper that they should refrain from voting because they were the owners of newspapers, and therefore directly interested in the price of newspaper paper. But, on the other hand, it was entirely proper, he said, for Senators to vote for matters in which they had an overwhelming financial interest if other people in their States were likewise interested. In other words, the Senator from Wisconsin laid down the rule, Mr. President, that we have a right as Senators to advocate anything the people in our States wish. That is what it reduces itself to, that we have a right to violate the oath of office we took when we were sworn into the Senate of these United States and justify it by saying that it is the wish of the people we represent.

How, then, could any man be held to any course of propriety? He could say that he spoke for the interests and opinions of his people. He could advocate the repeal of the Constitution and be entirely within his right by saying that the people of his State wanted it done. John C. Calhoun and those Senators who believed with him in State rights and nullification ought never to have been condemned by any Senator on the other side of this Chamber, if they accept the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, because those Senators evidently spoke the sentiment of the people of their States. A Senator from the State of Kentucky was driven out of this Senate during the war, not because he did not speak the sentiments of his people but because he did not speak the sentiments of the people who lived north of the Mason and Dixon line. Senators expelled him from the Senate. Now, the Senator from Wisconsin would condemn every Senator who voted that way because, he has said, we have a right to advocate anything and cast any kind of vote, however corrupt, if we can show that

the people in our State wanted us to cast that vote or that they would be benefited by it.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. At that point may I say that we have this anomalous situation: The people in my State are admittedly for free wool. The people in the State of Idaho are not for free wool. A woolgrower from Kentucky, if he were in the Senate, could not vote for the duty if he had a material interest, because his people do not agree with him, while a woolgrower in Idaho could vote for it.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think the Senator's statement—the Senator from Wisconsin—will be interesting reading in New Jersey, for instance. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] wants to stay here. That is a laudable ambition. The people of his State evidently believe in light wines and beer, because they elected a governor on that platform by an overwhelming majority when the other State officers were Republican and the governor a Democrat. I suggest, according to the Senator from Wisconsin, that the Senator from New Jersey had no right to cast a dry vote here, if the Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Oh, the idea that the question of whether an act is right or wrong could be determined by whether your people agree with you is so absurd that any Senator who could lay that down as a touchstone of right or wrong has not any conception of what right or wrong really is. On the contrary, Mr. President, it is a principle; it is a question of honor; it is a question of that finer sense that gentlemen feel should guide them in dealing with all questions, public or private, and not whether their State would be financially interested or bettered.

Now, may I say one further thing and then I am through. I realize that the resolution of the Senator from Idaho was not urged very strenuously. I rather imagine he expected the thing to happen to it that did happen to it. I suspect he wanted it that way. It strikes me, if I may say so without being critical, that it was such an absurd resolution that I did not presume anybody was going to seriously press it. I do not presume it was expected to be pressed. The country is permitted to make up its mind as to whether Senators on the floor of the Senate of the United States have been influenced by their private interests in piling up rates on schedules that are to cost the other part of the country hundreds of millions of dollars by the attitude of the Republican Party which by its act says, "We are not going to permit you, the people who are to pay the taxes, to have any information as to the motives which impelled us to levy these outrageous rates of duty upon you, if we by any parliamentary tactics can keep you from knowing them."

There is a rule of evidence, as old as the common law, that where a witness is in possession of information and he alone has it and refuses to reveal it, it must be presumed that his testimony would hurt his cause. Applying that rule to the present situation, the country would be justified in deciding, and will decide, that there is information in the possession of the Senate which, if made known, would be hurtful to the Senators who wrote these schedules, and therefore that information is denied.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a decision rendered by the Speaker of the House of Representatives a good many years ago on the question of the right of a Member of the House or the Senate to vote upon a question in which he is interested. I am not going to take the time to read it, but I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, because it covers the question fully, and I think every Senator ought to read it before he casts his vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From vol. 5, par. 5952, pp. 503-504, of Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives.]

"On April 11, 1874, the House was considering the bill of the House (No. 1572) to amend the several acts providing a national currency and to establish free banking, and for other purposes.

"During the proceedings Mr. Robert M. Speer, of Pennsylvania, made the point of order that certain Members holding stock in national banks were not entitled to vote, being personally interested in the pending question. Mr. Speer mentioned three Members—Messrs. Poland, of Vermont, and Hamilton and Phelps, of New Jersey—who were officers of national banks, and therefore, as he held, not entitled to vote on the pending question, which included the following proposition:

"That in lieu of the tax of 1 per cent per annum now imposed on the outstanding circulation of national banks, a tax

of 3 per cent per annum, payable semiannually in gold, shall be collected upon the circulation which has been issued to each national bank which has not been returned for cancellation."

"The Speaker, in ruling, said:

"The Chair will say that the question in fact lies somewhat back of the rules of the House, and while the Chair is going to give his opinion upon the rule and construe it, he begs to make a remark that goes somewhat deeper than the rule. When a very distinguished predecessor in this chair, Mr. Nathaniel Macon, of North Carolina, occupied it, as is familiar to the House, a question arose upon the amendment to the Constitution changing the mode of counting the votes for the election of President and Vice President. The rule at that time was peremptory that the Speaker should not vote except in the case of a tie. It has since been changed. The vote, if the Chair remembers correctly, as handed up to Mr. Macon was 83 in favor of the amendment and 42 opposed to it. The amendment did not have the necessary two-thirds and the rule absolutely forbade the Speaker to vote, and yet he did vote, and the amendment became engrafted in the Constitution of the United States upon that vote; and he voted upon the distinct declaration that the House had no right to adopt any rule abridging the right of a Member to vote; that he voted upon his responsibility to his conscience and to his constituents; that although that rule was positive and peremptory it did not have any effect upon his right. He voted, and, if the Chair remembers correctly, it was attempted to contest afterwards by some judicial process whether the amendment was legally adopted. But the movement proved abortive, and the amendment is now a part of the Constitution. Now, the question comes back whether or not the House has a right to say to any Member that he shall not vote upon any question, and especially if the House has a right to say if 147 Members come here, each owning one share of national-bank stock—which there is no law to prohibit them from holding—they shall by reason of that very fact be incapacitated from legislating on this whole question.

"If there is a majority of one in the House that holds each a single share of stock, and it incapacitates the Members from voting, then, of course, the House can not approach that legislation; it stops right there. \* \* \* Now, it has always been held that where legislation affected a class as distinct from individuals, a Member might vote. Of course, everyone will see the impropriety of a sitting Member, in the case of a contest, voting on his own case. That is so palpably an individual personal interest that there can be no question about it. It comes right down to that single man. There is no class in the matter at all. But where a man does not stand in any way distinct from a class the uniform rule of the American House of Representatives and of the British Parliament, from which we derive our rulings, have been one way. In the year 1871—the Chair is indebted for the suggestion to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. G. F. Hoar], but he remembers the case himself—when a bill was pending in the British House of Commons to abolish the right to sell commissions in the army, which officers had always heretofore enjoyed, and to give a specific sum of money to each army officer in lieu thereof, there were many officers of the army members of the British House of Commons, as there always are, and the point was made that those members could not vote on that bill because they had immediate and direct pecuniary interest in it. The House of Commons did not sustain that point, because the officers referred to only had that interest which was in common with the entire class of army officers outside of the House, many thousands in number.

"Since I have had the honor of being a Member of this House, on the floor and in the chair, many bills giving bounty to soldiers have been voted on here. We have the honor of the presence on this floor of many gentlemen distinguished in the military service who had the benefit of those bounties directly and indirectly. It never could be made a point that they were incapacitated from voting on those bills. They did not enjoy the benefit arising from the legislation distinct and separate from thousands of men in the country who had held similar positions. It was not an interest distinct from the public interest in any way. \* \* \* And the same with pensions. \* \* \* And further, as the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. Henry L. Dawes], has well said, if it should be decided to-day that a Member who holds a share of national-bank stock shall not vote on a question relating to national banks, then the question might come up whether a Member interested in the manufacture of cotton shall have the right to vote upon the tariff on cotton goods, or whether a Member representing a cotton State shall vote upon the question whether cotton shall be taxed, for

that interest is largely represented here by gentlemen engaged in the planting of cotton. And so you can go through the whole round of business and find upon this floor gentlemen who, in common with many citizens outside of this House, have an interest in questions before the House. But they do not have that interest separate and distinct from a class, and, within the meaning of the rule, distinct from the public interest. The Chair, therefore, has no hesitation in saying that he does not sustain the point of order presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Speer].

"Mr. William S. Holman, of Indiana, having appealed from this decision, the appeal was laid on the table, and so the decision of the Chair was sustained."

Mr. McCUMBER obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to send to the desk and have read on behalf of the minority a proposition with reference to a unanimous-consent agreement for a time to vote upon the bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not want to have it considered at this time?

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply want it read, and then to have it lie on the table.

Mr. McCUMBER. I was in hopes the Senator would prepare something and present it to this side of the Chamber so that we would have a little time to consider it, and possibly agree upon it, and settle the matter right now.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not going to ask that.

Mr. McCUMBER. I said that I wish the Senator had presented it to us before he sent it to the desk; but if that is the channel through which we are to receive it, I am glad to receive it from any source. I have no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. I send to the desk a proposition on behalf of the minority looking to an agreement on a time to vote upon the pending bill. I ask that it may be read and lie upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The reading clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT.

It is agreed by unanimous consent that not later than 10 o'clock a. m. on the calendar day of Thursday, August 17, 1922, the Senate shall proceed to vote, without further debate and to the exclusion of all other business upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment thereto, and immediately thereafter upon the bill H. R. 7456, an act to provide revenue, etc., through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition.

That hereafter debate shall be confined to the question before the Senate or the bill itself, and no other business or irrelevant question or motion shall be entertained except by unanimous consent.

That upon the conclusion of the consideration of amendments to the schedule now before the Senate the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of amendments pending or hereafter to be offered to the following paragraphs in the order named, the agreement heretofore made that committee amendments shall be first disposed of being hereby modified so far as such agreement affects those particular paragraphs and amendments offered thereto, namely:

Paragraphs relating to sugar (Schedule 5).

Paragraphs relating to potash and bounty thereon (paragraphs 1635 and 1636) and white arsenic (paragraph 1).

Paragraphs relating to presidential powers (sections 315, 316, 317).

Amendments to tariff commission act.

Paragraphs relating to hides, leather, boots, shoes, and leather goods (paragraphs 1427a, 1431, 1432, 1433, and 1435a).

That upon the conclusion of amendments to said paragraphs, or if the amendments to said paragraphs shall not be concluded prior to that time, after the hour of 11 o'clock a. m., Saturday, August 12, 1922, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on any amendment or motion nor longer than 30 minutes upon the bill.

All questions of order under this agreement shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not ask for immediate action. I ask that it may lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed agreement will lie on the table for the present.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I simply desire to say in respect to the proposal just submitted by the Senator from North Carolina that I think, with a very slight amendment, it will be entirely satisfactory; and I think the amendment which I shall propose will also be satisfactory to Senators on the other side of the Chamber. Inasmuch, however, as the proposed agreement is not to be acted upon just now, I should like to go over it a little with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] in order to understand just exactly what particular provisions come within the matters which are proposed first to be considered.

Mr. President, having spent four and a quarter hours of the day on matters outside the pending tariff bill, I hope we may now get to the bill and make some real progress upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the Committee on Finance.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 171, line 22, before the word "cents," to strike out the figures "20" and to insert "30," so as to read:

PAR. 1306. 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, gelatin, metal, or other material (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, shall pay duty at the following rates: Labels and flaps, printed in less than eight colors (bronze printing to be counted as two colors), but not printed in whole or in part in metal leaf, 30 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on page 171, line 22, before the words "per pound," I desire, on behalf of the committee, to modify the amendment by substituting the numeral "25" for the numeral "30."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I have endeavored to get the floor several times. I merely wish to make a short statement with reference to the much-discussed wool schedule and the statement made by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY]. The Senator from Arkansas seems to be very much disturbed about the moral integrity of the Senate; he pretends to be very seriously affected thereby. It is evident to my mind that there has never been any such exemplification of curbstone politics displayed in the Senate in all its history as has been indulged in within the last day or two with reference to the wool schedule.

There is no dispute as to the main facts relative to this matter. The Senator from Arkansas introduced his resolution pursuant to an article which appeared in the New York Herald charging that certain Senators were interested in the growing of wool. Mr. President, suppose they are. There is no denial that some Senators in this body are interested in the growing of wool. I, for one, am frank to say that I was interested in the growing of wool before I became a Senator, and I have been so interested since I have become a Senator. I have always believed in the doctrine of protection and in a tariff on wool.

The question of a duty on wool was brought up in my State in the State convention and it was made an issue in the election of 1921. The convention platform adopted specifically a duty of 33 cents a pound upon wool upon the scoured basis, and upon that platform I was elected a Senator from that State. I publicly pledged the people of my State to support a duty of 33 cents on clean wool, and, therefore, was charged with the duty of carrying out the mandate of the people of my State. If I did not do so, I would be failing in my duty.

I submit, Mr. President, that the fact that a Senator may have an interest or ownership in an industry which is national in its character is only an incident and can not be construed as an individual or personal question. The Senator from Arkansas assumes the position of a moral disinfector or a censor of what he imagines to be the morals of some of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, it is my view that a person who assumes that there is a lack of honesty as to questions of this kind and who would challenge the honesty of any Senator or his good faith or that he is not acting in accordance with the dictates of his conscience is pursuing the tactics of a demagogue. There is nothing else to the whole proposition. It is cheap politics—the cheapest kind of politics.

Mr. President, one of the fundamentals of the organization of this Government is the right of sovereign States to have representation in this body; and I deny the right of any Senator, of any committee, or even the Senate itself, to disfranchise any State from representation on all questions before the Senate upon grounds similar to those advanced in this resolution.

Mr. President, what is there to investigate? There is nothing to investigate. If any Senator has violated any rule of the Senate, let that fact be known; let the point of order be made to the Presiding Officer; and let the Presiding Officer decide the question. If any Senator is not satisfied with the decision of the Presiding Officer, let him take an appeal to the Senate on the floor of the Senate. We have our rules; there is no question about the rules; and there is no question about the application of the rules. In the matter suggested by the resolution of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] there is no question on earth that the rules in no way apply in any shape, manner, or form. It is simply a case of bidding and obtaining cheap notoriety on the first pages of the newspapers of the country in order to carry on propaganda for political purposes.

My prediction is that this tempest in a teapot resolution or investigation will amount to nothing. I do not care anything about this investigation; I have no objection to committees and Senators investigating until they are black and blue in the face; but I say now that nothing constructive or helpful to the public will come of it. It will only be a farce; we may waste a large sum of public money for which no useful purpose will have been subserved. I am thoroughly satisfied with the righteousness of my vote on wool. It is fair, just, reasonable, and right. It is an honest duty due an honorable and essential industry, necessary and vital to its preservation, and vital to the welfare and security of the Nation.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it ought to be the ambition and the desire of every Senator in this body to keep untarnished the good name of the Senate; it ought to be the desire of every Senator to do everything in his power to prevent anything from transpiring here that will reflect upon its honor and integrity. This body ought not to be the rendezvous of special privilege or the clearing house for tradesmen. It ought to remain the Senate of the United States, filled with men coming from the sovereign States who will live up to the oath which they took when they entered this body to support and defend free institutions. It looks as if some Senators would like to get away from that idea and make the Senate a trafficking institution whereby special interests can send their special agents here, and under the guise of United States Senators vote to tax the whole American people to build up the fortunes of those whose agents they are. That is not my conception of the duty of a Senator.

Mr. President, every State in the Union safeguards the principle that is involved here. We elect officers for a given term, and we throw restraints around those officers, in order to do what? To keep them from raising their own salaries during the term for which they were elected. A Senator should not vote to raise his salary during his term. When he is elected for a term of six years at \$7,500 per year, it would be wrong for him to vote to increase his salary to \$15,000 a year as soon as he gets in the Senate. What is the difference between that and a wool king taking his seat here as a United States Senator, when his business is worth a half million dollars, and then immediately vote to increase his wealth to three-quarters of a million dollars by taxing me and everybody else in the country upon wool? What right has he to do that? Senators resent the idea that some of us have of protecting this Chamber and the people against such trafficking.

The Senator from New Mexico invites the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] to submit his proposition to the Presiding Officer as to whether these men interested financially in the question before the Senate should be allowed to vote, and then, if he rules against them, to appeal to the Senate. I suggest an amendment to that suggestion, and that is that we then appeal to the judgment bar of the American people. We have got that right, and we will take advantage of it. Mr. President, the American people are not going to permit anybody to come here and simply vote to put money in his own pocket or to represent special interests against the interests of the great mass of the American people. That was not the intention the founders had when they builded this Republic, and those of us who are here ought to safeguard it from just such things as that. Instead of that we are being scolded and criticized by Senators on the other side for undertaking to hold the Senate true to the course the founders intended it should follow.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] has introduced a resolution which is pretty broad in its scope, to investigate who is who in this body with regard to these big interests. Let the investigation proceed; it is high time that the American people were finding out just what hold the money power has upon this great Government of ours. Turn on the light and let the truth be known.

What do they say here to-day? The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING]—himself accused, with a number of other wool kings, of voting in this body to put money into his own pockets by taxing the men and women of America—rises in his place and asks to have an investigation conducted; and here comes the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], chairman of a committee, sitting right in a place where he can use his power to protect these people who ought to be investigated; he rises immediately; he does not wait for the resolution to get cold until he comes in and tells the Senate and the country that his committee has reported it adversely, therefore shutting the door in the face of his Republican colleague from Idaho and saying, "There will be no investigation had just now."

Mr. President, that will be pleasing news to the Senator's friends in New York. My good friend [Mr. CALDER] has a race on up there now, running pretty lively, in New York State,

Some of those big buccaneers in Wall Street will laugh when they hear what he has done for them to-day.

"What about that resolution of investigation?"

"How is that?"

"What about the investigation resolution?"

"There will be no investigation."

"Good for you," they will say.

Oh, Mr. President, these revels of greed and avarice have been had before in history. They flourish for a time, but they pass away. The American people are not going to submit to this sort of thing, Senators. I do not think they will.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM] says he has always believed in protection, and therefore, because that is his belief, he should be excused from a rule that would prevent a man from voting where his private interests were involved. A burglar might say, "What business have you to arrest me? I have always believed in burglary. That is one of my cardinal principles. Pillage and plunder is what I live on. What right have you to interfere with my pleasant pastime?" [Laughter.] So one of these pillaging and plundering fellows comes in and says, "Yes; I voted to put this money in my pocket by laying a tax on wool and taxing all the men, women, and children in America; but what right have you to say anything about it? I have believed in that doctrine from my youth up."

Mr. President, when I used to practice law, many years ago, I would see a judge sitting on the bench trying cases, and after a while he would reach a certain case and then he would rise and say, "Gentlemen," speaking to the lawyers and the people present, "I am interested in the next case that is to be tried, and I do not think I am competent to sit in it, and I ought not to sit in it because of the interest I have in it. I therefore vacate the bench and ask one of you lawyers to come up and preside in this case"; and another lawyer would go and relieve the judge in the trial of a case, maybe, where the amount of \$50 or \$100 or more was involved. So careful is a judge to safeguard this principle of eternal right and justice that he will not sit in a case where he is even remotely interested. Every time one of these cases is tried and a jury is impaneled to sit in it and to make its judgment upon it the lawyers on both sides of the case sit there and they will have this question asked of the juror: "Are you personally interested in this case? Are you interested in the outcome of this litigation? Are you related by blood or marriage to either one of the parties litigant here?" He says: "I am not." All right; he is qualified so far as that goes and they either accept him or reject him; but the minute he says, "I am interested in a financial way," the judge says, "You are incompetent; stand aside." But in the great Senate of the United States a Senator who has millions of dollars invested in wool can stand in this body and vote to put upon it a sky-high tax rate that increases his fortune, and then those of us who say that that is wrong, that it is immoral to do it, are criticized, and they say we are old fogies in our ideas.

Mr. President, when a Senator stands in this lawmaking body and a great trust concern like the Woolen Trust is up for consideration and a measure is pending that will put money in his pocket by the thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars, when his name is called he ought to stand up like a real American and say, "If this amendment is adopted it means hundreds of thousands of dollars to me. If I vote for it I am voting to take money out of the pockets of other people to put into my own. Under the circumstances I do not feel that I should vote upon this particular item."

Mr. President, that has been done before in both branches of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On line 23, page 171, the committee proposes to strike out "30" and insert "45," so as to read:

Cigar bands of the same number of colors and printings, 45 cents per pound.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cummins	Frelinghuysen	Harrison
Ball	Curtis	Glass	Hefflin
Broussard	Dillingham	Gooding	Jones, Wash.
Calder	du Pont	Hale	Kendrick
Capper	Ernst	Harris	Keyes

Ladd	Nelson	Ransdell	Sterling
Lehroot	Newberry	Rawson	Trammell
Lodge	Oddie	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
McCormick	Overman	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
McCumber	Pepper	Simmons	Watson, Ind.
McKinley	Phipps	Smoot	Willis
McLean	Pittman	Spencer	
McNary	Pomerene	Stanfield	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 171, line 23, where the committee proposes to strike out "30" and to insert "45."

Mr. SMOOT. I desire that the Senate shall substitute "35" for "45."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the action of the committee in receding from the outrageously high rate proposed by them in the first place is to be commended, but the reduction proposed is comparatively insignificant. Possibly the Senate might be interested in learning just exactly what these specific rates in this particular paragraph mean when converted into ad valorem rates and compared with the rates in existing law.

This paragraph includes a large number of commodities made of paper. Thus, cigar bands, labels, and flaps of less than eight colors are included. The present law subjects those to a duty of 28.08 per cent, and that is raised to 73.4 per cent. If those come from Cuba they bear a rate under the present law of 6.55 per cent, which becomes 14.7 per cent under the pending bill.

Mr. SMOOT. What rate is the Senator speaking of?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am speaking of cigar bands, labels, and flaps, if they are of less than eight colors. The present rate is 7.31 and that is raised to 17.5 per cent; 14.86 per cent on another variety is raised to 35.8 per cent; 24.01 per cent to 54.2 per cent; 11.08 per cent to 25 per cent; and 14.78 per cent to 28.6 per cent. Cigar labels, flaps, and so on, in whole or in part printed upon metal leaf, are subjected, under the present law, to a rate of 34.05 per cent, and that is increased to 73.5 per cent. I am not particularly interested in this commodity, but I dare say that the manufacturers of cigars throughout the country will find this no small burden.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator tell me to what year he refers in giving the equivalent ad valorem to which he has referred?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. They are based upon current prices, as shown in the Reynolds report, figures prepared for me by the expert on paper for the Tariff Commission.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the figures of the Senator are wrong, or I misunderstand them.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not pretend to know myself. I am giving the information which comes from the expert of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They are based on values for 1921.

Mr. SMOOT. Were those equivalents based upon the rates which were first proposed by the committee?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. They were based on the rates proposed. I invite the Senator's attention to the reductions. For instance, by the change just made the rate is reduced from 32 to 25 cents a pound, which is a reduction of 16½ per cent, so 73.4 per cent will be reduced to practically 54.4 per cent, as against 28.8 per cent, and so on down the line. In other words, these figures I have given now must be reduced, by virtue of the reductions proposed by the committee, somewhere from 10 to 20 per cent. The Senate will understand that.

Let me give some other items which are included in this paragraph. A great many of our young women are interested in pottery decoration and that kind of thing. Decalcomanias are used in that interesting work, which is artistic and educative in character. The rate on decalcomanias under existing law is 11.6 per cent, and that is increased to 28.5 per cent. Another variety, of a different style, is increased from 11.78 per cent to 31.4 per cent. Souvenir post cards are raised from 12.11 per cent to 40 per cent. I am not going to spend any time upon these matters. I just wanted to indicate to the Senate what they were doing in adopting these rates.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this relates to the art of lithographing, and men serve years to learn the trade. There are engaged in it about 20,000 men in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, where this work is very largely done.

The Tariff Commission have taken the trouble to inquire into the wages paid to men in this industry. They tell me that in America, in and about the centers I have indicated, they pay the men an average wage running from \$39 to \$42 a week, and men doing the same sort of work in Germany are receiving in the neighborhood of \$2.35 a week. So, of course, if we hope to check what appears to be a rush of these imports into

this country during the past few months, we must increase the duty as the committee has recommended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 172, line 2, to strike out "30" and insert in lieu thereof "45," so as to read:

Labels and flaps printed in eight or more colors (bronze printing to be counted as two colors), but not printed in whole or in part in metal leaf, 45 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I move to substitute "35" for "45."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 172, line 3, to strike out "40" and insert in lieu thereof "60," so as to read:

Cigar bands of the same number of colors and printings, 60 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I move to insert "50" for "60."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 172, line 5, to strike out "50" and insert in lieu thereof "75," so as to read:

Labels and flaps, printed in whole or in part in metal leaf, 75 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that "60" be substituted for "75."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 172, line 6, to strike out "55" and insert in lieu thereof "82½," so as to read:

Cigar bands, printed in whole or in part in metal leaf, 82½ cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that "65" be substituted for "82½."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 172, line 14, to strike out "8" and insert in lieu thereof "12," so as to read:

Fashion magazines or periodicals, printed in whole or in part by lithographic process, or decorated by hand, 12 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that amendment be disagreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would that leave the existing rate in operation?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the existing rate is 6 cents, but it reduces the rate one-third from what the House fixed it.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 173, line 2, to strike out "20" and insert "30," so as to read:

All other articles than those hereinbefore specifically provided for in this paragraph, not exceeding eight one-thousandths of an inch in thickness, 30 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. As to that, I move that "25" be substituted for "30."

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to ask the Senator whether the committee did not intend to propose an amendment in line 17, page 172. I was advised that an amendment was contemplated there.

Mr. SMOOT. That refers to decalcomanias, and the committee thought there was no necessity for making a change under the conditions existing to-day.

Mr. WILLIS. I wish the Senator would give me some information about that item. I have sought information unsuccessfully.

Mr. SMOOT. I think what the Senator is interested in, because it refers to the pottery business, is found on page 170, where the duplex and the simplex decalcomanias are enumerated. We passed those the other day, and put the duplex on the free list and the simplex was made dutiable at 5 cents a pound.

Mr. WILLIS. I was interested in that item, but I am also interested in this one. I have sought in the hearings and in the Summary of Information to find what justification there is for the increase in the rates. As the Senator will see, there is a very considerable increase. The rate in the present law on decalcomanias is 60 cents a pound. This proposes to make it 70 cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem. That would figure out, under the rate in the present law, for the year 1920, 13.8, or nearly 14 per cent. Now there is 15 per cent ad valorem added. It is not a large industry, of course, and it is not a large item of expense, yet it is of a good deal of interest to our people. As the Senator knows, we have in the State of Ohio the largest pottery industry there is to be found in the country. There are perhaps 45 or 50 great potteries in that State, and I have had a great deal of correspondence with persons interested in that business, complaining about this very rate. I shall not object to it if some good reason can be given for the increase of 100 per cent. That is what it amounts to, because it is now 13 or 14 per cent, and it is proposed to add 15 per cent ad valorem. Why should it be increased?

Mr. SMOOT. On these decalcomanias in ceramic colors weighing not over a hundred pounds for 1,000 sheets, on the

basis of 20 by 30 inches in dimensions—because those are the dimensions these rates are based upon—we give 70 cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem. The equivalent ad valorem on all the imports for 1921 was but 29 per cent.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will refer to the Summary of Tariff Information, page 1069, he will find that the rate is a little lower than that. The figures are given as 13.8 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. The equivalent ad valorem on imports for the full year of 1921 is 29 per cent. That is the amount of duty that is put upon these decalcomanias in ceramic colors, and that is all.

Mr. WILLIS. I can not quite see why there should be that apparent doubling in a year. At all events, this makes a very considerable increase in price.

Mr. SMOOT. The present rate is 60 cents a pound and the proposed rate is 70 cents a pound.

Mr. WILLIS. And 15 per cent ad valorem. That is where the tremendous increase comes in.

It is shown in the Summary of Tariff Information that our annual production in this country is only 100 tons and that our annual consumption is 600 tons. Of course, if an industry can develop here, as the Senator knows, I am in favor of it, but it does seem to me it is a heavy burden upon the potters of the country to increase their rate 100 per cent unless some perfectly good reason should be given for it, which I have not yet heard.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the potters are more interested in the duplex decalcomania than they are in the ceramic colors.

Mr. WILLIS. They are interested in both.

Mr. SMOOT. They are used so slightly, I will say to the Senator, that it would cut no figure at all in the case of pottery.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator understands, of course, that we can use our own product here, but where we have to come in competition with the foreign market, and we do export some pottery, of course, if we are to compete with the foreign product we must have as good designs as they have, and it is a matter of a good deal of importance.

Mr. SMOOT. So far as designs are concerned, I think the American is equal to that of any foreign country.

Mr. WILLIS. We are equal in our view but we are not in their view.

Mr. SMOOT. We know what we want in this country better than anybody else does.

Mr. WILLIS. I shall not quarrel with the Senator. I hope that this will succeed in establishing a new industry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 173, in line 4, the committee proposes to strike out the numeral "35" and insert the words "thirty-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 173, in line 5, to strike out "8½" and insert "12½," so as to read:

exceeding eight and not exceeding twenty one-thousandths of an inch in thickness, and less than 35 square inches cutting size in dimensions, 12½ cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. To make this equivalent to the amendments we have already agreed to, I move that "10" be substituted for "12½."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 173, in line 6, to strike out "8" and insert in lieu thereof "12," so as to read:

exceeding 35 square inches cutting size in dimensions, 12 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that "9½" be substituted for "12."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 173, in line 9, to strike out "one-half" and insert "three-fourths," so as to read:

and in addition thereto, on all of said articles exceeding eight and not exceeding twenty one-thousandths of an inch in thickness, if either die cut or embossed, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the amendment be disagreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 173, in line 10, to strike out "1 cent" and insert "1½ cents," so as to read:

if both die cut and embossed, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the amendment be disagreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 173, in line 12, to strike out "6" and insert "9," so as to read: exceeding twenty one-thousandths of an inch in thickness, 9 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I move to substitute "7½" for "9."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, this paragraph has for its subject matter pictures, calendars, cards, labels, cigar bands, placards, and other articles composed wholly or in chief value of paper lithographically printed, and increases substantially the existing rates on these articles. Many of these articles, such as lithographic calendars, pictures, and cards, are the only means of adornment and beautification within the reach of thousands of humble homes, while the cards and pictures may serve as appropriate but inexpensive souvenirs and presents on many occasions where large expenditure may be neither practicable nor desirable. These articles for the most part contribute to the pleasure and instruction of the masses. Certainly the advance proposed is without basis in reason or foundation in fact. Imports totaled about \$600,000 in 1920. Production figures for this country I am unable to obtain, but the spectacle of great numbers of these articles on sale in every city, town, and hamlet in the land evidences a domestic output beside which these importations fade into unimportance. Certainly no profound consideration of material defense or national economy justifies a high tariff tax in behalf of picture cards, art calendars, advertising placards, and cheap souvenirs of pictured paper.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 174, in line 4, to insert "Bristol board of the kinds made on a Fourdrinier machine," so as to read:

PAR. 1307. Writing, letter, note, drawing, handmade paper and paper commercially known as handmade paper and machine handmade paper, japan paper, and imitation japan paper by whatever name known, Bristol board of the kinds made on a Fourdrinier machine, and ledger, bond, record—

And so forth.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, paragraph 1307 deals with writing paper, letter paper, and note paper and that kind of thing used for ordinary correspondence. Under the present law it all bears a rate of 25 per cent. The changes made operate as a reduction in the case of a number of the articles.

Mr. SMOOT. Even from the existing law.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; from existing law; but in the case of drawing paper and not paper that is ruled, bordered, or embossed an increase occurs, 27.9 per cent in the one case and about 32.3 per cent in the other case, without apparently any justification whatever for it. I read from the summary as follows:

Production: The production of fine paper increased from 248,000 tons, valued at \$34,055,900, in 1914 to 325,000 tons, valued at \$87,741,000, in 1919. Massachusetts is the principal seat of the fine-paper industry; the other States of importance are New York, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Ohio. The domestic production is sufficient to supply practically the whole of the demand for domestic consumption and to export a surplus.

Imports of writing paper in 1914 were 2,163,432 pounds, valued at \$203,171.

The survey of the subject tells us as follows:

Before the war Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and, to some extent, Italy sent high-grade writing paper to the United States. The tariff, however, was comparatively high, averaging nearly 45 per cent in ad valorem equivalent under the tariff act of 1909, although reduced to 25 per cent in 1915. Hence the quantities imported were not large, the greatest amount entering in any year being a thousand tons in the fiscal year 1914, which was less than one-half of 1 per cent of domestic production.

Accordingly the rates, wherever there is an increase, are prohibitive rates.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in this whole paragraph the only increase is in writing paper, calendered or uncalendered, weighing 7 pounds or over per ream, and paper similar to any of the foregoing. The committee asked that the "8" be stricken out and "7" inserted. That is to follow out the plan adopted in the first paragraph of the paper schedule where the rate was changed from 8 cents to 6 cents. The weight of these papers over and above the tissue paper is about 1½ pounds and, therefore, there ought to be a difference between the 6 pounds and the other to make the weight equivalent to the tissue paper. That being the case, it is a little less than 7 pounds, but the committee decided that they did not want any fractions, so they put it at 7 pounds instead of 8.

The ad valorem equivalents of these compound rates based on the 1921 report are 21 to 32 per cent. The rates on writing

papers are the only ones higher than existing law to-day. The straight rate of 25 per cent to-day applies to all, and some of the papers are 21 per cent equivalent ad valorem, which is lower than the rate to-day. It is true that the rates on certain kinds of the high-priced writing papers are a little higher than the existing rates to-day. I will say to the Senator from Montana that all our imports, nearly every pound of them, are of that kind of paper.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I wish to give just a little additional information. I read:

The Crane Co., of Dalton, Mass., and the Crocker-McElwain Co., of Holyoke, Mass., however, do not believe that our paper industry is in danger of serious competition from Europe. These concerns say that the best American writing paper is equal to any produced abroad and that where there is competition between the American and imported grades we can hold our own. Mr. C. A. Crocker, president of Crocker-McElwain, says that on account of the fact that high-grade writing paper is sold principally by trade-mark, each consumer having a definite preference for one or another brand, the foreign product is hardly the same article, as far as buying conditions are concerned, and comes very little into competition with the domestic product.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say that the Crane Paper Co. make the paper for our money, and not only for this country, but for foreign countries. They make the best paper used for currency in all the world. The high-priced papers to which the commission refers in that statement must be made from all new linen rags. It can not be made from anything else. I have been in the Crane factory and have seen them unload carload after carload of new linen rags. We have to pay a duty upon linen. Therefore, the rate here is none too high. I say again that the importations all fall within that class.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 174, in lines 7 and 8, to strike out "Bristol board of the kinds made on a Fourdrinier machine."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 174, in line 8, after the word "uncalendered," to insert the words "weighing 8 pounds or over per ream, and paper similar to any of the foregoing."

Mr. SMOOT. I move that "7" be substituted for "8."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 174, line 14, after the word "rate," to insert a colon and the following proviso:

*Provided*, That in computing the duty on such paper every 187,000 square inches shall be taken to be a ream.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 174, in lines 18 and 19, to strike out "for, folded or flat, if plain," and insert "for," so as to read:

PAR. 1308. Paper envelopes not specially provided for shall pay the same rate of duty, etc.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, envelopes bear, under the present law, 15 per cent. These envelopes, of course, are made of the fine paper provided for in the paragraph which we have just passed, which carries a duty of from 21 to 30 per cent. In addition to that the envelopes bear 5 per cent additional if plain, 10 per cent if bordered, embossed, and so forth, and 30 per cent if lithographed.

The Summary of the Tariff Commission says:

Production: The production of envelopes in the United States increased from \$18,481,000 in 1914 to \$39,664,000 in 1919 and the number of establishments making envelopes from 90 in 1914 to 106 in 1919. Domestic production supplies practically the whole of the demand for domestic consumption. The capitalization of the 90 envelope establishments in the United States in 1914 was \$15,830,000.

Imports in 1914 were valued at \$29,850. Later statistics follow:

Calendar year.	Value.	Duty.	Ad valorem rate.
1918.....	\$5,122	\$768	15
1919.....	14,291	2,144	15
1920.....	148,742	7,288	15
1921 (9 months).....	81,387		

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the figure given (\$48,742) envelopes to the value of \$152 were imported free of duty from the Philippine Islands.

There are, one might very properly say, no imports at all even under the present rate. The duty, therefore, upon this commodity is prohibitive. It might as well be an embargo on the importation of envelopes of foreign manufacture, giving the American producer in the State of Massachusetts and a couple of other States an opportunity to boost his prices.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the rate of 30 per cent on lithographed envelopes is provided in this case to take care of a condition which has arisen in the trade. In many cases en-

velopes now used as containers are lithographed exactly the same as to the character of the work as are cigar-box flaps. They bear advertisements, pictures of ladies, and all kinds of scenery, and the work is executed with a high degree of artistic skill. The use of such envelopes is growing in the United States, and, indeed, all over the world; and it is upon those articles that we put a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

The Tariff Commission experts claim that the industry making that class of envelopes in the United States may be able to get along with the 30 per cent duty. The committee, however, was told by men who manufactured them that they needed a 60 per cent duty in order to keep foreign goods out of the United States, based upon the actual invoices of goods coming into this country. I think, however, Mr. President, that they can get along with this rate; the committee felt so; and therefore we have reported it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 174, line 20, after the word "made," to strike out "and 5 per cent ad valorem; if bordered, embossed, printed, tinted, decorated, or lined, 10 per cent ad valorem in addition to the foregoing rates," and in lieu thereof to insert "and in addition thereto, if plain, 5 per cent ad valorem; if bordered, embossed, printed, tinted, decorated, or lined, 10 per cent ad valorem; if lithographed, 30 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 175, paragraph 1309, line 4, before the words "per cent," to strike out the figures "23" and to insert "35," so as to read:

PAR. 1309. Jacquard designs on ruled paper, or cut on Jacquard cards, and parts of such designs, 35 per cent ad valorem; hanging paper, not printed, lithographed, dyed, or colored, 10 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 175, in line 6, after the words "ad valorem," to strike out "paper hangings with paper back or composed wholly or in chief value of paper, not printed, lithographed, dyed, or colored, 5 cents per pound."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have not been able to follow the statement of the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment just stated is on page 175, in paragraph 1309, line 6, where the committee proposes to strike out the words "paper hanging with paper back or composed wholly or in chief value of paper, not printed, lithographed, dyed, or colored, 5 cents per pound," so that the clause will read:

Printed, lithographed, dyed, or colored—

The committee have also reported an amendment in line 10, inserting "3 cents per pound and," so as to read "3 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem." That is a reduction. I will say to the Senator from Montana, but it may be that the committee will want to reduce it still further, and I ask that the amendment in line 10 go over for the present.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very glad that the committee will again take this matter under consideration, because it is a very important item.

Mr. SMOOT. I know it is.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. This is the ordinary wall paper that is used in every house, and it ought to be made as reasonable to the purchaser as it can be.

Mr. SMOOT. I will assure the Senator that the committee will act upon the matter to-morrow, and, whatever we agree on, we shall then ask to return to this paragraph and suggest the amendment; but I am quite sure the rate will be less than the committee has reported.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator that the committee should restore the two classifications of wall paper. One class of wall paper is unfinished paper, which is used by manufacturers in making the finished wall paper; but the committee has reported the same rate on both the unfinished and the finished paper.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that if we are going to have a specific rate of 3 cents per pound, the Senator's suggestion would be absolutely correct; but if we materially reduce the rate, then it will not make so very much difference; and a straight ad valorem rate will really be a protective rate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the Senator mean to impose the same duty on both types of wall paper, the unfinished and the finished?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; where an ad valorem rate is applied it makes but very little difference, I will say to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment striking out after the words "ad valorem" in line 6 down to and including the word "pound" in line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment in line 10, page 175, will be passed over.

The next amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 175, line 11, before the words "per centum," to strike out the numerals "23" and to insert the numerals "30," so as to read:

Wrapping paper not specially provided for, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is the ordinary wrapping paper, I presume, used in grocery stores and other mercantile establishments and for express packages and all that kind of things. The duty is raised 5 per cent, the present law imposing a duty of 25 per cent on that article. There are no substantial importations, so far as I can learn, and I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah why it is deemed advisable to put a higher duty on wrapping paper.

Mr. SMOOT. Of all of the papers included in this paragraph there is the strongest competition in wrapping paper. It is imported from Sweden, Norway, and Germany, but more particularly from Sweden and Norway. The importations for the last year, as I remember, were 11,000,000 pounds under the rate of duty of the present law, 25 per cent. The invoices which have been shown to the committee and other facts indicate that the importations of wrapping paper will be greater than ever in the past. So the committee felt that 30 per cent was the lowest rate that they could provide and afford the industry in the United States a chance to live.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Tariff Commission says that the exports in 1914 of paper hangings were valued at \$453,412; exports of wrapping paper were 14,133,097 pounds, valued at \$532,667.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call the Senator's attention to a fact which will show where we are drifting. In May, 1921, we imported of wrapping paper 1,111,909 pounds, and in May, 1922, of this year, we imported 6,066,041 pounds. That shows how the imports are increasing under the 25 per cent rate of duty, and we are only increasing it 5 per cent up to 30 per cent. The House rate was 23 per cent, based on American valuation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 175, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out "2 cents per pound and 10" and insert "30," so as to read:

Blotting paper, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 175, line 13, after the words "ad valorem," to strike out "filtering paper, 5 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem," and the semicolon.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment be disagreed to. The Senate will remember that filtering paper was taken out of this paragraph and put into paragraph 1304 under a higher rate of duty. I asked that the amendment in paragraph 1304 be disagreed to, and gave notice at that time that when we reached paragraph 1309 I would also ask that the amendment in that paragraph be disagreed to, which will reduce the duty on filtering paper from 6 cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem to 5 cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem, as the House bill provided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 175, line 14, after the word "for," to strike out "23," and in lieu thereof to insert "30," so as to read:

Paper not specially provided for, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 175, line 20, after the word "for," to strike out the figure "20" and to insert "if of bona fide foreign authorship, 15 per cent ad valorem; all other 25"; in line 23, after the word "for," to strike out the figures "33½" and to insert "45."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to modify the committee amendments just stated by inserting a substitute for that portion of paragraph 1310, from the word "Books," in line 16, to and including the words "ad valorem" in line 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as proposed to be modified by the Senator from Utah on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 175 it is proposed to strike out all beginning with the word "Books," in line 16, down to and including the words "ad valorem," in line 24, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Unbound books of all kinds, sheets or printed pages of books bound wholly or in part in leather, bound books of all kinds except those bound wholly or in part in leather, including blank books, slate books, and pamphlets, engravings, photographs, etchings, maps, charts, music in books or sheets, and printed matter, all the foregoing not specially provided for, if of bona fide foreign authorship, 15 per cent ad valorem; all other, 25 per cent ad valorem; book bindings or covers wholly or in part of leather, not specially provided for, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified by the Senator from Utah on behalf of the committee.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I do not understand the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I think I can explain it if the Senator will give me a moment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I will be very glad to hear the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is a paragraph in which I take a great deal of interest, and the amendment which has been proposed I offered some time ago and had printed. I will say to the Senator, as, of course, he is perfectly aware, that the printer and the compositor are entirely protected under the copyright laws, because no book can be copyrighted in this country that is not printed in this country. The House had so arranged the paragraph as to put books in foreign languages on the dutiable list, where they have never been and never ought to be, and they also eliminated the provision that all books more than 20 years old shall be on the free list.

I was very anxious to have them restored to the free list. What I desired to do, in the draft I made of this amendment—and it is merely a redraft of what is here in print—was to make sure that the duty which it was desired to impose on the binding should fall on the binding alone, and not upon the book—that is, the book more than 20 years old.

Some of those books, as the Senator well knows, first editions—take the first folio of Shakespeare as an extreme example—are of enormous value. They may have been bound within the 20 years. To tax the whole book on the full value of the book would be monstrous, of course. They really ought to come in free; and the purpose of this amendment, with which I had something to do, was to make sure that the tariff duty should be confined to the binding, and I think it achieves that purpose. It must be taken in connection with an amendment to the free list which will be offered in a moment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The proposed amendment also affects the importation of books, does it?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. That refers to the free list.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. The free-list provision is as follows. These are on the free list:

Books, maps, music, engravings, photographs, etchings, lithographic prints, bound or unbound, and charts, which have been printed more than 20 years at the time of importation: *Provided*, That where any such books have been rebound wholly or in part in leather within such period, the binding so placed upon such books shall be dutiable as provided in paragraph 1310.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to follow this amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Utah, the proposed substitute for paragraph 1310. This reads:

Unbound books of all kinds—

That is to say, if they have bindings they do not fall under this paragraph. That is the first clause. The second clause is:

Sheets or printed pages of books bound wholly or in part in leather—

Unbound books of all kinds bear a duty of 15 per cent under this provision. Now, why should a bound book come in free and an unbound book bear a duty of 15 per cent? I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to say that the sole purpose was to reach the binding.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; on books over 20 years old. The books over 20 years old come in free. All books less than 20 years old, bound or unbound, bear a duty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But this says "unbound books of all kinds." That would include, of course, books over 20 years of age.

Mr. LODGE. I think not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Unless you add "except as herein otherwise provided."

Mr. SMOOT. It says here:

Printed matter, all the foregoing not specially provided for, of bona fide foreign authorship, 15 per cent ad valorem; all other, 25 per cent ad valorem; bookbindings or covers wholly or in part of leather, not specially provided for, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LODGE. "All the foregoing not specially provided for."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is carried clear through?

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will say to the Senator that in the amendment that we propose to offer on page 215, line 22, it is provided that they shall come in free if they are 20 years old or more. In other words, "books, maps, music, engravings, photographs, etchings, lithographic prints, bound or unbound, and charts, which have been printed more than 20 years at the time of importation," come in free. Paragraph 1310 applies only to the dutiable books.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But it will be observed that after that provision you have "unbound books of all kinds, \* \* \* not specially provided for."

Mr. LODGE. That is specially provided for in the free list.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; exactly—

If of bona fide foreign authorship, 15 per cent ad valorem—

Now, you provide—

All other, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I suppose "all other" must mean "all other books, pamphlets, engravings, photographs, etchings, maps," and so forth.

Mr. LODGE. "Not specially provided for."

Mr. SMOOT. Not of foreign authorship.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; excuse me. That is not the case. The "not specially provided for" does not qualify that.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; I beg the Senator's pardon—

All other, 25 per cent ad valorem; books bound wholly or in part in leather, the chief value of which is in the binding, not specially provided for.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; but the Senator will observe that there is a semicolon after "ad valorem" in the fourth line from the bottom.

Mr. SMOOT. It is a comma. It goes back to that "not specially provided for." There is not a semicolon there.

Mr. LODGE. The "15 per cent ad valorem" covers all from line 16 to line 21.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes. If the Senator will pardon me, then follows:

All other, 25 per cent ad valorem—

And a semicolon.

Mr. LODGE. Oh! I see what the Senator means.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And then it says:

Book bindings or covers wholly or in part of leather, not specially provided for.

Mr. LODGE. I see. I think the Senator is right.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; there is a semicolon there.

Mr. LODGE. It should read:

All other, not specially provided for, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. That ought to be repeated, because of the semicolon.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the words "all other," insert the words "not specially provided for."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before we agree to that, I want to inquire where provision is made for textbooks, if at all.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think there is any provision for textbooks as such.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not, either.

Mr. LODGE. Unless it is under one of the educational paragraphs; but I was going to ask, when we take up, as the Senator from Utah is about to take up, the free list—

Mr. SIMMONS. Sundries; not the free list.

Mr. LODGE. No; this is the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will turn to page 216, paragraph 1531, he will see that it reads:

Any society or institution incorporated or established solely for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific, or literary purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in the United States, or any State or public library, may import free of duty any book, map, music, engraving, photograph, etching, lithographic print, or chart, for its own use or for the encouragement of the fine arts, and not for sale, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; but that is not the idea I have in mind.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the textbook provision. That is the paragraph under which these institutions will import them.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, yes; but what I want to know about is the ordinary textbooks that are purchased by students for use in colleges.

Mr. LODGE. They come under the duty, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. They are dutiable under existing law, and always have been, and will be under this law.

Mr. LODGE. The ordinary schoolbook, of course, is printed in this country, and ought to be.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But I am speaking about those printed in foreign languages.

Mr. SMOOT. They are free.

Mr. LODGE. No; they are not. I was going to offer that amendment about books printed in foreign languages, because I see that that is not specifically stated.

Mr. SMOOT. They are in paragraph 1530.

Books and pamphlets printed wholly or chiefly in languages other than English; books, pamphlets—

And so forth.

Mr. LODGE. I was misled. I did not know there was another paragraph dealing with this subject. It is scattered about in a bad way. We ought to have one paragraph embracing the whole of it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is all right, then.

Mr. LODGE. I have brought it back as nearly as possible, I think, to the existing law. This is all right, then, on page 215, line 22, after the word "Governments"?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is going to dispose of that?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; just as soon as we get paragraph 1310 disposed of.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Will the Senator suggest the amendment?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think it is necessary, since the Senator has shown me that books in foreign languages are covered in paragraph 1530.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I refer to the absence of the words "otherwise specially provided for."

Mr. LODGE. That has been put in.

Mr. SMOOT. We have agreed to that.

Mr. LODGE. That has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 176, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "20" and insert "25."

Mr. LODGE. We were going to dispose first of the free list in regard to books.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to dispose of the free list now. On page 215, the first word in paragraph 1529, where the committee struck out "Hydrographic," I desire that that shall be rejected, and then I desire to strike out the balance of that line down to and including the word "hydrographic" on line 17, so that it will read:

Hydrographic charts and publications issued for their subscribers or exchanges by scientific or literary associations—

And so on, down to the word "Governments" on line 22; and then I offer, to follow the word "Governments" in line 22, the amendment that I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee beginning on line 12, page 215, striking out "hydrographic" and inserting certain other words.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Utah what is the meaning of this? That practically restores the paragraph to the condition in which it was when it came from the House, does it not?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

Mr. SMOOT. Not when we get through with the other amendment.

Mr. LODGE. We are going to insert what will be read from the desk.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will follow me I will read it just as it will be, with the exception of the insertion, and then I will ask the Secretary to read the insertion. It will read now:

Hydrographic charts and publications issued for their subscribers or exchanges by scientific or literary associations or academies, and publications of individuals for gratuitous private circulation, not advertising matter, and public documents issued by foreign governments.

Then, after "Governments," I move to insert the matter which I ask to have read from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Books, maps, music, engravings, photographs, etchings, lithographic prints, bound or unbound, and charts, which have been printed more than 20 years at the time of importation: *Provided*, That where any such books have been rebound wholly or in part in leather within such period, the binding so placed upon such books shall be dutiable as provided in paragraph 1310.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. There is one amendment in line 19 that proposes to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment as read.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business on this calendar day it recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed substitute for the unanimous-consent agreement proposed this morning by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]; and in order that we may be able to take them up in the morning, I ask that both the proposed unanimous-consent agreement offered by the Senator from North Carolina and this substitute may be printed as separate sheets.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator if he does not think it would be wise to print also the proposition submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will include that in the request for printing.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I ask for the information of Senators who are here, that the unanimous-consent agreement which has just been submitted by the chairman of the committee be read.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well, Mr. President, if the Senator desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that not later than 10 o'clock a. m. on the calendar day of Thursday, August 17, 1922, the Senate shall proceed to vote without further debate and to the exclusion of all other business upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, any amendment that may be made relative thereto, and immediately thereafter upon the bill H. R. 7456, an act to provide revenue, etc., through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition.

That hereafter debate shall be confined to the question before the Senate or to the bill itself, and no other business or irrelevant question or motion shall be entertained except by unanimous consent.

That upon the conclusion of the consideration of amendments to the schedule now before the Senate the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of amendments pending or hereafter to be offered to the following paragraphs in the order named (the agreement heretofore made that committee amendments shall be first disposed of being hereby modified so far as such agreement affects these particular paragraphs and amendments thereto), namely:

"Paragraphs relative to sugar, Schedule 5.

"Paragraphs relative to potash and bounty thereon, being paragraphs 1635 and 1636, and white arsenic, paragraph 1.

"Paragraphs relating to presidential powers (sections 315, 316, 317).

"Amendments to Tariff Commission act.

"Paragraphs relating to hides, leather, boots, shoes, and leather goods (paragraphs 1427-a, 1431, 1432, 1433, and 1435-a)."

That during the consideration of the aforementioned paragraphs no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than one hour upon any one of such paragraphs or more than once nor longer than one hour upon any amendment thereto.

That upon the conclusion of amendments to said paragraphs or if the amendments to said paragraphs shall not be concluded prior to that time, after the hour of 11 o'clock a. m., Saturday, August 12, 1922, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on any amendment or motion nor more than 10 minutes upon the bill.

All questions of order under this agreement shall be decided by the presiding officer without debate.

Mr. McCUMBER. I call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that this is exactly the same as written by the Senator, with the exception of the first paragraph on the second page, which seeks to limit the debate upon those several paragraphs and amendments thereto, so that no Senator can speak longer than one hour on any one of the amendments, or longer than one hour upon the bill itself. I submitted that because I thought we should take it into consideration to the end, if possible, of agreeing so that we might not run over to the 12th before we had finished those paragraphs.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from North Dakota that it does not require consideration on my part; I accept it at once. I am glad the Senator made

that limitation. I think it very proper, and it will be helpful. Certainly no Senator will want more than an hour to discuss these preferential amendments, and certainly will not want more than an hour to discuss any amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will find that agreeable.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand the matter is not up for action?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; it is not.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I merely desire to inquire whether the clause with reference to Schedule 5 is understood to cover paragraph 503?

Mr. McCUMBER. It covers everything that pertains to sugar and molasses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that these various propositions have been read to-day and will appear in the RECORD. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota that this unanimous-consent agreement be printed as a separate sheet?

Mr. LENROOT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. LENROOT. Did the Senator request that all the proposed requests for unanimous consent be printed as separate sheets?

Mr. McCUMBER. I make that request. There are only three of them.

Mr. LENROOT. That is all right.

Mr. SIMMONS. On behalf of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] I desire to offer and have pending for consideration several amendments to the pending bill, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, it so happens that I have a very important engagement on the 18th of August, and I would a little have preferred if, instead of fixing the 17th, it had been one day earlier, or perhaps after the 18th; but I am not going to make any objection on that score.

Mr. McCUMBER. I made it one day earlier; that is, on the 17th.

Mr. POMERENE. I will have to leave on the evening of the 17th, but I am not going to make any objection on that score.

Mr. LODGE. If we enter into the agreement, the vote may be taken before the Senator has to leave.

Mr. POMERENE. There may be a great many amendments and roll calls, and it may not be possible to get through by that time.

#### OATHS OF NATIONAL BANK DIRECTORS.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3840) to amend section 5147 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. SMOOT. Will it lead to any discussion?

Mr. McLEAN. If it does, I will certainly not press its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Reserving the right to object, I ask that the bill be read.

Mr. McLEAN. I will explain the bill. Section 5147 of the Revised Statutes provides that the directors of national banks shall be sworn, but it does not provide any officer before whom the oath can be taken. Consequently, the director of a national bank who makes a false statement can not be held responsible, and the Comptroller of the Currency is very anxious for that to be remedied. This bill is reported unanimously from the Committee on Banking and Currency. It provides only that the oaths may be taken before a notary public, or other officer authorized to administer oaths, and that a record shall be kept.

Mr. HEFLIN. Is that the bill the Senator from Connecticut spoke to me about yesterday?

Mr. McLEAN. That is the bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 5147 of the Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5147. Each director, when appointed or elected, shall take an oath that he will, so far as the duty devolves on him, diligently and honestly administer the affairs of such association, and will not

knowingly violate or willingly permit to be violated, any of the provisions of this title, and that he is the owner in good faith, and in his own right, of the number of shares of stock required by this title, subscribed by him, or standing in his name on the books of the association, and that the same is not hypothecated, or in any way pledged, as security for any loan or debt. The oath shall be taken before a notary public, properly authorized and commissioned by the State in which he resides, or before any other officer having an official seal and authorized by the State to administer oaths, except that the oath shall not be taken before any such notary public or other officer who is an officer of the director's bank. The oath, subscribed by the director making it, and certified by the notary public or other officer before whom it is taken, shall be immediately transmitted to the Comptroller of the Currency and shall be filed and preserved in his office for a period of 10 years."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The next amendment was, on page 176, line 3, to strike out "20" and insert in lieu thereof "25," so as to read:

Books of paper or other material for children's use, printed lithographically or otherwise, not exceeding in weight 24 ounces each, with more reading matter than letters, numerals, or descriptive words, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 176, line 8, at the beginning of the line, to insert the words "not specially provided for," so as to read:

Booklets, wholly or in chief value of paper, decorated in whole or in part by hand or by spraying, whether or not printed, not specially provided for, 15 cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 176, line 10, to strike out "26" and to insert in lieu thereof "40," so as to read:

All post cards (not including American views), plain, decorated, or printed, except by lithographic process, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that "30" be substituted for "40."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 176, line 18, to strike out "20" and insert in lieu thereof "25," so as to read:

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, 15 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 176, line 20, to strike out the following: "Christmas and other greeting cards, printed lithographically or otherwise, or decorated in whole or in part by hand or by spraying, 30 per cent ad valorem," and to insert: greeting cards, and all other social and gift cards, including those in the form of folders and booklets, wholly or partly manufactured, with text or greeting, 45 per cent ad valorem; without text or greeting, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 177, line 5, before the words "per cent," to strike out the figures "23" and to insert "35," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 1311. Photograph, autograph, scrap, post-card, and postage-stamp albums, and albums for phonograph records, wholly or partly manufactured, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that "30" be substituted for "35."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 177, line 7, to strike out "60" and to insert "10 cents per pack and 20," so as to read:

PAR. 1312. Playing cards, 10 cents per pack and 20 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 1313, page 177, line 18, to strike out "23" and to insert "all the foregoing, 35," so as to read:

Press boards and press paper, all the foregoing, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. I move to substitute "30" for "35."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 177, line 21, to strike out "15" and insert "25."

Mr. SMOOT. I move to substitute "20" for "25."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 177, line 22, to strike out "28" and insert in lieu thereof "35."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. This is quite a controversial item. The wisdom of the amendment proposed offers a very grave question, and I shall endeavor to state what it is about.

The stereotype mat or board is a paper product that is used in printing newspapers. Instead of the regular stereotype plate, which is taken from the type as it is set and from which the newspapers are printed, a paper board of peculiar structure is used, and the impression taken from the type, and that is used instead of the stereotype plate.

It is extensively used by the newspapers of the country, chiefly the newspapers of the smaller cities running in population from 5,000 to 50,000. It is not very extensively used by the metropolitan papers because it would not stand taking as many imprints as it is necessary to take for their use. It is used in towns of the size of Billings, in my State, for instance, and, as I said, in towns of from 5,000 to 25,000 or 30,000 people.

It was a German product. The method of producing the board from which a matrix is made was originated in Germany, and that country had a monopoly upon the manufacture of this particular product until some time during the war, when either the process which was in use in Germany was by some means or other learned, or another process perhaps equally effective was discovered and devised by an American institution, which is likewise a monopoly. There is just one company in the United States that produces this product. Its representatives told the committee that it is a secret process. That is the situation which presents itself. The question is whether the one American institution shall be given a monopoly of the sale of this particular product.

Newspaper associations throughout the country quite generally have protested against the imposition of this duty.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator said that this is a monopoly. Do I understand that the process under discussion is covered by patent rights?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; my understanding is that it is not patented, but it is manufactured by what representatives of the company say is a secret process. For a long time the American manufacturers have been endeavoring to determine the process of manufacture in Germany in the past, but without success. These people in some way or other, as I said, have either appropriated the German process or have devised a process of their own which is as effective as the German process.

Mr. CALDER. My understanding is that it is not a patented process, but that anyone can engage in the business if they learn how to do it. I have had letters from numerous publications in my State, newspapers which use this commodity, stating that they think the duty ought to be allowed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have before me letters or copies of letters sent by various papers throughout the country; but of course things of that kind do not deceive the Senator from New York any more than they deceive me. We know how those things are secured. The newspaper associations are against it. Individual newspapers say that they would like to see the duty imposed. Some papers say so. The American Newspaper Association, for instance, have filed a protest against this particular duty, from which I read as follows:

The flog, or dry mat, employed by many small newspapers but seldom by the larger publications, is a sheet, composed largely of wood products, used to convey the impression of the type to the stereotype metal used on the printing press.

The Underwood tariff provides a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on dry mats, or \$0.019275 per mat.

The Fordney Act, paragraph 1313, Schedule 13, provides a duty of 28 per cent ad valorem, American valuation, of \$0.0504.

There is but one American manufacturer of dry mats, the Wood Flog Corporation, of New York, whose present price is 18 cents per mat to all newspapers which use its mats exclusively in lots of 500 or more. Its price to occasional users is higher. During June, 1921, its price to occasional users in lots of 500 was 30 cents each, and in lots of 100, 35 cents each.

All dry mats used in this country other than those of the Wood Flog Corporation are imported from Germany, which enforces an export price of 25 cents per square meter, or \$0.0771 per mat.

We are informed there are but two importers of dry mats, the W. B. Wheeler Corporation and H. Reeve Angel & Co., both of New York.

The former states its cost, delivered in the warehouse, is \$0.1046, or, including selling cost, \$0.1433, exclusive of overhead; the latter states its cost, under the present 25 per cent ad valorem duty, delivered New York, is approximately 11 cents, or, including overhead and selling cost, approximately 14 cents.

We are informed by these importers that they are unable to secure the price of 18 cents now paid for the American mat, and that therefore they must operate on a very close margin of profit to secure sales, and that only by largely increasing such sales, and thus decreasing the overhead average, may they secure even a fair profit under the present tariff.

Should the present duty of approximately 2 cents per mat be increased as provided by paragraph 1313, Schedule 13, of the Fordney Act to \$0.0504, increasing the present cost by 3 cents, or should the present duty of approximately 2 cents be replaced by 4 cents, imports would cease, and the smaller newspapers, the main users of such mats, would be forced to purchase from the one domestic source of supply.

It is obvious that the present duty results in the 18-cent price now charged for the domestic mat. It is also obvious that every argument in favor of the free entry of newsprint and wood pulp applies equally to the free entry of dry mats.

The question is one of policy. What policy is to be represented in this particular duty? Are we going to give a monopoly by the imposition of this duty to the American producer of this commodity? Of course, if it were open to production anywhere—that is to say, if others might go into the business and produce a competing article—the price might be reduced, but the situation is as I have presented it. I can not understand that there is any reason why a duty as high as this should be imposed upon this mat. I propose accordingly what I think will give these people ample protection against foreign competitors and give the newspapers of the country an opportunity to get the thing at a fair price. I move that the rate in the amendment proposed by the committee of "35," in line 22, be reduced to "15."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, this schedule relates to a duty on dry mats, sometimes called the flong. It is a species of pasteboard upon which the imprint of the type is taken and then it is stereotyped and forms a very efficient method for the smaller newspapers of the country for printing their papers.

There is in this country an industry called the Wood Flong Co. I believe it is the only industry making these mats or matrices, as they are called. The bill as it passed the House gave them 28 per cent on the American valuation. I asked the committee to increase that duty to 50 per cent, because as to the two importers in this country importing these matrices from Germany the price was 11 cents as against 18 cents, the lowest manufacturing sale cost of the Wood Flong Co. That rate was placed in the bill. Then I received a protest from certain of the newspapers in my State, who said that they thought the duty was too high. I asked them that it be reduced to 35 per cent, although I felt that if German importers were allowed to have full swing at the market it would simply mean that the American industry would be destroyed.

The president of this company called to see me and told me that the newspapers in my State did not understand the situation; that if the industry was not properly protected it would simply mean that the smaller American newspapers would be at the mercy of the importers, and that they could not afford to make these mats in this country for that price. I get my figures as to the imported cost from the process made by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Mr. FREMONGS. Mr. President—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator when I finish my speech, unless the Senator wishes to ask a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply wish to ask the Senator if he has any information which he could furnish the Senate as to the capitalization and profits made by the corporation. I am advised that they are making great profits.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have not. I am interested in the principle of protecting an American industry and I have not looked into the question of profits. I have looked into the question of the production costs of the two articles, the German article and the American article.

I told the president of this corporation that if he could satisfy his customers that it was proper to have a duty of this character and would succeed in inducing those who purchase his products to support the duty, I, too, would support it. I have heard from one paper that was very vigorous in its protests against the 50 per cent rate. I have received from New Jersey a number of letters, a dozen or more from newspapers, all of the same purport. I have one from the Courier News, of Plainfield, N. J., a very prosperous paper. The letter comes from the owner, and in it he says:

On further consideration and consultation with others on the dry-mat schedule, concerning which we have previously written you, we think it only fair to you and the manufacturers of dry mats that we notify you of a change in our viewpoint. The Wood Flong Co. is the only maker of these mats in the United States at present. With a tariff providing sufficient protection to encourage profitable manufacture there would be others in this field. The mat—matrix or flong—is a peculiar composition of wood pulp, tissues, and various other substances united by a process which has taken many years to devise and to perfect. This is not a cardboard product, which is the cheapest form of paper making, but is the result of a complex and expensive process and is produced for one purpose only. The dry mat is the only real advance in the process of stereotyping made since stereotyping was invented in the early fifties. If, therefore, the Wood Flong Co. can not produce a mat at the very cheap rate at which German labor can produce a stereotype mat, we would think it only fair that sufficient protection be given the Wood Flong Co. until they have attained such economy of production as they feel will enable them to successfully hold their home trade.

There is a new industry in our country. It will always employ a good class of skilled labor. It is a productive and essential enterprise making a necessity of daily life.

We were strongly opposed to making a prohibitive tariff in their favor and have so written you. We are not, however, opposed to a tariff giving the Wood Flong Co. sufficient protection, and we gladly withdraw our previous statement, as it has been shown that a higher rate is necessary and that a higher rate will not work a hardship upon their customers, the daily papers of the United States.

With kindest personal regards to yourself, I am,  
Yours very truly,

CHARLES H. FROST.

I have another letter from the Bergen Record; also one from the Perth Amboy Evening News and several others which I shall not read. I understand the price which the Wood Flong Co. has been charging has been from 18 to 20 cents. I will read an excerpt from a letter from the Waterbury Republican:

I have never complained about dry mats. I found that when we started to use them in September, 1917, the former discrepancy in price between wet mats and finished dry mats had disappeared because, while tissues and matrix paper had jumped very much in price, your price on dry mats had apparently remained the same. From 1917 to the peak of the price you raised the price of dry mats from about 14 to about 20 cents, an increase of approximately 40 per cent. I do not know of any material or service used in the making of a newspaper which advanced in price less than this, with the possible exception of printing ink.

I find that the latest bill we have from you, dated November 2, is at 18 cents a mat, which represents an increase of less than 30 per cent over the price of the summer of 1917. I regard this as reasonable in view of the moderate increase that you made during the war and postarmistice period, which was undoubtedly necessary.

Here is another bit of testimony from the Paterson (N. J.) Call, which was the first paper in the United States to use dry mats, and with many others paid 25 cents each for them:

Our records show that our first shipment of dry mats was made on May 3, 1911, and the price paid was 25 cents each. At that time the Call began the use of dry mats, and since then has never used wet mats.

In view of the present price of the Wood dry mat, the 25-cent price which we paid in 1911 seems high, but the fact that the Call never discontinued the dry mat since the start proves that we considered it profitable to use, even at 25 cents.

Our present price is, therefore, 7 cents lower than the price charged by the Germans when in sole control of the American market.

In other words, when the Germans had an absolute monopoly of this market they charged 7 cents higher for mats than this American industry which has been established here and which is furnishing the newspapers with this necessity. The price of 25 cents which the Call paid when the Germans had a monopoly was 7 cents higher than the price now paid.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from New Jersey has called our attention to what the Germans did when they had a monopoly of the market. Of course, it illustrates the evils of monopoly. Does not the Senator think that the American manufacturer will do exactly the same thing if he secures a monopoly?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am glad to find such sublime confidence in the American producer as that exhibited by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have always sublime confidence in the fairness of American industry; and I also have confidence in the fact that if we furnish protection, establish an American industry, and control the market competition will exist here; and it will be a healthy American competition and not an unhealthy European competition.

The Senate may reduce this rate if it so wishes, but 35 per cent is an equalization between the import price and the present domestic selling price, which is lower by about 7 cents than the price which the Germans formerly charged. I asked for a 50 per cent duty, but the committee reduced it to 35 per cent. These newspapers using this product support the 50 per cent ad valorem rate; but the committee saw fit not to raise it, although I appealed to them to do so on the basis of the figures; but most certainly it will not be fair to this American corporation to reduce the rate below 35 per cent. That rate is fair; it will protect an American industry; and it has not been shown that it will create a monopoly. Most certainly if there is such great profit in this business other concerns will spring up under this protection, but surely it is not an argument to say that we are protecting an American monopoly against a German monopoly.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has stated that a German monopoly controlled this commodity before one American company entered upon its manufacture. That is true, but the American company, which is a monopoly, has under the existing 25 per cent rate been able to drive the German monopoly practically out of business in this country. Now, this one corporation, a monopoly, supplies 350 newspapers, which have gone to considerable expense on the promise that they may have dry mats at a certain price; 350 newspapers have gone to that expense, and the one American company has

practically shut out the German competition. Now, after getting these 350 papers to go to that expense, this company wants to get the present rate increased and then increase the price to the publishers.

I had a letter from Mr. Wood, the president of the company, as other Senators did, which was misleading. Evidently he tried to deceive us. I quote from his letter as follows:

It will be necessary for upward of 350 newspapers that now use our dry mats exclusively for all work to entirely reequip their plants at great expense and to largely increase their consumption of print paper by returning to the old wet-mat process.

The following are Georgia newspapers which already depend upon dry mats and will suffer—

Notice the word "suffer"—

if the altogether inadequate 35 per cent rate recommended by the Finance Committee is not increased to 50 per cent—

Although he has built up a complete monopoly on a 25 per cent duty.

Then he names the Georgia newspapers which will be injured if the rate is not increased.

Mr. President, the Georgia newspapers, without my writing them, heard of the propaganda of this corporation, and many of them wrote me. I will quote from the letters of some of the editors and owners of papers which this man had already written me were very much interested and would suffer if the rate was not increased. The first is from Mr. R. L. McKenney, owner and editor of the Macon News, one of the papers mentioned by Mr. Wood:

THE MACON NEWS,  
Macon, Ga., July 5, 1922.

Hon. W. J. HARRIS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: It has been called to my attention that the Wood-Flong Corporation are still pursuing their efforts to get a high tariff placed on imported mats, and that a communication has been addressed to the United States Senators, naming a number of newspapers who are using their product, and that the importance of the high tariff being placed on foreign mats was "in the interest of these newspapers."

This letter is simply written for the purpose of reiterating my former position regarding tariff on foreign mats, as I feel that they should be placed on the free list, if possible.

I also quote from the letter of the editor of the Macon Telegraph, another paper which Mr. Wood said would suffer if the rate of duty was not increased:

I feel that the Wood Flong people are endeavoring to build up a monopoly in this country, and if they can protect their industry with the tariff that is already prohibitive, as a newspaper publisher I am in favor of going out of business, as far as dry mats are concerned. The Wood Flong product is no better than the imported mat, and if we afford them the protection they want, it means the newspapers in this country will be compelled to pay from 4 cents to 6 cents more than these mats are actually worth. I desire to enter my protest against any additional tariff on these mats.

In addition to the efforts these people have made to influence Congress in giving them undue protection, they have actually written to the stereotypers in the various newspapers asking that they refuse to handle any imported mats. I feel that this part of their propaganda is entirely out of order and seeks to destroy the newspaper business itself, rather than to protect their industry.

I quote next from a letter addressed to me by the owner and editor of the Daily Herald, of Albany, Ga., that newspaper being one of those mentioned by Mr. Wood and which he said was very much interested in the proposed increase in the rate of duty. Here is part of what the editor of the Albany Herald says:

This corporation induced newspaper publishers to put in the necessary equipment for using their mats, representing to us that it would be a permanent saving. Now that they have 350 or more of us hooked they seek a tariff protection that would enable them to increase the cost of their mats to more than what that of the wet-mat system was. It is unfair to those of us who have gone to the expense of equipping our plants for the use of the dry mats, and is in keeping with the general policy of monopolies in this country that are fostered by the iniquitous protective tariff system.

This is a simple proposition; one company has built up a monopoly under the 25 per cent duty; it has practically shut out foreign competition, as well as domestic, and this monopoly comes here and asks us to put a tax on the readers of 350 daily papers in order to pay additional dividends to this one company, a trust. If all Senators were present, instead of a very few in the Chamber at this time, and could hear the facts presented, there would be little doubt of the defeat of this proposal to increase the duty.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I do not think that the Senate wants to waste much time on this discussion. If Senators want to abandon the principle of protecting American industry they may vote for a reduction of the rate proposed. The rate should be 50 per cent in order to provide an adequate rate to cover the difference between the production costs here and in Germany.

The argument of the newspaper publishers in the South is a free-trade argument; but what does the Reynolds report show? The Reynolds report has been the textbook for both sides in the

controversy over the tariff. I have here an item, 1313, representing a shipment of 1,000 sheets of stereotype matrices or boards. The figures show a foreign cost of \$82.60; landing charges, \$1.50; selling price of the imported article, \$120. The selling price of the comparable domestic article is \$200. So 108 per cent would be required to equalize the difference; and yet I have shown by the testimony of the Paterson, N. J., Call that the Wood Flong Co., this great monopoly, employing American labor, asking for protection against German competition, are selling their mats to the Paterson Call at 7 cents less than Germany sold them for when they had control of the market, and 15 cents less than Germany is willing to sell them for now.

On the basis of the record, on the basis of the comparative production costs, a rate of 50 per cent is justified, and 35 per cent is too low. The committee, however, has made that rate, and of course it has been reported to the Senate. It should not be reduced below that figure in all fairness to this American industry.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] and to other Senators that if we want further to strengthen and fortify the monopolies that have grown up under the present tariff rate, and to allow them further to advance their prices, the way to do it is to vote for this committee amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have not quite finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was under the impression that the Senator had concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS. It does seem to be out of order for anybody to oppose protection asked by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for industries in his State. It was out of order in the committee, I understand; and while the Senator got on the committee rather late, he succeeded in getting on the protected list about every industry in his State that was not already on it, and practically every one that was on it got its protection increased. He is a very industrious and a very persistent Senator. Next to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] he is probably the rankiest protectionist in this body. I think the Committee on Finance found that out after he became a member of it. We have been protecting practically everything in New Jersey; and I think right here, at the close of the protective provisions of this bill, we might give some little consideration to the question of whether we should further advance the rate in favor of this admitted monopoly—a monopoly that we can not find out anything about. It is about the closest-mouthed monopoly in the United States. The Tariff Commission does not seem to have been able to ascertain anything about it. It discusses what dry mat is; it tells us how it is made and how the newspapers use it; but when it comes to the production and the importations the commission was unable to get any information. The Senator from New Jersey seems to think that unless we give this concern in his State an increase in its protection it will go out of business altogether, and that the newspapers of the country will suffer by losing the opportunity to buy its products; and yet, when I asked him what were the profits of that institution, that monopoly, that closely owned, closely controlled, secretly controlled monopoly in his State, he could not tell me anything about them. No member of the committee can tell us anything about them. What the cost of production in this country is, nobody knows. Nobody is going to be allowed to know. What the capital of the concern is, nobody knows. The sponsor for this increase in the duty, the Senator from New Jersey, does not know. It is a secretly controlled, secretly operated monopoly.

Is there anybody upon this floor who will get up here and say that these people are not the sole producers of this product in the United States, that they do not enjoy an absolute and a complete monopoly under the 25 per cent duty in the present law, that they are not able now to dictate to every newspaper in this country what it shall pay, and, whenever they see fit to do so, that they are not able, under the present duty, to increase the price of their product? If there are any importations into this country, I have not heard of them. My information is that there are practically no importations into this country at this time, and that these people are holding up the newspapers of the country.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is not the only Senator who has had letters from newspaper men protesting against this increase in duty, protesting against the manner in which this monopoly treats them, protesting against the fact that by this duty they are made absolutely subservient to the wishes and the will and the avarice and the greed of this monopoly. Now, this man who will not tell what his profits are, who has

the newspapers in his power, who can advance his prices whenever he pleases, and who does advance them whenever he pleases and imposes such conditions upon his customers as he desires, comes here and tells us that unless he is permitted to increase his prices through the instrumentality of an advance in his protection, and still be secure from foreign competition, the newspapers will suffer. That is the same character of letter he wrote me. That is the same character of letter he has been writing to the newspapers, intimating that unless they helped him get this duty, he would go out of business, and they would have to go back to the old wet-mat process.

Why will he have to go out of business, Mr. President, if we do not increase this rate? Has he not built up his business upon this rate? Has he not been able to maintain his monopoly upon this rate? Is he at present troubled with competition under this rate? I do not believe, so far as my information goes, that there is any monopoly in this country which has conducted a more insolent propaganda than this particular company has. I regard this man's statement to the newspapers of this country that unless they helped him, unless they withdrew their protests, and all that sort of thing, he would go out of business and leave them helpless, as insolent. Let him go out of business if he wants to. Nobody is asking him to stay in business; but, Mr. President, he will not go out of business as long as he has the present 25 per cent protective duty. He will continue in business. This corporation will continue a monopoly, controlling the trade in this country and fixing its prices as it has in the past.

Mr. President, we have given the newspapers of this country free print paper. On yesterday we voted to take off of chemically prepared wood pulp the duty proposed by the committee. The manufacturers of wood pulp in this country were demanding that duty. They were insisting upon that protection; and yet, Mr. President, what we did yesterday was to say that the newspapers of this country are performing a great public service; that they are the agents for the dissemination of information in this country; that they are the greatest single educational force in the United States to-day; and that they ought not to be fettered with high costs of their raw materials or their necessary equipment. That has been the policy of this Congress and of every former Congress of which I have been a Member. It is a policy to which I largely subscribe. If there is one thing in this world upon which I would not impose a protective duty, it is the instrumentalities of information and intelligence and the dissemination of thought.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall be through in one second.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, while refusing protection to the many manufacturers of pulp in this country, to the many manufacturers of chemical pulp in this country, to the manufacturers of paper in this country, in the interest of the press of the country and in the interest of cheaper news and cheaper distribution of intelligence, shall we finally bow the knee to a single corporation located in the great State of New Jersey, the breeding place of the trusts of the United States? Shall we bow the knee to that corporation and say: "We will make you the single and only exception to the general policy of the Congress"?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator can ask it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Senator spoke of the great benefit to the public of these newspapers, and stated that newspaper paper was free and wood pulp was free. Did the Senator vote for the 25 per cent duty imposed on this product in the Underwood tariff bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. I presume I did, Mr. President; and when I did it I made a very great mistake, as I have discovered now. It was not a monopoly then, as it is now; and I will say, with the consent of the Senator, another thing. There are a great many duties in the Underwood bill that experience has shown were very much too high. They were higher than were necessary, and this is one that was higher than necessary, because in 13 years it has bred a trust and a monopoly in this country.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, when the Senator voted for that duty, recognizing that an industry in this country should be protected, the mark in Germany was worth 23.8 cents. To-day it is worth one-seventh of 1 cent. That would seemingly justify a 10 per cent advance in the ad valorem duty imposed in this bill.

As far as New Jersey being the home of trusts is concerned, I think that is amply taken care of in the laws which have been placed upon the Federal statute books. New Jersey is proud of her industries and proud of the fact that she has a million wage earners; and I want to say that I stand here for their protection and a continuance of their employment, notwithstanding the free-trade theories of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no doubt that the Senator from New Jersey is proud of his trusts and proud of his monopolies. He has already told us that many times and he has especially emphasized it to-day.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I want it perfectly understood that, so far as the case for the duty asked on this particular commodity is concerned, it rests entirely with the statement of Mr. Wood, who owns the corporation which produces this product, and if Mr. Wood is to be believed, his industry is gone now if you impose the duty that is proposed by the committee of 35 per cent. He said in a letter to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] under date of June 21, 1922, as follows:

Unless stereotype dry mats, included in paragraph 1313 of the tariff bill now under consideration, are granted a rate of at least 50 per cent this company will be compelled to immediately go out of business, and the industry will be totally destroyed in the United States.

If that is the case, if Mr. Wood is entirely truthful and accurate in this statement, his industry is gone.

But upon what basis does he make any such statement as that? I have called the attention of the Senate to the fact that there is not an item in this paper schedule with reference to which American producers are in the slightest danger from any European competition, as shown by the actual figures, wherever there are any imports at all. We have not any information whatever with respect to the imports of this particular commodity, whether they are increasing or whether they are decreasing, whether they even exist or do not exist. Upon what basis does the Senator assert, as he has asserted upon this floor, that this industry must perish unless it gets a duty of 50 per cent? The manufacture of this particular paper product is practically the same as the manufacture of other paper products, of cardboard, of box paper, of wall board, and of all the various kinds of paper, with reference to which the American producer seems to have no difficulty whatever in competing with the German producer or with the producer anywhere in the world. What does he say about it? Let me call your attention to his brief. Mr. Wood appeared before the committee but practically submitted a brief in which he said as follows:

The selling price of our dry mat to newspapers is 20 cents per mat, or sheet, and with present costs of labor and materials it has been most difficult for us to maintain this price.

That is all he said about what it cost him to produce a mat which he sells for 20 cents. But he gives us this further information:

An investigation recently made in Germany shows that the export value of dry mats or slongs is placed at the equivalent of 25 cents United States money per square meter under the German law. A square meter of this material provides three slongs of newspaper page size.

He said further:

The Germans have offered and are offering in their efforts to destroy us dry mats for as low as 8 cents each, with the result that unless proper protection is afforded us under the tariff measure now under consideration we will soon be forced out of business.

Bear in mind, the export price of the mat in Germany is 25 cents, and he sells the mat in this country for 20 cents, but he says the Germans are dumping this product on the market and selling it for less than the German cost of production. But, of course, that is a case which should be taken care of by a dumping clause.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The statement the Senator has made is in conflict with the brief of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, who oppose this duty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I can not help that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The American Newspaper Publishers' Association say that the selling cost in this country, plus the duty, is 14 cents.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am reading from Mr. Wood's brief.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am reading from the brief of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association dated March 16, 1922.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am trying to tell the Senator of the evidence offered by those who are seeking this particular duty. It may be true, and it may be untrue. I am giving it to the Senate for what it is worth.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, it has been stated on the one side that the newspapers generally were opposed to this increase in the duty on mats. On the other side of the Chamber it has been urged that the newspapers insist upon it. I can only speak for the newspapers in my own State from which I have heard, and without exception they are protesting against this increase in this rate, and I have had no communications to the contrary from that State. Every one of them is insisting, just as the Senator from Montana and the Senator from North Carolina have been urging, that this one firm at the present time has a complete monopoly of the production of these mats in this country, and it seems to me that anyone coming here and asking a gratuity from the Congress of the United States ought to be a little more liberal in the giving of information with respect to his business to the Congress so that they can act intelligently upon it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have given the Senate practically all the information that was given to us by Mr. Wood.

In order to be entirely fair about the matter, I am going to withdraw the amendment which I proposed and substitute therefor "25 per cent," the present rate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana to the committee amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HALE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and vote "nay."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and vote "nay."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], who is absent on account of sickness in his family, to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KENDRICK. I have a general pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK], which I transfer to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], and vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING. I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE], and vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL. My pair, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], is absent, and being unable to obtain a transfer, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (after having voted in the affirmative). The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] has not voted. I transfer my general pair with that Senator to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and allow my vote to stand.

The roll call resulted—yeas 16, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—16.

Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Sheppard
Harris	Jones, Wash.	Pomerene	Simmons
Harrison	Kendrick	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Heflin	Overman	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.

NAYS—27.

Broussard	Gooding	New	Shortridge
Bursum	Hale	Nicholson	Smoot
Calder	Keyes	Norbeck	Spencer
Cameron	Lenroot	Oddie	Stanfield
Cummins	Lodge	Pepper	Sterling
Curtis	McCumber	Phipps	Willis
Frelinghuysen	McNary	Rawson	

NOT VOTING—52.

Ball	Fernald	McKellar	Smith
Borah	Fletcher	McKinley	Stanley
Brandegee	France	McLean	Sutherland
Capper	Gerry	Moses	Swanson
Caraway	Glass	Myers	Townsend
Colt	Harrell	Nelson	Trammell
Culberson	Hitchcock	Newberry	Underwood
Dial	Johnson	Norris	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kellogg	Owen	Warren
du Pont	King	Page	Watson, Ga.
Edge	Ladd	Poindexter	Watson, Ind.
Elkins	La Follette	Reed	Weller
Ernst	McCormick	Shields	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 16, and the nays are 27. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harrison	Norbeck	Simmons
Broussard	Heflin	Oddie	Smoot
Bursum	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Spencer
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	Stanfield
Cameron	Kendrick	Phipps	Sterling
Cummins	Keyes	Pittman	Trammell
Curtis	Lenroot	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Lodge	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Rawson	Willis
Gooding	McNary	Robinson	
Hale	New	Sheppard	
Harris	Nicholson	Shortridge	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The reading clerk called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. BORAH answered to his name when called.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. CAPPER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will call the roll on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the amendment of the committee.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], who is absent at this time. I am unable to obtain a transfer and therefore unable to vote. If privileged to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. HALE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair, I vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement of the transfer of my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called) Announcing as before my pair and transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON. Announcing the same transfer of my pair as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to announce the transfer of my pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CARAWAY. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY]. He is absent. I am unable to obtain a transfer and therefore refrain from voting.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the following pairs: The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST] with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY];

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The roll call resulted—yeas 18, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—18.			
Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Trammell
Borah	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Harris	Kendrick	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Harrison	Overman	Sheppard	
Heflin	Pittman	Simmons	
NAYS—28.			
Broussard	Frelinghuysen	McNary	Rawson
Bursum	Gooding	New	Shortridge
Calder	Hale	Nicholson	Smoot
Cameron	Keyes	Norbeck	Spencer
Capper	Lenroot	Oddie	Stanfield
Curtis	Lodge	Pepper	Sterling
Fernald	McCumber	Phipps	Willis
NOT VOTING—49.			
Ball	France	McLean	Sutherland
Brandegge	Gerry	Moses	Swanson
Caraway	Glass	Myers	Townsend
Colt	Harrell	Nelson	Underwood
Culberson	Hitchcock	Newberry	Wadsworth
Cummins	Johnson	Norris	Warren
Dial	Kellogg	Owen	Watson, Ga.
Dillingham	King	Page	Watson, Ind.
du Pont	Ladd	Poindexter	Weller
Edge	La Follette	Reed	Williams
Elkins	McCormick	Shields	
Ernst	McKellar	Smith	
Fletcher	McKinley	Stanley	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the question the yeas are 18 and the nays are 28. There are present the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], who are paired but not voting. A quorum being present, the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the amendment of the committee is rejected. The question recurs on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the next amendment.

The READING CLERK. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance is, on page 177, line 23, where the committee proposes to strike out "part" and insert "value," so as to read:

Wall pockets, composed wholly or in chief value of papers, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 178, line 4, where the committee proposed to strike out "26" and insert "all the foregoing, 40," so as to read:

Manufactures of paper, or of which paper is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for, all the foregoing, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. I move to substitute "35" for "40."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as modified.

The amendment was modified was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish the Senator from Utah would permit me merely to correct a statement which I made in some remarks previously delivered.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to state that I am advised I was mistaken in having said that the corporation controlling the dry-mat product of this country was a New Jersey corporation. I am told that it is a New York corporation, just across the border, and probably infected with the vices of New Jersey corporations.

#### FEDERAL COURT OF CONCILIATION.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I have drafted a bill to establish the Federal court of conciliation.

In this Government of ours we have the necessary tribunals to determine every controversy between individuals and between States; and yet the wonder of it is that when there come controversies or disputes between capital and labor or between the employer and the employee that may affect the very life of the Nation and of the Nation's industries we have absolutely no tribunal to act upon them.

I am very clear in my mind that every effort at voluntary arbitration, conciliation, and conference ought first to be tried; but when all these have been tried and there exist still disputes whose settlement can not be made by voluntary means, there ought to be some commission, or some tribunal, or some court, which, in the name of all the people, can determine the dispute when it reaches a point that threatens the very welfare of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to introduce that bill and to have it printed in the RECORD in 8-point type for the consideration of my colleagues in the Senate.

The bill (S. 3889) to establish the Federal court of conciliation was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and it was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby established a Federal court of conciliation (hereafter referred to as the court), to consist of three judges, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; one of whom shall be designated by the President as presiding judge; each of whom shall possess the same qualifications as are or may be required by law of judges of the United States district court, except as to residence; hold their office during good behavior and receive the same compensation.

SEC. 2. The court shall sit at such places in the United States as may by it be determined or at which the court may be called to sit by the President of the United States.

SEC. 3. The court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine controversies or disputes affecting the operation of interstate commerce as may be brought before it in the manner herein provided, and to enforce its decisions and findings as the judgment of other Federal courts are enforced.

SEC. 4. Whenever it shall be made to appear to the court by petition or otherwise, under such regulations and rules as may by the court be adopted and with power in the court to secure on its own motion or on the application of either side such expert advice in open hearing concerning the matters under consideration as it may desire, that there exists a controversy or dispute between employers and employees or between employees or between employers in connection with the transportation of commodities in interstate commerce or in connection with any industry whose product directly or immediately is essential to such transportation, and that in good faith, efforts have been made by one or both sides of such controversies to settle the same by conference, conciliation, voluntary arbitration, or otherwise, and such efforts have been unavailing, and that the disputes and controversies are of such a character and extent as to endanger the general welfare of the people of the United States, the court shall on its own motion or on the application of either side of such dispute or controversy, hear and determine the same and render such interlocutory orders or final decrees or judgment as the evidence may require and shall possess all necessary powers equitable or legal to adjudicate the dispute and to protect the interest of the parties thereto and to secure the continuity and efficiency of interstate commerce: *Provided*, That either party to the dispute or controversy may at any time upon permission of the court, or, as of right, after such party has in good faith complied with such order, judgment, or decree for a period of 30 days apply to the court for a modification or a reversal of said order, judgment, or decree, and be entitled to present evidence and reasons thereof which together with the original testimony in the case shall be considered by the court: *And provided further*, That no order, judgment, or decree shall require any individual man to work except when and where and under such conditions as he pleases.

SEC. 5. Appeals may be taken by either party from any order or judgment or finding of the court to the circuit court of appeals in the circuit wherein the finding of the court is made, and the judgment of the circuit court of appeals shall be final on such appeals unless in the judgment of the said circuit court of appeals a further appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States should be granted. Pending the appeal to the circuit court of appeals or to the Supreme Court the findings, orders, decrees, or judgment of the court shall be in full force and effect.

The appellate court to which appeals as herein provided for are taken shall advance such appeals to as prompt a hearing and determination as may be possible.

SEC. 6. The court shall have a seal, with such design as it may order; shall regulate its own terms of court; make rules for its government; regulate the practice before it; possess all the powers and rights with regard to its writs, process, practice, and the enforcement of its orders, decrees, and judgment as may be now or hereafter possessed by the United States district courts with regard to their practices, orders, decrees, or judgments.

SEC. 7. The court shall be furnished with such officers, equipment, and supplies as may be necessary.

SEC. 8. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with any of the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

#### ABANDONED COTTON ACREAGE.

Mr. HEFLIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 333), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to include in his September 1 cotton report an estimate of the acreage of cotton abandoned since June 25 up to August 25, 1922, and the acreage remaining in cultivation on the last-named date.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, August 5, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate August 4 (legislative day of August 3), 1922.*

## AGENT BEFORE THE ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL.

Fred K. Nielsen, of Nebraska, now Solicitor for the Department of State, to be agent of the United States before the arbitral tribunal constituted under the special agreement of the 18th of August, 1910, between the United States and Great Britain for the arbitration of outstanding pecuniary claims in accordance with the provisions of that agreement and of the convention of The Hague of the 18th of October, 1907, for the specific settlement of international disputes.

## MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL FARM LOAN BOARD.

John H. Guill, jr., of California, to be a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board, vice William H. Joyce, resigned.

## UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

D. Q. Morrow, of Ohio, to be United States attorney, southern district of Ohio, vice Thomas H. Morrow, appointed by court.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

## QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

*To be major general.*

Col. William H. Hart, Quartermaster Corps, to be quartermaster general for a period of four years from date of acceptance, with rank of major general, from August 28, 1922, vice Maj. Gen. Harry L. Rogers, Quartermaster General, whose term of office will expire on August 27, 1922.

## ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

*To be brigadier general.*

Col. Benjamin Alvord, Adjutant General's Department, to be assistant The Adjutant General for a period of four years from date of acceptance, with the rank of brigadier general, from August 16, 1922, vice Brig. Gen. James T. Kerr, Adjutant General's Department, to be retired from active service August 15, 1922.

## POSTMASTERS.

## ALABAMA.

Addie M. Cannon to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ala. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

## ARIZONA.

Catherine T. Dupen to be postmaster at Warren, Ariz., in place of J. M. Byrns, resigned.

## CALIFORNIA.

Raymond P. Hawkins to be postmaster at Allegheny, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Frederic W. Stahler to be postmaster at Yorba Linda, Calif., in place of E. R. West, resigned.

## COLORADO.

Robert B. Kerr to be postmaster at Stonington, Colo. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

## CONNECTICUT.

John E. O'Clare to be postmaster at North Grosvenor Dale, Conn., in place of C. A. Bonin, resigned.

## FLORIDA.

Edward Roberts to be postmaster at Odessa, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

## ILLINOIS.

John R. Scroggin to be postmaster at Gardner, Ill., in place of L. G. Horrie. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Albert Weiland to be postmaster at Peru, Ill., in place of G. W. Halm. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1922.

## IOWA.

Harry L. Emerson to be postmaster at Kenwood Park, Iowa. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Freda L. Thompson to be postmaster at Oto, Iowa. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Tibbals G. White to be postmaster at University Park, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

## KANSAS.

Anna E. Waterman to be postmaster at Healy, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Thomas G. Armour to be postmaster at Hutchinson, Kans., in place of S. S. Graybill, resigned.

## KENTUCKY.

Hiram H. Braden to be postmaster at Blue Diamond, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Albert H. Holoway to be postmaster at Bournedale, Mass. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

Grace G. Kempton to be postmaster at Farnumville, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Annie F. Corcoran to be postmaster at North Oxford, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Molly A. Gilman to be postmaster at Allerton, Mass., in place of M. A. Gilman. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1922.

## MICHIGAN.

Minnie McGuineas to be postmaster at Elberta, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

## MINNESOTA.

Nettie Layng to be postmaster at Bruno, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Jennie L. Phillips to be postmaster at Clear Water, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

William H. Wright to be postmaster at Montrose, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Chapin A. Farnham to be postmaster at Rockford, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Claire M. Peterson to be postmaster at Stanchfield, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Charles Olson to be postmaster at Sturgeon Lake, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Maggie N. Halgren to be postmaster at Wahkon, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Emory B. Linsley to be postmaster at Willow River, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

## NEW JERSEY.

Henry C. Straight to be postmaster at Morsemere, N. J. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Ada E. Holmes to be postmaster at Sayreville, N. J., in place of T. F. Dolan, removed.

## NEW YORK.

Arthur N. Fero to be postmaster at Esperance, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Francis E. San Jule to be postmaster at Hogansburg, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Alexander Hickey to be postmaster at St. Bonaventure, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Cornelius J. Carey to be postmaster at Newman, N. Y., in place of A. W. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

William H. Young to be postmaster at Voorheesville, N. Y., in place of F. M. Joslin, declined.

William S. Elwyn to be postmaster at Woodstock, N. Y., in place of C. M. Park, removed.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

Thomas R. Hundley to be postmaster at Draper, N. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Forney L. Abernethy to be postmaster at Mount Holly, N. C., in place of R. P. Gardner, resigned.

Simon S. Strother to be postmaster at Stantonsburg, N. C., in place of L. D. Williams, resigned.

## OKLAHOMA.

Thomas J. McNeely to be postmaster at Goltry, Okla. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Governor Everidge to be postmaster at Fort Towson, Okla. in place of John Huskey. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

## OREGON.

Drusilla M. Crance to be postmaster at Cornelius, Ore. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Frank Shupp to be postmaster at Shillington, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Isaac L. Shilling to be postmaster at Reedsville, Pa., in place of John C. Werts. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

## RHODE ISLAND.

Hilda S. Murray to be postmaster at Centerville, R. I. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Hoyt S. Gartley to be postmaster at Nisland, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

## TEXAS.

Art E. Frieze to be postmaster at Silvertown, Tex., in place of E. L. Cowart, resigned.

Ralph H. Kelly to be postmaster at Stanton, Tex., in place of L. H. Salter, resigned.

## VIRGINIA.

James K. Carter to be postmaster at Clinchport, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Louise J. Nottingham to be postmaster at Eastville, Va., in place of R. P. Custis, declined.

Annie G. Smith to be postmaster at Purcellville, Va., in place of Eugene Monroe. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

## WISCONSIN.

Winford Suits to be postmaster at Medford, Wis., in place of Franz Markus. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

## WYOMING.

Thomas B. Wright to be postmaster at Riverton, Wyo., in place of Nellie Gilbert, resigned.

James C. Hurtt to be postmaster at Sundance, Wyo., in place of H. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1922.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 4 (legislative day of August 3), 1922.*

## MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

C. F. McIntosh to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for a term of three years from July 17, 1922.

## SOLICITOR OF THE TREASURY.

Richard Randolph McMahon to be Solicitor of the Treasury.

## COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

S. M. Parker to be collector of customs, district No. 16, Charleston, S. C.

## REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Earl B. Coffin to be register of land office, Susanville, Calif.

James Edgar Hays to be register of land office, Lincoln, Nebr.

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Frederick A. Franke to be assistant surgeon.

## POSTMASTERS.

## KENTUCKY.

Everett Hickman, Burlington.

Eddie E. Shelton, Clay.

William M. Maffett, Cynthiana.

Andy M. Smith, McHenry.

Fountain S. Aynes, Pleasureville.

George V. Auxier, Russell.

Edith Ashby, Uniontown.

## MAINE.

Luther C. Spiller, Mechanic Falls.

Reed H. Ellis, Rangeley.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Charles H. Spaulding, Lexington.

## MINNESOTA.

Raymond R. Swanson, Bronson.

Gustaf A. Johnson, Hallock.

Herman O. Hoganson, Perley.

James A. Christensen, Preston.

Thorvald H. Froslee, Vining.

William A. Clement, Waseca.

## NEW MEXICO.

John A. Dickson, Fort Bayard.

## NEW YORK.

Earl W. Kostenbader, Groton.

George A. Gardner, Newfield.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

William S. Hancock, Edgeley.

## OHIO.

Brice H. Murphy, Maynard.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Thomas V. Diffendafer, Millerstown.

Frank T. Stiner, Moylan.

Charles F. De Labar, Riegelsville.

Louis O. Mellinger, Slickville.

## WITHDRAWALS.

*Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate August 4 (legislative day of August 3), 1922.*

## PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Rene F. A. Bucholz to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 7th day of June, 1922.

## POSTMASTER.

James S. Young to be postmaster at Reedsville, in the State of Pennsylvania.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, August 5, 1922.

*(Legislative day of Thursday, August 3, 1922.)*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its session on this calendar day it recess until Monday at 11 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Inasmuch as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has given notice of his intention to discuss the sugar schedule this morning, I see no reason why we can not take up the sugar schedule, and go right on with it after the Senator has discussed it. For that purpose I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Schedule 5, and that in its consideration any amendment offered by the committee or by any individual Senator to the schedule may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON. Personally I have no objection. Indeed, I should like to see that course pursued. But the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who is in charge of the bill on this side of the Chamber, is not here. He will probably be here in a moment, and I wish the Senator would withhold his request until that Senator comes in. There is just at this moment no minority member of the Finance Committee on the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. I talked with the Senator from North Carolina yesterday, and he was very agreeable that these particular important matters should be taken up first and disposed of. I think this course will be very agreeable to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from North Carolina will enter the Chamber in about five seconds.

Mr. HARRISON. We can see about it then.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well; we can consider it a little later.

Mr. SIMMONS entered the Chamber.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. President, I would like to ask if the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] will not have the time extended to some extent so that those of us who wish to discuss the sugar schedule, and who are not prepared at this time to discuss it, may be permitted to discuss the question, say, next Tuesday?