

328.73
U. S. R.
V. 72-pt. 3
Cop. 1
Ref.

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, January 24, 1930

(Legislative day of Monday, January 6, 1930)

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

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	George	La Follette	Simmons
Baird	Gillett	McKellar	Smith
Barkley	Glass	McMaster	Smoot
Bingham	Glenn	McNary	Steak
Blaine	Goff	Metcalf	Steiwer
Blease	Goldsbrough	Moses	Sullivan
Borah	Greene	Norbeck	Swanson
Bratton	Grundy	Norris	Thomas, Idaho
Brook	Hale	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Harris	Oddie	Townsend
Broussard	Harrison	Overman	Traumell
Capper	Hatfield	Patterson	Tydings
Caraway	Hawes	Phipps	Vandenberg
Connally	Hebert	Pine	Wagner
Copeland	Heflin	Ransdell	Walcott
Couzens	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Johnson	Robison, Ky.	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Jones	Schall	Watson
Fess	Kean	Sheppard	
Fletcher	Kendrick	Shipstead	
Frazier	Keyes	Shortridge	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is necessarily detained from the Senate on account of serious illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. FESS. My colleague the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] is detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETITIONS

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions adopted by the Great Bend branch of the Business and Professional Women's Club, and by eight branches of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all in the State of Kansas, favoring the prompt ratification by the Senate of the proposed World Court protocol, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a resolution adopted by the faculty of Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville, Tex., favoring the ratification of proposed protocols for adherence of the United States to the World Court, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying for the passage of legislation to create a Federal department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SULLIVAN presented a resolution adopted by Chapter No. 9, Izaak Walton League of America, at Casper, Wyo., favoring the passage of legislation amending the migratory bird treaty act with respect to bag limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES OF YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SULLIVAN presented a resolution adopted by the Game and Fish Commission of the State of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution by Wyoming Game and Fish Commission

Whereas it is proposed to change and extend the eastern and south boundary lines of Yellowstone National Park from the present location of said lines, which have been used and found satisfactory for more than 50 years; and

Whereas it is proposed by said extension to include within said park all that part of the State of Wyoming lying within the drainage area of the upper Yellowstone River and Thorofare Creek, thereby removing from said State the control and police jurisdiction over this vast wilderness area and the control and protection of the game animals, birds, and fish in the above area; and

Whereas we know that these powers of protection and control can and will be administered more effectually and satisfactorily by the State of Wyoming under its laws; and

Whereas no reasonable, logical, or valid excuses or reasons have been given or attempted to show or prove that such extension is necessary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Wyoming State Game and Fish Commission in regular meeting assembled, That we are unalterably opposed to any extension of the present east or south boundary line of said Yellowstone National Park so as to include any land whatsoever now under the jurisdiction of the State of Wyoming or the United States Forestry Department for the following reasons, to wit:

1. The land proposed to be included within the extended boundary lines constitute the most valuable big-game territory in the United States, of like area, and the continued exercise of police jurisdiction over it is vitally necessary to the State of Wyoming in the protection, conservation, and control of the elk, moose, and other species of big game ranging thereon.

2. Perpetual protection and sanctuary of the above animals on the area above referred to will remove from the proper officers of our State the power to control the said animals within the number possible to range and feed during the winter seasons, and by reason of overstocking our winter range endanger the very existence of the whole herd by starvation and disease.

3. Through the virgin forests of this area wind the blazed trails of the early explorers, trappers, and hunters, and around it lingers the traditions and tales of these pioneer adventurers, rich in the spirit of American freedom of our yesterdays which we wish continued.

4. The wild and primitive character of this bit of nature's handiwork attracts, and will continue forever to attract, the lover of the great out of doors, the hunter and the fisherman, who desire to journey here to enjoy their particular sport or recreation free from too much restrictive rules and regulations.

5. No danger of commercialization or exploitation by the United States Forestry Service or the State of Wyoming is threatening this area, and for more than 40 years these agencies have administered this wilderness ably and well, and will continue to preserve it for all time to come if left in control of the same.

6. Basing our belief upon the manner in which the primitive beauty and natural wonders of Yellowstone National Park have been commercialized and exploited, we view with apprehension and regret the inclusion of the above area within said Yellowstone Park, and reaffirm that it should be left in the control of those who have protected it from spoliation and exploitation down through the years, and ask that it be left as a sample of God's handiwork through the years to come; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread on the minutes of this meeting, and that copies of the same be sent to our honorable United States Senators, PATRICK J. SULLIVAN and JOHN B. KENDRICK; to our Congressman, VINCENT CARTER; to our governor, Frank C. Emerson; to Director of National Parks, Horace M. Albright; to the members of the President's Yellowstone National Park Boundary Commission; and to the Associated Press of Wyoming.

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported nominations of postmasters, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. GREENE, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported sundry nominations in the Army, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Commerce, reported nominations in the Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as in open executive session I ask permission to make public a treaty known as the treaty for the protection of industrial property, Executive C. I will say that the State Department have requested that this treaty be made public, so that it may be sent to different organizations which may wish to see it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, and as in open executive session, the injunction of secrecy is removed from the text of the treaty.

The text of the treaty is as follows:

To the Senate:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of the convention, I transmit herewith a duly authenticated copy of a convention signed at The Hague on November 6, 1925, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and of the other Governments members of the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property modifying the International Industrial Property Convention of March 20, 1883, revised at Brussels on December 14, 1900, and at Washington on June 2, 1911. The convention was signed in one original, which is deposited with the Government of the Netherlands.

I recommend that the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of the convention be given subject to the understandings set forth in the three declarations made by the American plenipotentiaries, and which are quoted in the accompanying report from the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, Washington.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a duly authenticated copy of a convention signed at The Hague on November 6, 1925, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and of the other governments members of the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property, modifying the International Convention of March 20, 1883, revised at Brussels on December 14, 1900, and at Washington on June 2, 1911.

It is suggested that it be recommended to the Senate that its advice and consent to ratification be given subject to three declarations made by the plenipotentiaries of the United States, as follows:

(1) "The delegation of the United States understands that article 5, eliminating requirement of mention of registration on designs or industrial models, will not affect the present law in their country. The law of the United States as to notice of patents has been explained to the delegates, and will not be changed or affected by this provision of this convention."

(2) "The delegation for the United States understands that the term of the period of permissible nonuse, and the causes that may justify the nonuse of a registered mark in article 5, are to be decided solely by the country where use is required, and according to its own law and practice."

(3) "As to article 5 bis, the delegation of the United States understands that the taxes referred to do not include the final fee required by its laws after an application for patent is allowed and before the patent can be issued, and as to which a period of six months is now allowed for payment without fine or condition."

The convention has had the attention of the Secretary of Commerce who, in a letter to the undersigned dated January 20, 1927, concurring in the opinion of the undersigned that the treaty should be sent to the Senate, adds as follows:

"While the delegates for the United States to the Congress at The Hague were unable to obtain all that they desired in modifying the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, as revised in Washington on June 2, 1911, they did succeed in obtaining very material modifications looking to

the amelioration of the present practice of many of the foreign countries, especially with relation to the working of patents."

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 4, 1927.

[Translation]

The President of the German Reich; the President of the Republic of Austria; His Majesty the King of the Belgians; the President of the United States of Brazil; the President of the Republic of Cuba; His Majesty the King of Denmark; the President of the Dominican Republic; His Majesty the King of Spain; the President of the Republic of Estonia; the President of the United States of America; the President of the Republic of Finland; the President of the French Republic; His Majesty the King of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India; His Serene Highness the Governor of Hungary; His Majesty the King of Italy; His Majesty the Emperor of Japan; His Majesty the Sultan of Morocco; the President of the United Mexican States; His Majesty the King of Norway; Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands; the President of the Polish Republic, in the name of Poland and the Free City of Danzig; the President of the Portuguese Republic; His Majesty the King of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes; His Majesty the King of Sweden; The Federal Council of the Swiss Confederation; the States of Syria and Grand Liban; the President of the Czechoslovak Republic; His Highness the Bey of Tunis; the President of the Turkish Republic.

Having deemed it expedient to make certain modifications and additions to the International Convention of March 20, 1883, for the creation of an International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property, revised at Brussels on December 14, 1900, and at Washington on June 2, 1911, have appointed as their plenipotentiaries, to wit:

The President of the German Reich:

M. W. F. von Vietinghoff, Conseiller de Légation d'Allemagne à la Haye;

M. von Specht, Geheimer Oberregierungsrat, Président de l'Office des Brevets;

M. Klauer, Conseiller ministériel au Ministère de Justice;

M. le Prof. Dr. Albert Osterrieth, Justizrat;

The President of the Republic of Austria:

M. le Dr. Carl Duschaneck, Conseiller ministériel, Vice-Président de l'Office autrichien des Brevets;

M. le Dr. Hans Fortwängler, Conseiller ministériel audit Office;

His Majesty the King of the Belgians:

M. Octave Mavaut, Directeur Général de l'Industrie au Ministère de l'Industrie, du Travail et de la Prévoyance sociale;

M. Albert Capitaine, Avocat à la Cour d'Appel de Liège, ancien Bâtonnier, Délégué de la Belgique à la Conférence de Washington;

M. Louis André, Avocat à la Cour d'Appel de Bruxelles;

M. Thomas Braun, Avocat à la Cour d'Appel de Bruxelles;

M. Daniel Coppieters, Avocat à la Cour d'Appel de Bruxelles;

The President of the United States of Brazil:

M. le Dr. Julio Augusto Barboza Carneiro, Membre du Comité Économique de la Société des Nations;

M. le Prof. Dr. Carlos Americo Barbosa de Oliveira, Professeur à l'École Polytechnique, Directeur de l'École Normale des Arts et des Métiers Wenceslau Braz;

The President of the Republic of Cuba:

M. le Dr. Raphaël Martinez Ortiz, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire de Cuba à Paris;

M. le Dr. Raphaël de la Torre, Chargé d'Affaires de Cuba à la Haye;

His Majesty the King of Denmark:

M. le Dr. N. J. Ehrenreich Hansen, Sous-Chem de Bureau au Ministère de l'Industrie, du Commerce et de la Navigation;

The President of the Dominican Republic:

M. C. G. de Haseth Cz., Consul de la République dominicaine à la Haye;

His Majesty the King of Spain:

S. Exc. M. Santiago Mendez de Vigo, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire de S. M. le Roi d'Espagne à la Haye;

M. Fernando Cabello y Lapiedra, Chef du Bureau de la Propriété Industrielle et Commerciale d'Espagne;

008275

- M. José García-Monge y de Vera, Secrétaire du Bureau de la Propriété Industrielle et Commerciale d'Espagne;
- The President of the Republic of Esthonia:
M. O. Aarmann, Ingénieur, Directeur de Bureau des Brevets;
- The President of the United States of America:
Mr. Thomas E. Robertson, United States Commissioner of Patents, Member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of U. S. A.;
Mr. Wallace R. Lane, formerly President of the American and Chicago Patent Law Associations, Member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of U. S. A. and the Supreme Court of Illinois;
Mr. Jo Bailly Brown, Pittsburgh, Member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of U. S. A., and the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania;
- The President of the Republic of Finland:
M. Yrjö Saastamoinen, Chargé d'Affaires de Finlande à la Haye;
- The President of the French Republic:
S. Exc. M. Chassain de Marcilly, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire de France à la Haye;
M. Marcel Plaisant, Député, Avocat à la Cour d'Appel de Paris;
M. Charles Drouets, Directeur de la Propriété Industrielle au Ministère du Commerce;
M. Georges Millard, Avocat à la Cour d'Appel de Paris, Vice-Président du Comité technique de la Propriété Industrielle;
- His Majesty the King of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India:
For Great Britain and North Ireland:
Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith, G. C. B., Chief Economic Adviser to His Britannic Majesty's Government;
M. Alfred James Martin, O. B. E., Assistant Comptroller of the Patent Office and Industrial Property Department of the Board of Trade;
Sir Arthur Balfour, K. B. E., One of His Majesty's Justices of the Peace; Chairman of the Committee on Trade and Industry;
For the Dominion of Canada:
M. Frederick Herbert Palmer, M. C., Canadian Government Trade Commissioner;
For the Commonwealth of Australia:
M. le Lieutenant-Colonel Charles Vincent Watson, D. S. O., V. D., Commissioner of Patents and Registrar of Trade Marks and Designs;
For the Irish Free State:
M. le Comte Gerald O'Kelly de Gallagher, Représentant de l'État Libre d'Irlande;
- His Serene Highness the Governor of Hungary:
M. Elemér de Pompéry, Président de la Cour de Brevets;
- His Majesty the King of Italy:
M. Dominico Barone, Conseiller d'État;
M. Gustavo de Sanctis, Directeur de Bureau de la Propriété Industrielle;
M. l'Ingénieur Letterio Labocetta;
M. Gino Olivetti, Député, Secrétaire Général de la Confédération de l'Industrie italienne;
M. le Prof. Mario Ghiron, Docteur de droit industriel à l'Université de Rome;
- His Majesty the Emperor of Japan:
M. Saichiro Sakikawa, Président du Bureau des Brevets d'Invention;
M. Nobumi Ito;
- His Majesty the Sultan of Morocco:
S. Exc. M. Chassain de Marcilly, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire de France à la Haye;
- The President of the United Mexican States:
M. Julio Poulat, Attaché Commercial à la Légation du Mexique à Paris;
- His Majesty the King of Norway:
M. Birger Gabriel Wyller, Directeur Général du Bureau de la Propriété Industrielle de Norvège;
- Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands:
M. le Dr. J. Alingh Prins, Président du Conseil des Brevets, Directeur de l'Office de la Propriété Industrielle;
M. le Dr. H. Bijleveld, ancien Ministre, Membre de la Chambre des Députés, ancien Président du Conseil des Brevets, ancien Directeur de l'Office de la Propriété Industrielle;
M. le Dr. J. W. Dijkmeester, Membre du Conseil des Brevets;
- The President of the Polish Republic:
For Poland:
S. Exc. M. le Dr. Stanislas Koźmiński, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire de Pologne à la Haye;
M. le Dr. Frédéric Zoli, Professeur à l'Université de Krakow;
For the Free City of Danzig:
S. Exc. M. le Dr. Stanislas Koźmiński, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire de Pologne à la Haye;
- The President of the Republic of Portugal:
S. Exc. M. A. C. De Sousa Santos Bandeira, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire du Portugal à la Haye;
- His Majesty the King of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes:
M. le Dr. Yanko Choumane, Président de l'Office pour la Protection de la Propriété Industrielle auprès du Ministère du Commerce et de l'Industrie;
M. Mihailo Preditch, Secrétaire audit Office;
- His Majesty the King of Sweden:
M. le Directeur-Général E. O. J. Björklund, Chef de l'Administration des Brevets et d'Enregistrement;
M. K. H. R. Hjertén, Conseiller de la Cour d'Appel de Göta;
M. A. E. Hasselrot, ancien Directeur de Bureau à ladite Administration, Conseil en matière de propriété industrielle;
- The Federal Council of the Swiss Confederation:
S. Exc. M. Arthur de Pury, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire de Suisse à la Haye;
M. Walter Draft, Directeur du Bureau Fédéral de la Propriété Intellectuelle;
- The President of the French Republic:
For the States of Syria and Grand Liban:
S. Exc. M. Chassain de Marcilly, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire de France à la Haye;
- The President of the Czechoslovak Republic:
S. Exc. M. P. Baráček, Ingénieur, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire de Tchécoslovaquie à la Haye;
M. le Dr. Karel Hermann-Otavský, Professeur à l'Université de Prague;
M. Bohuslav Pavlousek, Ingénieur, Vice-Président de l'Office des Brevets de Prague;
- His Highness the Bey of Tunis:
S. Exc. M. Chassain de Marcilly, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire de France à la Haye;
- The President of the Turkish Republic:
Mehmed Essad Bey, Chargé d'Affaires de Turquie à la Haye.
- Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, which were found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:
- The contracting countries constitute themselves into a Union for the protection of industrial property.
- The scope of industrial property includes patents, utility models, industrial designs and models, trade marks, commercial names and indications of origin, or appellations of origin, as well as the repression of unfair competition.
- Industrial property is to be understood in the broadest meaning and is to be applied not only to industry and commerce as such, but likewise to agricultural industries (wines, grain, tobacco leaves, fruit, cattle, etc.) and extractive (minerals, mineral waters, etc.).
- The term "patents" includes the various types of industrial patents granted by the laws of the contracting countries, such as patents of importation, improvement patents, patents and certificates of addition.

ARTICLE 2

Nationals of each of the contracting countries shall, in all other countries of the Union, as regards industrial property protection, enjoy the advantages that their respective laws now grant, or may hereafter grant, to their own nationals, without any prejudice of the right specially provided by the present convention. Consequently they shall have the same protection as the latter, and the same legal remedy against any infringement of their rights, provided they observe the conditions and formalities imposed on subjects or citizens.

Nevertheless no condition as to the possession of a domicile or establishment in the country where protection is claimed can be required of those who enjoy the benefits of the Union for the enjoyment of any industrial property rights.

The provisions of the legislation of each of the contracting countries relative to judicial and administrative proceedings, and to competent authority as well as to the choice of domicile or the appointment of an authorized agent which may be required by the industrial property legislation are expressly reserved.

ARTICLE 3

Nationals of countries not forming part of the Union who are domiciled or who have real and effective industrial or commercial establishments in the territory of any of the countries of the Union, shall be assimilated to the nationals of the contracting countries.

ARTICLE 4

(a) Any person who has duly applied for a patent, the registration of a utility model, industrial design or model, or trade mark in one of the contracting countries, or his legal representative or assignee, shall enjoy, subject to the rights of third parties, for the purposes of registration in other countries, a right of priority during the periods hereinafter stated.

(b) Consequently, subsequent filing in any of the other countries of the Union before the expiration of these periods shall not be invalidated through any acts accomplished in the interval, either, particularly, by another filing, by publication of the invention, or by the working of it, by the sale of copies of the design or model, or by use of the trade mark.

(c) The above-mentioned periods of priority shall be twelve months for patents and utility models, and six months for industrial designs and models, and trade marks.

These periods shall start from the date of filing of the first application in a country of the Union; the day of filing is not counted in this period. If the last day of the period is a day non in the country where protection is claimed, the period is extended until the next working day.

(d) Any person desiring to take advantage of the priority of a previous application must make a declaration giving particulars as to the date of such application and the country in which it was made. Each country will determine for itself the latest date at which such declaration must be made.

The particulars referred to shall be stated in the publications issued by the competent authority, and in particular in the patents issued and the specifications relating thereto.

The contracting countries may require any person making a declaration of priority to produce a copy of the application (with the specification, drawings, etc.) previously made. The copy certified as correct by the authority receiving this demand shall not require any legal authentication, and in any circumstances can be filed at any time within the period of three months from the lodging of the last application. They may also require that the declaration shall be accompanied by a certificate by the proper authority showing the date of application, and also by a translation.

No other formalities may be required for the declaration of priority at the time of application. Each of the contracting countries shall decide for itself what consequences shall follow the omission of the formalities prescribed by the present article, but such consequence shall in no case be more serious than the loss of the right of priority. At later stages, further proof in support of the application may be required.

(e) Where an application is filed in a country for the registration of an industrial design or model by virtue of a right of priority based on the registration of a utility model, the period of priority shall not exceed that fixed for industrial designs and models.

Furthermore it is allowable to deposit in a country a utility model by virtue of rights of priority based on a patent application in another country, and vice versa.

(f) If an application for a patent contains claims for multiple priority, or if examination discloses that the application contains more than one invention, the competent authorities must at least allow the applicant to divide it, subject to the conditions of internal legislation reserving as date of each divisional application the date of the initial application and, (if there is occasion for it,) the benefits of the right of priority.

ARTICLE 4 BIS

Patents applied for in the various contracting countries by nationals of the Union shall be independent of the patents obtained for the same invention in other countries, whether such countries be or be not parties to the Union.

This stipulation must receive a strict interpretation; in particular, it shall be understood to mean that patents applied for during the period of priority are independent, both as regards the grounds for refusal and for revocation, and also as regards their normal duration.

This stipulation shall apply to all patents already existing at the time when it shall come into effect.

The same stipulation shall apply, in the case of the accession of new countries, to patents in existence, either on one side or the other, at the time of accession.

ARTICLE 5

The introduction by the patentee into the country where the patent has been granted of objects manufactured in any of the countries of the Union shall not entail forfeiture.

Nevertheless, each of the contracting countries shall have the right to take the necessary legislative measures to prevent the abuses which might result from the exercise of the exclusive rights conferred by the patent, for example failure to work.

These measures will only provide for the revocation of the patent if the granting of compulsory licenses shall not suffice to prevent such abuses.

In all cases the patent will not be subject to such measures before the expiration of at least three years from the date of its grant and if the patentee produces just excuses.

The protection of designs and industrial models cannot be liable to cancellation by reason of the introduction of objects corresponding to those protected.

Articles shall not be required to bear any indication of registration for recognition of this right.

If in a country the use of a registered trade mark is compulsory, the registration cannot be cancelled until after a reasonable period, and only then if those interested cannot justify the causes of their inaction.

ARTICLE 5 BIS

A period of grace of at least three months will be granted for the payment of taxes prescribed for the maintenance of industrial property rights, together with a surcharge if the internal legislation of a country so provides. For patents of invention the contracting countries undertake moreover either to prolong that extended period to six months at least, or to provide for the restoration of a patent which has lapsed owing to the non-payment of fees. It is understood that these provisions are subject to the conditions prescribed by internal legislation.

ARTICLE 5 TER

In each of the contracting countries the following shall not be considered as infringing the rights of the patentee:

(1) The use on board ships of other Unionist countries of anything the subject matter of his patent in the body of the ship, in the machinery, tackle, apparatus, and other accessories when such ships enter temporarily or accidentally the waters of the country, provided that such thing is employed there exclusively for the needs of the vessel.

(2) The use of anything the subject matter of the patent in the construction of or functioning of the engines of locomotion for air or land of the other Unionist countries, or of the accessories of these engines, when these enter the country temporarily or accidentally.

ARTICLE 6

Every trade mark duly registered in the country of origin shall be admitted for registration and protected in the form originally registered in the other countries of the Union.

Nevertheless the following marks may be refused or cancelled:

1. Those which are of such a nature as to prejudice rights acquired by third parties in the country in which protection is applied for.

2. Those which have no distinctive character, or which consist exclusively of signs or indications which serve in trade to designate the kind, quality, quantity, destination, value, place of origin or date of production, or which have become customary in the current language, or in the bona fide and unquestioned usages of the trade of the country in which protection is sought.

In arriving at a decision as to the distinctiveness of the character of a mark, all the circumstances of the case must be taken into account, and, in particular, the length of time that such a mark has been in use.

3. Those which are contrary to morality or public order.

It is to be understood that a mark can not be considered as contrary to public order for the sole reason that it does not conform to some legislative requirement concerning trade marks, except in circumstances where this requirement itself relates to public order.

The following shall be deemed the country of origin:

The country of the Union where the applicant has an actual and genuine industrial or commercial establishment, and if he has not such an establishment, the country of the Union where he has his domicile and if he has not a domicile in the Union the country of his nationality in the case where he enjoys the benefits of the Union.

In no case the renewal of the registration of a trade mark in the country of origin shall involve the obligation of renewal of the registration of the mark in other countries of the Union in which the mark has been registered.

The benefits of priority shall subsist in trade mark applications filed in the period allowed by Article 4, even when the registration in the country of origin is only completed after the expiration of such period.

The provisions of paragraph 1 do not preclude the right of requiring from an applicant a certificate, in due form, as to the

registration of his mark, issued by the competent authority of the country of origin but no legal authentication of such certificate shall be required.

ARTICLE 6 BIS

The contracting countries undertake to refuse or invalidate, either administratively if their legislation so permits, or at the request of an interested party the registration of a trade mark which constitutes a reproduction or imitation liable to create confusion with a trade mark considered by the competent authority of the country of registration to be well-known there as being already a mark of a national of another contracting country and used for products of the same or a similar kind.

A period of at least three years must be granted in order to claim the cancellation of these marks. The period shall start from the date of registration of the mark. No period shall be established to claim the cancellation of fraudulently-registered marks.

ARTICLE 6 TER

The contracting countries undertake to refuse or invalidate registration, and to prohibit by appropriate means the use, failing authorization from the competent authority, whether as trade mark or as components of such all Coats of Arms, flags, and other State emblems of contracting countries, official control and guarantee signs, and stamps adopted by them, and all imitation from an heraldic point of view.

The prohibition of official control and guarantee signs and stamps shall apply only in cases where marks which comprise them are intended to be used on merchandise of the same or a similar nature.

For the application of these provisions the contracting countries agree to communicate reciprocally through the intermediary of the International Bureau of Berne, the list of State emblems and official control, and guarantee signs and stamps which they desire, or will desire, to place, wholly or with certain reservations, under the protection of the present article, as well as all subsequent modifications added to the list. Each contracting country shall place the communicated list at the disposal of the public in due course.

Each contracting country may within a period of twelve months from the receipt of the notification, and through the intermediary of the International Bureau of Berne, transmit its possible objections to any other country concerned.

For State emblems which are well known the provisions of paragraph 1 shall only be applicable to marks registered after the signature of this Convention.

For State emblems which are not well known and for official signs and stamps, these provisions shall only be applicable to marks registered more than two months after the receipt of the notification provided for in paragraph 3.

In the case of (bad faith), countries shall have the right to cancel even the marks registered before the signature of the present Convention and embodying State emblems, signs and stamps.

Nationals of each country who are authorized to make use of State emblems, and signs and stamps of their country, may use them even if there be a similarity with those of another country.

The contracting countries undertake to prohibit the unauthorized use in trade of State Coats of Arms of other contracting countries when such use would be liable to cause confusion as to the origin of the product.

The preceding provisions will not prevent the countries exercising the right to refuse or to invalidate by the application of number 3 of paragraph 2 of Article 6 marks containing without authority Coats of Arms, Flags, decorations, and other State emblems or official signs and stamps adopted by a country of the Union.

ARTICLE 7

The nature of the goods on which the trade mark is to be used can in no case, form an obstacle to the registration of the trade mark.

ARTICLE 7 BIS

The contracting countries undertake to allow the filing of, and to protect, trade-marks belonging to associations the existence of which is not contrary to the law of the country of origin, even if such associations do not possess an industrial or commercial establishment.

Nevertheless, each country shall be the sole judge of the particular conditions on which an association may be allowed to obtain protection for its marks.

ARTICLE 8

A trade name shall be protected in all the countries of the Union without the obligation of filing or registration, whether it form part or not of a trade mark.

ARTICLE 9

All goods illegally bearing a trade mark or trade name shall be seized on importation into those countries of the Union where this mark or name has a right to legal protection.

Seizure shall be effected equally in the country where the mark or name was illegally applied, or in the country to which the article bearing it has been imported.

The seizure shall take place either at the request of the proper Government department or of any other competent authority, or of any interested party or actual or legal person, in conformity with the domestic law of each country.

The authorities are not bound to effect the seizure in transit.

If the law of a country does not admit of seizure on importation, such seizure shall be replaced by prohibition of importation or seizure within such country.

If the law of any country does not admit either of seizure upon importation or of prohibition of importation or of seizure within the country, and until such time as this legislation shall be accordingly modified, these measures will be replaced by the remedies assured in such cases to nationals by the law of such country.

ARTICLE 10

The stipulations of the preceding Article shall be applicable to every production which may falsely bear as indication of origin the name of a specified locality or country when such indication shall be joined to a trade name of a fictitious character or used with the intent to defraud.

Any producer, manufacturer, or trader, engaged in the production, manufacture, or trade, of such goods and established either in the locality falsely designated as the place of origin, or in the district where the locality is situated or in the country falsely designated shall be deemed in all cases a party concerned, whether such persons be actual or legal.

ARTICLE 10 BIS

The contracting countries are bound to assure to nationals of the Union an effective protection against unfair competition.

Every act of competition contrary to honest practice in industrial or commercial matters constitutes an act of unfair competition.

The following particularly are to be forbidden:

1. All acts whatsoever of a nature to create confusion by no matter what means with the goods of a competitor.

2. False allegations, in the course of trade, of a nature to discredit the goods of a competitor.

ARTICLE 10 TER

The contracting countries undertake to assure to the nationals of other countries of the Union appropriate legal remedies to repress effectively all acts set forth in Articles 9, 10, and 10 bis.

They undertake, moreover, to provide measures to permit syndicates and associations representing the industry or the trade interested, and of which the existence is not contrary to the laws of their country, to take action in justice or before the administrative authorities in view of the repression of the acts set forth in Articles 9, 10, and 10 bis so far as the law of the country in which protection is claimed permits it to the syndicates and associations of that country.

ARTICLE 11

The contracting countries shall, in conformity with the legislation of each country, accord temporary protection to patentable inventions, to utility models, and to industrial designs or models, as well as to trade marks in respect of products which shall be exhibited at official, or officially-recognized international exhibitions held in the territory of one of them.

This temporary protection shall not prolong the periods provided by Article 4. If, later, the right of priority is sought, the competent authority of each country may date the period from the date of the introduction of the product into the exhibition.

Each country may require, as proof of the identity of the object exhibited, and of the date of the introduction, such proofs as it may consider necessary.

ARTICLE 12

Each of the contracting countries agrees to establish a special Government (service) for industrial property, and a central office for communication to the public of patents, utility models, industrial designs or models, and trade marks.

This (service) shall publish an official periodical paper.

ARTICLE 13

The International Office, established at Berne under the name "Bureau international pour la protection de la Propriété Industrielle," is placed under the high authority of the Government of the Swiss Confederation, which is to regulate its organization and supervise its working.

The official language of the International Bureau is French.

The International Bureau centralizes information of every kind relating to the protection of industrial property and collates and publishes it. It interests itself in all matters of common utility to the Union and edits, with the help of documents supplied to it by the various administrations, a periodical paper in the French language, dealing with questions regarding the object of the Union.

The numbers of this paper, as well as the documents published by the International Office are circulated among the Administrations of the countries of the Union in the proportion of the number of contributing units as mentioned below. Such further copies as may be desired, either by the said Administrations, or by societies or private persons, will be paid for separately.

The International Bureau shall at all times hold itself at the service of members of the Union, in order to supply them with any special information they may need on questions relating to the International system of industrial property. The Director of the International Bureau will furnish an annual report on its working, which shall be communicated to all the members of the Union.

The expenses of the International Bureau will be borne by the contracting countries in common. Unless fresh sanction is given, they must not exceed the sum of 120,000 Swiss francs per annum. This sum may be increased in cases of necessity by a unanimous decision of one of the conference provided for by Article 14.

To determine the part which each country should contribute to this total of expenses the contracting countries and those which may afterwards join the Union shall be divided into six classes, each contributing in the proportion of a certain number of units, namely:

	Units
1st Class.....	25
2nd Class.....	20
3rd Class.....	15
4th Class.....	10
5th Class.....	5
6th Class.....	3

These co-efficients will be multiplied by the number of countries in each class and the sum of the result thus obtained will supply the number of units by which the total expense has to be divided.

The quotient will give the amount of the unit of expense.

Each of the contracting countries will designate, at the time of its accession, the class in which it wishes to be placed.

The Government of the Swiss Confederation is to superintend the expenses of the International Bureau to advance the necessary funds and to render an annual account which will be communicated to all the other administrations.

ARTICLE 14

The present convention shall be submitted to periodical revisions with a view to the introduction of amendments calculated to improve the system of the Union.

For this purpose, Conferences shall be held successively in one of the contracting countries between the delegates of the said countries.

The Administration of the country in which the Conference is to be held will make preparation for the transaction of that Conference, with the assistance of the International Bureau.

The Director of the International Bureau will be present at the meetings of the Conferences, and will take part in the discussions, but without the privilege of voting.

ARTICLE 15

It is agreed that the contracting countries respectively reserve to themselves the right to make separately, as between themselves, special arrangements for the protection of industrial property, in so far as such arrangements do not contravene the provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE 16

Countries which are not parties to the present Convention shall be allowed to accede to it upon their request.

The accession shall be notified through the diplomatic channel to the Government of the Swiss Confederation, and by the latter to all the other Governments.

It shall entail, as a matter of right, accession to all the classes, as well as admission to all the advantages stipulated in the present Convention, and shall take effect one month after the dispatch of the notification by the Government of the Swiss Confederation to the other countries of the Union, unless a subsequent date has been indicated by the acceding country.

ARTICLE 16 BIS

The contracting countries have the right of acceding to the present Convention at any time on behalf of their Colonies, Possessions, Dependencies and Protectorates, or territories ad-

ministrated by virtue of a mandate from the League of Nations, or any of them.

For this purpose they may either make a general declaration, including all their Colonies, Possessions, Dependencies and Protectorates, and the Territories referred to in Paragraph 1, in the accession, or may expressly name those included, or may confine themselves to indicating those which are excluded therefrom.

This declaration shall be notified in writing to the Government of the Swiss Confederation and by the latter to all the other Governments.

Under the same conditions, the contracting countries may denounce the Convention on behalf of their Colonies, Possessions, Dependencies and Protectorates, or for the Territories referred to in Paragraph 1, or of any of them.

ARTICLE 17

The execution of the reciprocal engagements contained in the present Convention is subordinated, in so far as necessary, to the observance of the formalities and rules established by the constitutional laws of those of the contracting countries who are bound to procure the application of the same, which they engage to do with as little delay as possible.

ARTICLE 17 BIS

The Convention shall remain in force for an unlimited time, till the expiration of one year from the date of its denunciation.

This denunciation shall be addressed to the Government of the Swiss Confederation. It shall only effect the denouncing country, the Convention remaining in operation as regards the other contracting countries.

ARTICLE 18

The present Act shall be ratified and the ratifications deposited at The Hague not later than the 1st May 1928. It shall come into force between the countries which will have ratified it one month after such date.

Nevertheless, if before May 1st 1928 it should be ratified by at least six countries, it will come into force between those countries one month after the Government of the Swiss Confederation has notified them of the filing of the sixth ratification, and for the countries who should subsequently ratify, one month after the notification of each of these ratifications.

This Act shall replace, as regards relations between the countries which ratify it, The Union Convention of Paris, 1883, revised at Washington 2nd June, 1911, and its Final Protocol, which shall remain in force as regards relations with countries which have not ratified the present Act.

ARTICLE 19

The present Act shall be signed in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the Netherlands. A certified copy shall be forwarded by the latter to each of the Governments of the contracting countries.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Act.

Done at The Hague, in a single copy, the sixth day of November, 1925.

For Germany:

VIETINGHOFF.
V. SPECHT.
KLAUER.
ALBERT OSTERMETH.

For Australia:

C. V. WATSON.

For Austria:

DR. CARL DUSCHANEK.
DR. HANS FORTWÄNGLER.

For Belgium:

CAPITAINE.
LOUIS ANDRÉ.
THOMAS BRAUN.
D. COPPIETERS.

For the United States of Brazil:

J. A. BARBOZA CARNEIRO.
CARLOS AMERICO BARBOSA DE OLIVEIRA.

For Canada:

FREDERICK H. PALMER.

For Cuba:

R. DE LA TORRE.

For Denmark:

N. J. EHRENREICH HANSEN.

For the Free City of Danzig:

ST. KOZMIŃSKI.

For the Dominican Republic:

C. G. DE HASETH CZ.

- For Spain: SANTIAGO MENDEZ DE VIGO.
FERNANDO CABELLO LAPIEDRA.
JOSÉ GARCIA MONGE.
- For Esthonia: O. AARMANN.
- For the United States of America: THOMAS E. ROBERTSON.
WALLACE R. LANE.
JO BAILY BROWN.
- For Finland: YRJÖ SAASTAMOINEN.
- For France: CH. DE MARCILLY.
MARCEL PLAISANT.
CH. DROUETS.
GEORGES MAILLARD.
- For Great Britain and Northern Ireland: H. LLEWELLYN SMITH.
A. J. MARTIN.
A. BALFOUR.
- For Hungary: ELEMÉR DE POMPÉRY.
- For the Free State of Ireland: G. O'KELLY DE GALLAGH.
- For Italy: DOMENICO BARONE.
LETTERIO LABOCETTA.
MARIO GHIRON.
- For Japan: S. SARIKAW.
N. ITO.
- For Morocco: CH. DE MARCILLY.
- For the United Mexican States: JULIO POULAT.
- For Norway: B. WYLLER.
- For The Netherlands: J. ALINGH PRINS.
BIJLEVELD.
DIJCKMEESTER.
- For Poland: ST. KOZMIŃSKI.
FRÉDÉRIC ZOLL.
- For Portugal: BANDEIRA.
- For the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovians: DR. YANKO CHOUMANE.
MIHAILO PRÉDITCH.
- For Sweden: E. O. J. BJÖRKLUND.
H. HJERTÉN.
AXEL HASSELROT.
- For the Swiss: A. DE PURY.
W. KRAFT.
- For Syria and Grand Liban: CH. DE MARCILLY.
- For Czechoslovakia: BARÁČEK.
PROF. DR. KAREL HERMANN-OTAVSKY.
ING. BOHUSLAV PAVLOUSEK.
- For Tunis: CH. DE MARCILLY.
- For Turkey:

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

- By Mr. BROOKHART:
A bill (S. 3200) for the relief of Daniel J. Sullivan; to the Committee on Civil Service.
- A bill (S. 3261) granting an increase of pension to Elsie E. Bradd (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
- By Mr. McMASTER:
A bill (S. 3262) for the relief of George C. Mortensen; and
A bill (S. 3263) for the relief of George C. Widlon; to the Committee on Claims.
- By Mr. CAPPER:
A bill (S. 3264) granting a pension to Catherine M. Whittam (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

- By Mr. GOFF:
A bill (S. 3265) to provide for the erection at Parkersburg, W. Va., of a memorial monument to certain veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Library.
- By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:
A bill (S. 3266) granting an increase of pension to May E. Clark;
- A bill (S. 3267) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Downing;
- A bill (S. 3268) granting an increase of pension to Maggie A. Freeman; and
- A bill (S. 3269) granting an increase of pension to Rose E. Van Horn; to the Committee on Pensions.
- By Mr. PHIPPS:
A bill (S. 3270) to vest in the Postmaster General authority to decide which bid is the most advantageous to the Government in connection with the purchase of motor trucks and motor-truck equipment in order that a reasonable standardization of motor trucks and equipment may be maintained throughout the Postal Service, and to purchase motor-truck parts from the manufacturers of the motor trucks, under such arrangements as the Postmaster General may deem advantageous to the Government;
- A bill (S. 3271) to extend to Government postal cards the provision for defacing the stamps on Government stamped envelopes by mailers;
- A bill (S. 3272) to authorize the dispatch from the mailing post office of metered permit matter of the first class prepaid at least 2 cents, but not fully prepaid, and to authorize the acceptance of third-class matter without stamps affixed in such quantities as may be prescribed;
- A bill (S. 3273) to authorize the Postmaster General to issue additional receipts or certificates of mailing to senders of any class of mail matter and to fix the fees chargeable therefor;
- A bill (S. 3274) to authorize the Postmaster General to charge for services rendered in disposing of undelivered mail in those cases where it is considered proper for the Postal Service to dispose of such mail by sale or to dispose of collect-on-delivery mail without collection of the C. O. D. charges or for a greater or less amount than stated when mailed;
- A bill (S. 3275) to authorize the Postmaster General to impose fines on steamship and aircraft carriers transporting the mails beyond the borders of the United States for unreasonable and unnecessary delays and for other delinquencies;
- A bill (S. 3276) to enable the postmaster to designate employees to act for him, including the signing of checks in his name; and
- A bill (S. 3277) to provide against the withholding of pay when employees are removed for breach of contract to render faithful service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.
- By Mr. TYDINGS:
A bill (S. 3278) relating to the retirement of naval officers with service as chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
- By Mr. JONES:
A bill (S. 3279) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Stafford (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
- By Mr. WATSON:
A bill (S. 3280) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Badders (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
- By Mr. COPELAND:
A bill (S. 3281) to amend section 24 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended;
- A bill (S. 3282) to amend subdivision (10) of section 202 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; and
- A bill (S. 3283) to provide for the manner of making payment of the revived war-risk insurance of John J. McCully; to the Committee on Finance.
- By Mr. SULLIVAN:
A bill (S. 3284) for the relief of the Buck Creek Oil Co. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.
- By Mr. McKELLAR:
A bill (S. 3285) granting a pension to Benjamin M. Casteel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
- By Mr. SHEPPARD:
A bill (S. 3286) for the relief of the heirs of I. L. Kleinman; to the Committee on Claims.
- By Mr. HOWELL:
A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 127) authorizing the erection on the public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to William Jennings Bryan; to the Committee on the Library.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. HOWELL, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3199) authorizing refunds to certain railroads of interest erroneously collected on account of overpayments under sections 209 and 212 of the transportation act, 1920, as amended, and it was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Sundry messages in writing were communicated to the Senate from the President of the United States by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions and acts:

On January 22, 1930:

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to Poland; and

S. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to authorize additional appropriations for the relief of Porto Rico.

On January 23, 1930:

S. 1752. An act to grant extensions of time on oil and gas prospecting permits;

S. 1784. An act authorizing an appropriation for improvements upon the Government-owned land at Wakefield, Westmoreland County, Va., the birthplace of George Washington; and

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to amend sections 3 and 4 of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington.

On January 24, 1930:

S. 581. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Jerome Bridge Co., a corporation, to maintain a bridge already constructed across the Gasconade River near Jerome, Mo.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2763) authorizing the cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, and the counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa, to construct, maintain, and operate one or more, but not to exceed three, toll or free bridges across the Missouri River.

The citizens of Omaha and Council Bluffs are very much interested in this measure, and it will cause no discussion.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the city of Omaha, Nebr., or Douglas County, Nebr., or the city of Council Bluffs, or Pottawattamie County, Iowa, or any two or more thereof cooperating, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate one or more, but not to exceed three, bridges and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at points suitable to the interests of navigation, one at or near Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr., one at or near South Omaha, Nebr., and one at or near Florence, Nebr., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon said cities and counties, acting jointly, or any one or more of them separately, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of any of such bridges and their approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said cities and counties, or any one or more thereof, are hereby authorized to operate any of such bridges free of tolls, or, in their discretion, to fix and charge tolls for transit over any of such bridges; and in case rates of toll are so fixed, such rates shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of each bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge

and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing costs, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 15 years from the completion thereof or acquisition thereof as hereinafter provided. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of such bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the cost of each bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. All rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act upon the city of Omaha, Nebr., the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa, the county of Douglas, Nebr., and the county of Pottawattamie, Iowa, may be enjoyed, used, or performed by said cities and counties, jointly, or by any one or more thereof separately, or by such boards or commissions as may be created by law to carry out the provisions of this act for said cities and counties, or any one or more thereof that may construct any of the bridges hereby authorized. The rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act may be assigned, conveyed, and transferred by said cities and counties to the State of Nebraska and the State of Iowa, or to either thereof, or to the highway departments of said States, or of either thereof, but shall not otherwise be assigned, conveyed, or transferred.

SEC. 6. Said cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, and said counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa, acting jointly, or any one or more thereof acting separately, or any board or commission created by law to carry out the privileges conferred by this act, be, and are hereby, authorized to purchase by voluntary bargain, or acquire by condemnation proceedings in the exercise of the power of eminent domain, the existing bridge across the Missouri River between the cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, and now owned or operated by private persons or corporation, and thereafter to repair, reconstruct, enlarge, renew, or replace such bridge in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 23, 1906, and to operate the same subject to all the conditions in this act provided with reference to the construction of a new bridge. The method of condemnation and of ascertaining and making payment of just compensation shall be as follows: If the condemnation proceeding is brought by any one of said cities or counties acting separately, the method shall be as provided by the laws of the State in which that city or county is situated for condemnation of public utilities or other property for public purposes by such city or county, or for condemnation by railroad corporations for railroad purposes, or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes; and if the proceeding is a joint condemnation proceeding by any two or more of such cities or counties acting jointly, or by any boards or commissions acting for said cities or counties jointly, the same may be brought in either of the States in which such cities or counties are situated and subject to the laws of that State as herein provided for action by the city or county situated in that State.

SEC. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, in the course of the discussion of the pending item it had been my intention to submit some remarks, but I believe the subject has been very fully covered. I think the whole situation has been laid before the Senate very clearly by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], so I do not care to take the time of the Senate by making any extended remarks. I would, however, like to have inserted in the RECORD certain telegrams and communications which I have received from growers of cattle who are interested in the hide question.

There being no objection, the telegrams and communications were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., January 12, 1930.

HON. LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Heavy imports on hides this fall have proven disastrous to local markets. Green salted country hides quoted in Nebraska, Colorado, and Wyoming territory about 5 cents a pound. Oddie amendment on hides entitled your strong support. Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine imports of canned beef almost double year ago. Packers circulating propaganda no increase in tariff needed, but stockmen are of different mind

and urge retention of 6-cent rate proposed in pending bill. Our convention meets here next week and will appreciate your making strong fight on above issues.

AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION,
By F. E. MOLLIN, *Secretary*.

PUEBLO, COLO., September 28, 1929.

L. C. PHIPPS,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Pueblo County Stockgrowers Association urge you to do all in your power to obtain duty on hides.

WALTER S. MARRIOTT, *Secretary*.

RIFLE, COLO., May 14, 1929.

Senator LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,

Washington, D. C.

Colorado cattlemen much concerned over securing adequate tariff on meats and hides. Colorado Legislature recognized importance of livestock industry on necessity of protecting stock growers against foreign competition when they sent committee to Washington to appear before Ways and Means Committee of House. Our statements can be found in volume 7 of Schedule 7 of hearings before Ways and Means Committee on tariff readjustment. Western Slope Cattle Growers Association ask that you make every effort to secure tariff on hides and meat products, as it is of vital importance to them.

CLAUD H. REES, *Secretary*.

FORT COLLINS, COLO., May 29, 1929.

Senator LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,

Washington, D. C.

At a meeting of the Colorado Livestock & Feeders Associations, held at Fort Collins to-day, the following resolution was passed:

"We urge upon Congress a full recognition of the principles that agriculture, including livestock, is entitled to the same protection as that accorded other industries. We ask your continued support of the present proposed tariffs regarding livestock and their by-products; notably hides; also upon oils. The bill as passed by House reasonably satisfactory."

RAY REYNOLDS, *Chairman*.

WALDEN, COLO., May 12, 1929.

Senator L. C. PHIPPS:

Northpark Stockgrowers Association at annual meeting, May 11, unanimously adopted resolution favoring substantial duty on hides.

D. N. SUDDUTH, *Secretary of Association*.

Senator LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,

Washington, D. C.

The Rifle Chamber of Commerce, realizing the importance of the livestock industry to the State and this community, requests that you make every effort to secure a tariff sufficiently large on hides and meat products to protect growers in this country. We sincerely hope you can secure tariff on hides.

RIFLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE LARIMER COUNTY STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION
SUNDAY, JANUARY 13, 1929, LIVERMORE, COLO.

Whereas the policy of the present Government of the United States is one of protection to its native industries; and

Whereas heretofore the meat-production business of the Western States has never had adequate tariff protection with regard to both hides and meat; and

Whereas the only real protection afforded the industry at the present time against huge importations of Argentine meats is the temporary embargo, which may be lifted at any time by our President, and receives no adequate protection from other sources; and

Whereas these commodities have their origination in countries where production costs are materially less than in this country; and

Whereas the costs of production have greatly increased in the past few years, making greater than ever the necessity of protection from all foreign competition; and

Whereas the by-products of the sugar beet raising industry are a necessary auxiliary to the meat production of the West, the sugar-beet industry should also be amply protected; and

Whereas the original idea of the tariff system was the protection of all our native industries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Larimer County Stock Growers Association of Colorado do request and urge the present Congress of the United States to save the livestock industry of this country from ruin by the placing of adequate measures of tariff protection upon our products and the products of industries allied to the meat-production business.

T. H. SACKETT.

GORDON P. JOHNSON.

JOHN MCNEY.

THE SAN LUIS VALLEY FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,

Alamosa, Colo., February 8, 1929.

Hon. LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The San Luis Valley Farm Bureau Federation, at its last regular monthly meeting held in Alamosa, Colo., February 4, 1929, discussed the subject of protective tariffs on a number of farm products. This federation of farm bureaus is composed of most of the progressive farmers in Alamosa, Conejos, and Rio Grande Counties, Colo.

Following thorough discussion at this last regular meeting, the membership voted unanimously in favor of adequate protective tariff on sugar and meats and meat products, and instructed their secretary to write all of the Colorado Senators and Representatives and "respectfully and earnestly urge that you do all within your power to obtain the tariff schedule of \$3.20 per hundredweight, as asked by the Mountain States Beet Growers Association and other farm and agricultural interests," and "to obtain the increased tariffs on meat, meat products, and hides as requested by the various livestock interests and associations."

This federation believes that increased tariffs on products which the American farmer produces in competition with cheap foreign labor is one of the most effective ways of relieving, at least a part of, the American farm burden. The farmers represented in this federation are making strenuous efforts to establish the sugar-beet industry in the San Luis Valley in order to more widely diversify their crops and enable them to fatten and finish some of the thousands of cattle and sheep produced here, which now have to be sold as feeders.

At the present price of refined sugar and the uncertainty of beef prices, particularly, resulting from foreign competition, the San Luis Valley farmers are unable to grow sugar beets or finish their livestock without excessive danger of incurring serious financial losses.

We have taken the liberty to write you at this length in order that you might better understand our conditions and feelings on these matters. Your efforts in our behalf will certainly be appreciated.

Respectfully and sincerely yours (signed for the San Luis Valley Farm Bureau Federation) by

CHARLES MAHL (by C. C.),

President San Luis Valley Farm Bureau Federation.

MAX C. GRANDY,

Secretary San Luis Valley Farm Bureau Federation.

FORT MORGAN, COLO., April 12, 1929.

Hon. L. C. PHIPPS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The cattle feeders of Morgan County, Colo., held a meeting at Fort Morgan the evening of March 11, 1929, at which meeting the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it seems expedient that a campaign of advertising to increase the consumption of beef be inaugurated: Be it

Resolved, That we promise our support and suggest that other organizations within the State of Colorado interested in the cattle industry in any way join in an effort to stabilize not only the cattle feeding but also the cattle-raising industry in Colorado and the United States."

The above resolution was unanimously adopted and an organization formed, to be known as the Morgan County Cattle Feeders Association. The purpose of this association is to actively cooperate with the State and National organizations, which are now being formed.

Respectfully,

THE MORGAN COUNTY CATTLE FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,

By R. B. GRAHAM, *Secretary*.

DENVER, COLO., May 9, 1929.

Senator LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PHIPPS: Ranchers and farmers of Colorado and the Western States were astonished when they read United Press dispatch dated May 7 which stated that hides were left on the free list. That the duty on wool had been increased. It had also been increased on dairy products, oranges, grapefruit, pineapple, etc., on sugar, on certain vegetables, on eggs, poultry, and other agricultural products.

The proposed increase of from 3 cents to 6 cents per pound on fresh, chilled, or frozen beef is 2 cents per pound less than we proposed; however, we are perfectly willing to accept this schedule.

The fact that hides were left on the free list has caused Colorado ranchers and farmers to write into this office and have suggested that I write you and respectfully request that you introduce at the proper time an amendment proposing to fix a duty on dry hides of 15 cents per pound and 6 cents per pound on green hides.

For your information, I will state that the following schedule of rates was proposed:

Dressed beef, 8 cents a pound; live beef cattle, 4 cents a pound; live feeder cattle, 3 cents a pound; tinned beef, 40 per cent ad valorem; hides, dry, 15 cents a pound; hides, green, 6 cents a pound.

These proposed schedules were included in the briefs filed with the Committee on Ways and Means. The American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Livestock Association, the National Grange, the

Farmers Union livestock commission agencies, the National Livestock Producers Association, and all western livestock associations in the 11 western national-forest States appeared, testified, and indorsed the proposed schedules.

Testimony from representatives of these organizations is printed in tariff readjustment, 1929, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Seventieth Congress, second addition, volume 7, Schedule 7, agricultural products and provisions.

Colorado representatives appeared and testified. The testimony of Senator Claude Reece, of Rifle, appears on page 3932. C. E. Collins, Kit Carson, on page 3888. R. T. Burdick, Fort Collins, on page 3896. B. F. Davis, Denver, on page 3881. L. F. Mollin, Denver, on page 3992.

According to testimony of witnesses who appeared and testified before the Ways and Means Committee, these facts were stated and appeared in the briefs filed.

First. Beef cattle inventories are still declining as a result of forced liquidations of loans during the period from 1921 to 1926.

Second. Protection is needed in order that range herds may be rebuilt and quality improved.

Third. United States has changed from an exporting to an importing country on beef cattle.

Fourth. Production costs are advancing due to increasing costs of ranch feed, labor, forest permits, and tax items.

Fifth. Production costs are much lower in the countries now shipping surpluses or in a position to ship surplus into this country.

Sixth. An adequate protection of the industry will tend to stabilize prices for the consumer and producer alike.

Seventh. United States shall be self-supporting in her beef-cattle production as a matter of national policy and necessity.

Eighth. Restoring the beef-producing industry to a profitable basis through an adequate tariff protection will increase the buying power of the industry.

HIDES

Cattle, when slaughtered, yield less than 60 per cent of their live weight in the carcass. The amount and character of the offal determines to a large extent the price paid to the producer.

Hides were imported as follows in 1929:

	Pounds
Imported.....	368,957,355
Exported.....	73,638,901
Net imports.....	293,323,085

The growth and development for substitute hides has increased at a tremendous rate in recent years. Under present conditions with hides on the free list our domestic hides meet a double competition, from substitutes and from importations.

During the month of September the price of hides went off 4½ cents per pound, due primarily to a heavy importation of free hides from foreign countries. One big leather concern marked off \$1,000,000 loss in their inventory for that month. This decline in hides was immediately reflected in the price of cattle.

We think it is highly important that in the next tariff revision agriculture, including livestock, be accorded the same protection in the American markets that is accorded to other industries.

We would be pleased to have your views concerning this subject and our suggestions.

Very truly yours,

B. F. DAVIS,

Secretary-Manager Colorado Stockgrowers Association.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, for the RECORD I offer two telegrams, one from Strange Bros., of Sioux City, Iowa, and the other from J. H. Mercer, secretary of the Kansas Livestock Association, both advocating a duty on hides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

The telegrams are as follows:

SIoux CITY, IOWA, January 23, 1930.

Senator TASKER L. ODDIE,

Washington, D. C.:

Adequate tariff protection on hides would increase farmers' revenue \$50 yearly. The current domestic hide market is so low in the country that most farmers refuse to skin fallen cattle.

STRANGE BROS.

TOPEKA, KANS., January 22, 1930.

Senator TASKER L. ODDIE,

Washington, D. C.:

American agriculture must have protection in our home markets from countries where land is cheap, living standards low, and labor poorly paid if this basic industry is to be maintained upon an economic level with other American industries. The farmer can not longer buy in a protected market and sell in competition with the world. The time has come when adequate tariff duties must be applied to imports of farm and livestock and livestock products. Livestock producers of Kansas urge adoption of those schedules agreed upon by farm organizations for hides, livestock, and meat. Country hides are now selling

at prices entirely out of line with values of the finished product and importations of livestock and livestock products are increasing at amazing rate.

J. H. MERCER,

Secretary Kansas Livestock Association.

Mr. ODDIE. The matter of a duty on hides has been discussed very thoroughly on the floor of the Senate during the last three days. I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment I have offered. The livestock raisers are not asking anything unreasonable. They are asking for a chance to live. It has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate recently that there are 12,000,000 less beef cattle in the United States than there were about nine years ago. That means that a large market for the agricultural products of the West has been destroyed and the market of the South for cottonseed cake that is used for feeding cattle has been impaired. No one who is interested in the tariff—

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ODDIE. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I notice that the Senator said the adoption of the amendment would benefit the cattle interests of the West. Are the benefits of the amendment to be limited to the West or are they to apply to cattle everywhere?

Mr. ODDIE. They are to apply to cattle everywhere. I should have said the West, the South, the Central West, the East, and the North. I am glad the Senator from Kentucky corrected me.

I am not going into any further discussion of the amendment. The question has been threshed out very thoroughly and I hope that the representatives of the people from all parts of the United States will see the justice of the amendment, the necessity for it, and the desire on the part of those advocating it to benefit all industries in the United States.

Mr. President, if there is to be no further discussion on the question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, there is one feature of the pending amendment which has not as yet been discussed, which I wish to present to the Senate very briefly, and that is the unfair and discriminatory character of a specific duty on hides. Specific duties are almost invariably offensive, misleading, and deceptive. A specific duty upon hides is especially so. Whatever duty is levied on this article ought to be an ad valorem duty. The value of hides varies so that a specific duty of 5 cents per pound translated into ad valorem terms based upon the value of hides represents a spread of from 30 to 60 per cent ad valorem. It is more deluding to urge 5 cents per pound duty than to demand a duty of 60 cents upon every dollar of value in the hide.

What does that mean? It means that a duty of 5 cents per pound on hides is more burdensome to the consumers of shoes manufactured from cheap hides than upon those who wear expensive shoes. The spread is about 100 per cent. Five cents per pound upon hides means in ad valorem terms almost double the amount of duty upon hides that are used in the manufacture of shoes worn by the poorer classes. It is less burdensome upon the hides which are used in the manufacture of shoes worn by the well to do. I raised the same objection and advanced the same reason in the case of the specific duty on wool.

Not only that, but it is a fact which is not disputed, that in the wintertime there is a great deal of manure in the hides. According to the Tariff Commission, manure represents about 5 per cent of the weight. So a specific duty means that the public are going to pay 5 cents a pound upon manure.

I am not going to prolong the discussion. I merely desire to repeat that specific duties are always misleading and offensive, but in this particular instance they are markedly so. The amendment ought to be defeated, if for no other reason than that it proposes to levy a specific duty, fixing the duty upon pounds rather than upon the value of the hides.

I have already discussed the serious injury which this amendment, if adopted, would inflict upon the leather industry and the exceedingly high compensatory duties that would have to be levied upon leather and boots and shoes in case this specific duty were adopted; but I want especially to call attention to the injustice of a specific duty in this case, and to repeat what I said yesterday in opposition to the amendment as a whole.

I ask to have inserted in the RECORD certain data and a memorandum in connection with my remarks, including the effect of this duty in increasing costs of shoes to the public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VANDENBERG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT SHOWING EFFECT OF 5-CENT DUTY ON HIDES IN COSTS OF SHOES, BY J. F. McELWAIN CO., REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL BOOT & SHOE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION (INC.)

CALFSKINS FOR UPPERS

It is the general opinion that on the average a pound of raw green calfskins would yield, or produce, 1 foot of finished leather. It must be understood that some skins would yield more and others less. We believe our assumption is fair and conservative.

Therefore, 5-cents-a-pound duty on green calfskin would increase cost of finished leather 5 cents a foot. There must, however, be added to this at least 10 per cent for selling and overhead, making total increased cost 5.5 cents per foot.

AMOUNT OF UPPER LEATHER CONSUMED IN EACH PAIR

We estimate that there is consumed 2 1/4 feet of leather to every pair of men's shoes produced, and 2 feet to every pair of women's shoes produced. This estimate is arrived at by averaging all types of shoes. Farm shoes would consume 3 to 6 feet per pair. We, therefore, feel that our figures are safe and conservative.

Calfskins are used for upper-leather purposes, not for sole-leather purposes.

COST PER PAIR FOR UPPERS CUT FROM CALFSKINS

Multiplying 5.5 cents, which is the increased cost per foot, by 2 1/4 feet, which is the estimated amount consumed in each pair of men's shoes, the increased cost in men's shoes would amount to 12.4 cents per pair.

Multiplying 5.5 cents by 2 feet, which is the estimated amount consumed in each pair of women's shoes, the increased cost would be 11 cents.

HIDES FOR UPPER LEATHER

Hides are used for both upper leather and sole leather. It is the general opinion that 1 pound of green hides would yield or produce 0.80 to 0.85 foot of finished leather.

COST PER PAIR FOR UPPERS MADE FROM HIDE LEATHER

Five cents per pound duty on green hides would, therefore, increase the cost of finished leather 5.9 cents per foot.

This would mean that the increased cost per pair of men's shoes made from side leather on the average would figure 13.3 cents and on women's shoes, 11.8 cents per pair.

HIDES FOR SOLE LEATHER

It is estimated that 1 pound of green hides would yield or produce 0.65 to 0.70 pound of finished sole leather. A 5 cents per pound duty on green hides would increase the cost of entire hide, including heads, bellies, shoulders, and bends, 7.7 cents per pound. This increase does not fall uniformly on all parts but would be absorbed according to the different values of the various parts as follows:

The bend, representing the best part of the hide from which outer soles are cut (approximately 50 per cent of the hide), would show an increased cost of 11.6 cents per pound.

Bellies, representing a less desirable part of the hide from which inner soles are cut, 3.8 cents per pound increase.

Heads and shoulders, 3.5 cents per pound increase.

The manufacturer, or cut-sole merchant, cuts from 10 to 12 pairs of men's outer soles from the average bend and 14 to 15 pairs of women's outer soles from the average bend.

With bends costing 11.6 cents per pound extra, this would result in a cost per pair on men's outer soles of 10.9 cents and on women's, 8.2 cents per pair.

Inner soles: Manufacturers cut from one and three-fourths to two and one fourth pairs of men's inner soles from 1 pound of leather and two and one-half to three pairs of women's inner soles from 1 pound of leather. The bellies costing 3.8 cents per pound, the average increased cost of men's inner soles would be 1.7 cents per pair and women's 1.5 cents per pair.

A complete sole leather summary would be as follows:

Sole leather: Estimated increased cost per pair due to a tariff of 5 cents per pound on green hides. (Outer sole and inner sole are the main factors. Other items detailed below.)

	Men's	Women's
Outer sole.....	\$0.109	\$0.089
Inner sole.....	.017	.014
Counter.....	.008	.006
Box toe.....	.005	.003
Heel.....	.003	.003
Top lift.....	.013	.010
Welt.....	.008	.005
Total.....	.163	.130

The above must be increased at least 10 per cent to cover selling and overhead, or a total increase sole-leather cost, men's, \$0.179; women's, \$0.143.

Total increased cost per pair to manufacturer for both upper and sole leather

	Men's	Women's
(a) Side-leather shoes:		
Upper leather cut from side, patent or hide leather.....	\$0.033	\$0.118
Sole leather.....	.179	.143
Total increased cost per pair.....	.312	.261
(b) Calfskin shoes:		
Upper leather.....	.124	.110
Sole leather.....	.179	.143
Total increased cost per pair.....	.303	.253

INCREASED ULTIMATE COST TO THE CONSUMER

Figuring on the basis of 15 per cent for wholesaling costs and 50 per cent on the cost price or 33 1/3 per cent on selling price for retailer, increase to the ultimate consumer would be at least 50 cents per pair.

STATEMENT OF EFFECT OF THE RATES RECOMMENDED BY SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

A duty of 17 1/2 per cent is proposed on calf, side, and kid leather in H. R. 2667. The estimated average price paid for upper leather to be used in medium to fine shoes is 40 cents per foot. A duty of 17 1/2 per cent on 40-cent leather would raise the price of the leather to 47 cents.

It is estimated that it takes approximately 2 1/2 feet of leather to produce one pair of men's shoes. The theoretical extra cost per pair because of the duty would be \$0.1575 per pair.

The estimated average price paid for upper leather to be used in cheaper grades of shoes is 30 cents. A 17 1/2 per cent duty on 30-cent leather would raise the price to 35.3 cents or 14 cents per pair.

A duty of 15 per cent is proposed on sole leather in H. R. 2667. The estimated increased cost per pair, due to this duty on sole leather, would be as follows:

	Medium grade	Cheaper grade
Outer sole.....	\$0.07	\$0.05
Inner sole.....	.018	.012
Counter.....	.012	.009
Box toe.....	.004	.003
Heel.....	.003	.002
Top lift.....	.015	.012
Welt.....	.01	.009
Increased cost per pair.....	.132	.097

Total increased cost per pair due to a duty of 17 1/2 per cent on upper leather and 15 per cent on sole leather would be as follows:

	Medium grade	Cheaper grade
Upper leather.....	\$0.157	\$0.14
Sole leather.....	.132	.097
Total.....	.289	.237

We believe that \$4 would be the average wholesale price for what would be termed medium-grade shoes. If this is correct, a compensatory duty would be 7 per cent.

We believe that \$2.60 would be the average wholesale price for what is termed a cheaper-grade shoe. On this grade a compensatory duty would be 9 per cent.

From a practical standpoint the question is, How much will the duty on leather actually increase the cost of the shoes? We are firmly convinced that a duty on hides and skins would increase the cost to the extent of the duty. A duty on leather would probably increase the cost of imported leather to the extent of the duty and where foreign leather is demanded, such as in high-grade shoes and certain types of women's shoes, shoes would increase in cost to the extent as indicated above, and, as my figures represent the average, in some instances the cost would be much greater.

What will happen to domestic leather because of the duty? Inasmuch as the industry is depressed and not making very much money, the domestic leather will undoubtedly advance relatively but not to the full extent of the duty.

It is obvious, however, if there is a duty on leather, there must be at least a compensatory duty on shoes and a protective duty representing the difference in cost of production.

TO CORRECT MISAPPREHENSIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE EFFECT OF AND NEED FOR A DUTY UPON HIDES AND SHOES

A duty on hides will increase the cost of leather shoes and other articles made of leather, while a duty on shoes will not increase the cost of American-made shoes. Consider these parallel columns:

HIDES

United States must import about 30 per cent of the hides they consume and about 40 per cent of the calfskins. There are not enough cattle or calves in the United States to produce all the hides we use.

Therefore the price of imported hides determines the price of domestic hides, and a duty on hides will be reflected in the price of all hides consumed in the United States. A duty on hides will mean an increase of millions of dollars in the cost of shoes, saddles, harness, trunks, suit cases, and other leather products.

Hides are a by-product of the cattle industry. The value of a hide is only about one-fifteenth the value of a steer. Cattle are raised for beef, and our per capita consumption of beef and the number of beef cattle are steadily declining. No claim is made that a duty on hides will result in the raising of a greater number of cattle or the employment of additional farm laborers.

Some cattlemen want a duty on hides because they believe such a duty would increase the price they will receive for hides, though it has been demonstrated that on account of the manner in which hides are handled and the number of middlemen through whom they pass the cattlemen will secure but a small part, if any, of the increase in value. The shoe manufacturer, on the other hand, wants a duty on shoes, not so that he may increase his prices, but simply so that we may make in this country shoes now made abroad. Remember also that very few farmers raise enough cattle to benefit to any material extent from an increase in the value of hides, while every farmer wears shoes and uses other articles of leather which will be increased in price by a duty on hides.

It has been argued that shoes should have no duty because imports of leather shoes represent but a small percentage of our domestic production. Note, however:

(a) During the year of 1929 there were imported 7,158,163 pairs of footwear, duty free, as compared with 3,250,882 pairs during the year of 1928.

(b) Of these totals, 6,182,641 in 1929 were leather boots and shoes, as compared with 2,616,884 in 1928; an increase of more than 136 per cent.

(c) Imports of women's shoes will probably amount to 5 per cent of our domestic production.

(d) Many commodities of which imports represent much less than 5 per cent of domestic production at present carry a duty which it is proposed to increase—milk and cream, for example, where imports represent about one-half of 1 per cent of domestic production.

It has been said that we do not need a duty on shoes. However:

(a) Wages in Czechoslovakia, the largest shoe-exporting country in the world, are about 25 per cent of our wages.

(b) The workmen there are probably just as efficient and factories just as well organized and equipped as ours here.

(c) We should consider what may happen before the next tariff bill is framed. Between 1923 and 1928 imports of leather shoes increased 655 per cent and of women's shoes 1,653 per cent. Imports are now increasing over 100 per cent annually. If this continues, in 1932 at least 48,000,000 pairs of leather shoes will be imported.

While our purpose is to point out the fallacy of a duty on hides and the justice of a duty on shoes, we assume it is generally recognized that a duty on hides or leather, without a duty on shoes, would be manifestly unfair.

The National Boot & Shoe Manufacturers Association will be glad to send to anyone who may apply further statistics or information upon the points above outlined.

National Boot & Shoe Manufacturers Association (Inc.), 342 Madison Avenue, New York.

SHOES

Our shoe factories have a capacity of at least 50 per cent in excess of the requirement of our domestic market and export trade. We can produce all the shoes we use.

Therefore American manufacturers—1,300 of them—are engaged in the keenest competition among themselves, even with no duty. With a duty the same intense competition and the same low prices will persist. A duty will do no more than shut out some imported shoes or will place the foreign article on a basis where it costs the American retailer more nearly what he must pay the American manufacturer.

If two-thirds of the shoes now imported should be manufactured here, it would mean additional wages in the pockets of American shoe operatives amounting approximately to \$2,800,000 without adding to the shoe bill of the consumer. The addition purchasing power of shoe operatives, to say nothing of tanners and manufacturers of shoe supplies, would help other industries.

Harold C. Keith, George E. Keith Co., Brockton, Mass., president.
Jay Otis Ball, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, managing director.
Raymond P. Morse, Cantilever Corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y., treasurer.
Edward J. Kuhn, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, secretary.
Fred L. Emerson, Dunn & McCarthy, Auburn, N. Y., chairman allied trades committee.

Paul O. MacBride, Milford Shoe Co., Milford, Mass., chairman trades relations committee.

Charles H. Jones, Commonwealth Shoe & Leather Co., Whitman, Mass., chairman Federal relations.

J. Franklin McElwain, J. F. McElwain Co., Boston, Mass., chairman tariff committee.

Vice presidents: Charles Ault, Ault-Williamson Shoe Co., Auburn, Me.; E. M. Rickard, the Rickard Shoe Co., Haverhill, Mass.; John R. Garside, A. Garside & Sons, Long Island City, N. Y.; Harry G. Johansen, Johansen Bros. Shoe Co., St. Louis, Mo.

Honorary vice presidents, former presidents of the association: Hon. John S. Kent, M. A. Packard Co., Brockton, Mass.; J. Franklin McElwain, J. F. McElwain Co., Boston, Mass.; John C. McKeon, Laird, Schober & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Henry W. Cook, A. E. Nettleton Co., Syracuse, N. Y.

HIDES

(1) During the past 100 years hides have been on the free list, with the exception of the Dingley bill in 1893, at which time the Senate put on a 15 per cent tax, as a compromise, and this duty was continued in effect for a period of 12 years.

(2) Hides, being a by-product of cattle, are not produced at will, and it has been demonstrated over a period of a great many years that higher prices for hides do not benefit the original producer of the cattle, as apparently there is no relation between cattle prices and hides.

(3) It is known that no country that is an important producer of leather has an import duty on hides. We are in competition with the world on leather, and as cost of production in this country, from a labor and tanning-material standpoint, runs at least 30 per cent higher than most of the important leather-producing countries, we would be at a still further disadvantage if a duty was placed on hides.

(4) From statistics we gather that the personnel of the tanning industries of wage earners and salaried employees are upward of 75,000 in this country. Most of the wage earners are trained in this particular field and the majority of them have worked in this industry all their lives, consequently it would be a great hardship if anything is done to throw these employees out of work.

(5) Approximately 85 per cent of all cattle hides go into leather for the manufacture or repair of shoes. It must be argued that if the cost of hides to the tanners is increased, this cost must be passed on to the consumer, and it is only natural to assume that consumers of shoes would have to pay much more than any increased return that the hide producer might obtain, and there is no assurance that any increased price would be passed on to the producer.

(6) From statistics we gather that approximately 9,000,000 heavy cattle hides, on an average, are used yearly by sole and belting leather tanners. Very few domestic hides are exported, and sole and belting leather tanners use approximately 5,400,000 of these hides annually, the balance of requirements coming from all parts of the world. There is no assurance, if a tax is placed on hides, that more hides can be made in the United States, as cattle in this country are ultimately raised for beef, and the demand for beef automatically regulates the production of cattle. This makes it necessary for tanners to go outside of the country to purchase the shortage of cattle hides which they may need. Except in times of panic there has never been any surplus or backing up of hides in the United States, and there is no reason to believe that this will occur unless hides get out of ratio with their value in the form of leather.

(7) When hides get out of line with their value in sole leather naturally sole leather has to be raised in price to take care of this increased hide cost, and it has been demonstrated, time and time again, that when this occurs substitutes for leather creep in. This ultimately works to a point where leather backs up and in turn is reflected by much lower prices, both on hides and leather, than the commodities are worth. Hides are worth only what a tanner can afford to pay for them and sell his production in the form of leather at cost plus a nominal profit.

(8) There are certain price limits to which leather can go and be sold in quantities large enough to consume hides from usual sources of supply. Beyond such limits substitutes displace leather; therefore the consumption of raw material will be affected to the extent of this displacement.

(9) Any increase in the cost of leather will result in an increased use of substitutes. Already the production of artificial leather has grown to a surprising figure—from \$6,097,000 in 1914 to \$40,932,000 in 1925. (Statistical Abstract, 1928, p. 759.) The manufacture of rubber and composition soles in the 12 months ended with September, 1928, was nearly double that for the 12 months immediately preceding.

BOSTON, MASS., January 23, 1930.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate:

Experience has proved that the income of the stock raiser can not be increased by a duty on hides. Whenever the price of hides rises above the normal level buying is checked and substitutes are used until price drops. Only result of levying this duty would prompt increase in price of leather and shoes, followed by demoralization of the tanning and shoe industries.

CHAS. H. JONES,
For the New England Shoe and Leather Association.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I have been requested by Mr. Milton S. Florsheim, the head of the Florsheim Shoe Co., of Chicago, one of the largest manufacturers and distributors at retail of shoes, to have read a letter which is a copy of a letter he recently wrote to a Member of the Senate. The letter was not written to me, and I have omitted the name of the addressee. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1930.

MY DEAR SENATOR: After my conference with you in your office, I wired to Chicago asking them to give me as near as they could, what in their opinion would be the added cost to the ultimate consumer of a 6-cent per pound duty on hides and calfskins.

Including profits, interest, and overhead, they estimate that men's shoes retailing for \$5 per pair would cost the ultimate consumer approximately 75 cents per pair additional. In other words, it would add approximately 75 cents to the price of a pair of \$5 men's shoes.

A duty of 6 cents per pound on the hides of animals of the bovine species would necessitate not only compensatory but also a protective duty, and I estimate that it would require a duty of at least 35 per cent to give the tanners the protection they would feel, and I believe would be entitled to, and should receive if hides of the bovine species were dutiable at 6 cents per pound. This would also necessitate a very high, and in my opinion, an excessive duty on shoes of not less than 50 per cent; that is, if you wish to give the leather manufacturers and the shoe manufacturers both a compensatory as well as a protective duty.

From my practical experience, I think 75 cents additional cost per pair does not cover the eventual added price to the ultimate consumer. These high protective duties with the tanners as closely associated as they are now, the price of both hides and leather would be fixed at the importing point, and they would get a higher price during many periods than the figures would indicate, and I am inclined to the opinion that any such duty as you mention would bring about an additional cost of 25 cents per pair more than the estimate, making the price of \$5 shoes cost the ultimate consumer \$1 per pair more than the present retail cost.

A 6-cent per pound duty may benefit the men who are exclusively cattle raisers. I approximate that there are 15,000 men engaged in that industry. Not having statistical information available, this is merely my opinion. They might get some benefit, although in the long run, I believe that cattle will only bring the price that the demand for meat justifies. The average farmer raises about three head of cattle per year, and a high duty such as you mention would, in my opinion, be a serious and costly measure for the average farmer.

With the average earnings of the average workingman declining, owing to the huge number now unemployed, it would hardly seem fair that for a possible benefit to a very few cattle raisers, any such duty you mention would be justified.

In fact, no duty appears to me to be justified as a large duty is unthinkable, and a small duty certainly does not benefit the average farmer and will cost the average citizen considerable money in the living cost. It would appear to me that any increase in the living cost would be resented by the average citizen.

With my knowledge of the entire situation, I do feel that in the long run all the citizens of the United States including the farmers, and the industry itself, will be better off if the entire schedule is left as in the present bill—everything free.

Very truly yours,

MILTON S. FLORSHEIM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], as modified.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if there is no Senator who desires to discuss the amendment, I suggest that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], who appears to be out of the Chamber for the moment, called for the yeas and nays on it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Let us have the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are demanded. Is there a second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ASHURST responded in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I had asked for recognition before there was any response to the roll call.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is correct. I withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have not been so concerned over any amendment in the pending bill up to now as in this particular one. This is a matter of importance to every household in America.

Not only that, but, as I view it, if the amendment proposed by the able Senator from Nevada shall be adopted, it will still further depress the great leather industry, the tanneries, as well as lessen the activities of the shoe factories of America. There are thousands of employees in the tanneries and leather factories. Because of these facts, it is my desire that every Member of the Senate should recognize the significance of what will happen should this amendment be adopted.

In the beginning of my campaign for reelection in 1928 I had every sort of appeal made to me by interests, some of which might be considered as selfish, that I might commit myself regarding what might be my legislative attitude on matters relating to them. I would not be true to my party and to myself if I did not stand always for every measure which seeks to reduce the cost of living in America. But, Mr. President, when I came to study the condition of industry and to consider the arguments set forth by various industries, there was at least one which seemed to me to be entitled to the considerate attention and sympathetic aid of the Members of the Congress.

During the past three or four years one of these industries, the leather industry, has brought to my attention facts showing the economic distress from which that industry is suffering. At my request in the Sixty-eighth Congress the Senate adopted a resolution calling upon the Secretary of Commerce to make an investigation and to ascertain what were the conditions abroad with reference to the leather industry, as well as to report on conditions in the United States as affecting that industry. Again in the Seventieth Congress I made a similar request, the Senate concurred, and the resulting report, which has not yet been distributed but is now in proof form, shows the same set-up of conditions.

Mr. President, it is a very common plea for industries to make, that unless this or that tariff is given, industry is going out of business; but as regards this particular one I have investigated for myself, and I find that the economic distress in the communities where tanneries are found and where shoe factories are found is real. It actually exists.

I have among my papers—and I have been upset by the fact that they have not come from my office—a letter which I have just received from a minister located in one of the places where a great tannery is situated. He points out in this letter the suffering of those employees and of their families. I want to say a word about that.

Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] was critical of the State of New York because of its attitude toward taxation and other financial matters. I have heard many Senators speak about the distress upon the farm and the necessity for farm relief, and the suffering of persons who live in the rural districts. I was born on a farm. My relatives are farmers. I know about farm conditions and I know the sacrifices made by those persons who live upon the farm. I know the loneliness and the isolation and the sacrifices made by the farm women. I know the difficulties which attend in the matter of education and progress of the young people upon the farm. I have been thankful for the invention of the telephone and of the radio and of the automobile because of what they have done to lighten the social burdens of farm life. Because of my knowledge of farm life, I know what it means for these families to feel the pinch of the lack of ready money. Because of my feelings regarding these matters, I have been glad to vote for the various measures granting farm relief.

But, Mr. President, there are comparisons which may be made as regards poverty. The poverty of the farm is entirely different from the poverty of the city home. No matter if there may not be a dollar in cash in a farmhouse, at least there is something to eat within reach of the farm home. It may not be such as would satisfy the epicure, but you do not have to die if you can get rutabagas; and it is indeed a barren farm if there are not a few chickens and eggs to be had through the season and other things to eat. The pinch of famine does not come to the farm home; but when you come to poverty in the cities and in the towns, you are dealing with an entirely different proposition.

When I contemplate what I know from actual observation of the poverty in the cities, I am choked with emotion. How many of you have gone into a tenement home, where many of

the workers in the shoe factories in Brooklyn and other parts of my State live? What do you know about the poverty and suffering of people who live in basements, and even in sub-basements? You may talk about the poverty and suffering of the farm, my friends; but there is no poverty and no suffering that can come to any individual on the face of the earth equal to the poverty and suffering of those who live under the conditions I have suggested.

I have seen eight persons in a basement home where one member of the family had tuberculosis. That means that within a year or two the whole family is almost certain to be wiped out with tuberculosis. The first consideration in the prevention of tuberculosis is that there may be good nourishment of those likely to come in contact with it. How can there be nourishment sufficient to ward off disease unless that family may have money enough to buy the food, the milk, the eggs, the meat, the potatoes, and the other articles of food necessary to build up their bodies?

Mr. President, I may be mistaken—I hope I am—but, in my opinion, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] shall be adopted, it will still further depress the dying leather industry, the workers in the tanneries will be distressed still more, and the employees in the shoe factories will suffer. More than that, the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be to place upon the price of every pair of shoes and every pair of boots an increased cost of anywhere from one to two dollars.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is now discussing shoes, and the probable increase in the cost in case this duty is put on hides.

We now have, and have had for years, free hides and free leather; and yet shoes have gone up at a rate that we can hardly keep pace with. The shoes for which, a short time ago, we paid \$6 are now twelve and fourteen dollars. What has caused that increase?

Mr. COPELAND. Many of the costs added to the price at which shoes are sold at present—and I think many of these prices are too high—are due to the increased standards which we have established for labor, the added costs of rents of stores, the added costs placed upon the wages of those who work there. There can be no doubt that we have had an economic revolution and reconstruction. We are living in a new era. But, regardless of whether or not the prices which now exist are excessive from the standpoint of the Senator from Idaho, it is my honest conviction that if this amendment is adopted the prices which we now pay will be materially increased.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, yes; possibly that is so; but if the farmer gets \$2.60 for his hide he can afford to pay 50 cents more for his shoes. As it is now, he is selling his hides for a mere trifle, or not selling them at all, and still he has to pay an exorbitant and an unconscionable price for shoes.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator certainly is not willing to force upon the people of the United States a measure which will increase the revenue of the farm to the extent of enabling the farmer to pay more for his shoes, when at the same time that measure will force upon millions and millions of people the necessity of paying that much more.

Mr. BORAH. The farmer is a great customer for the shoe people of the United States; and matters have reached a point when it has become important to know whether or not the farmer is going to remain a customer, whether or not he is going to have anything with which to purchase. The eastern people who desire a market have an opportunity to create one of the greatest markets in the world by giving the agricultural interests an opportunity to buy.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator need not argue that with me. I have voted for farm-relief measures. I am anxious to help the people on the farms, because, as I have said time and time again here, unless there can be buying power on the part of the farmers there will be bread lines in my city. There is no doubt about that. We do not use the things we make in New York; we sell them, and the farmers are our chief purchasers. But here is a measure which will benefit the average farmer very, very little—

Mr. BORAH. Oh, no!

Mr. COPELAND. But which will place a tremendous burden upon those who live in the cities, and all those who live away from the farm.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I suspect it may be true that this duty upon hides will benefit the farmer very little, because I think when we put on this duty there is liable to be a compensatory duty and a protective duty put upon leather and upon shoes which will take it all back from the farmer. That is the

system that is working now. How many duties have we put upon agricultural products in this bill that will not be taken back by putting duties upon the products which the farmer has to buy?

Mr. COPELAND. To be frank about it, I may say to the Senator that I think very few of the duties we impose in Schedule 7 will be of material benefit to the farmer.

Mr. BORAH. In view of the fact that the shoe industry has been reaping profits of a startling nature for the last several years, would it not be conscionable to put a reasonable duty upon hides, and not necessarily have to put a protective duty upon shoes?

Mr. COPELAND. As a matter of fact, so far as shoes are concerned, I am not so much concerned as I am about leather; but it would be if we did not now have an industry, speaking about leather, which demands a duty, regardless of what duty may be placed upon hides or upon shoes.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator would not want to put a duty upon leather, for the benefit of a few tanners, which will cost millions of people of the United States an additional amount, would he?

Mr. COPELAND. Let me say to the Senator from Idaho that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] yesterday pointed out the enormous importations of leather from abroad. I do not think it is likely to happen that the people will suffer; but I know that unless the American manufacturer of leather can have some chance to compete with foreign importations he is out of business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I pointed out yesterday was the fact that compared to the domestic production of leather, valued last year at \$345,000,000, we imported leather valued at \$42,000,000, but against that we exported leather valued at \$55,000,000; so that when we cancel the importations against the exportations, the exportations outweigh the importations by \$13,000,000. So that it is as if there were no importations, but that out of our \$345,000,000 of domestic production of leather we export a net sum of \$13,000,000 to other countries. My object in pointing out those facts was to show that the trouble with the shoe and leather industry is not due to importations of leather, but it is due to a condition that exists in our domestic market and in the factories that produce leather and tanned goods.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that some figures were given to me yesterday by the Department of Commerce, recently compiled, showing the imports and exports of leather, and the figures of this part year show that the exports were less than the imports. The exports have been declining. What the Senator has said in reference to previous years is true, but the swing is the other way.

Mr. BARKLEY. The year I spoke of was 1928. I do not have the figures for 1929. But even if we were not exporting any leather at all and were importing \$42,000,000 worth, as compared with \$345,000,000 worth, that of itself would demonstrate that the trouble with the leather and tanning industry is not on account of importations, which amount to less than 10 per cent of the domestic production, but is due to the condition of the industry in the United States.

I might say to the Senator that the packing industry controls a large proportion not only of the market for hides but controls a large proportion of the tanneries as subsidiaries, as was testified before the committee by the president of one of the subsidiaries of Armour & Co. He said that he thought Armour & Co. had been holding up the subsidiary company in the price of hides, and that one of the troubles they were up against, even with their own parent company, was the price they had to pay for hides; that the farmer had gotten no benefit out of that situation, but that the packing company had reaped the profit.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senators for what they have stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield a moment more, I intended to say that, based upon the tariff rate of 6 cents per pound on hides, figures were assembled recently by one of the manufacturers of shoes, stating that this would result in an increase in the average price of shoes to the American people of \$2.16 per pair.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. That may be true, that it will result in an increase in the price of shoes; but why should it increase the

price of shoes, when we take into consideration the present price of shoes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Because if without a tariff on shoes the American shoe industry has been able to raise the price to the present level, which is all the way from 100 to 150 per cent higher than it was a few years ago, how much more will they be able to take advantage of the tariff on leather to boost the prices still higher. I do not know of any way by which Congress can prevent that.

Mr. BORAH. I do not, either, but I think the Senator will agree with me that the reason which they are assigning for the increase in the price of shoes is a false reason, for the simple reason that it is not necessary for them to increase the price in view of the price they are now receiving.

Mr. BARKLEY. If they were able to double the price of shoes on a false reason, how much more will they be able to increase it if we give them a real reason?

Mr. BORAH. It is not a real reason, because the supposition is that the increase of price was by reason of the increase in the duty on hides because of their necessity, it being impossible for them to produce shoes at the price at which they are now producing them, but they can produce the shoes and still pay for the duty on hides and make a reasonable profit. All the Senator has to do is to look into the profits of the shoe companies.

Mr. BARKLEY. I looked into them, and I gave some figures yesterday showing what the profits had been.

Mr. BORAH. I know the Senator did.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator, if the Senator from New York will permit me further, that, taking the year 1914 as an average and 100 per cent as a basis, the average price now represents 140, as compared with 100 in 1914. The price of shoes in the United States represents 179, which is 39 per cent above the normal which it ought to occupy if it were upon the same basis with the average price of all other industries. That is true not only of shoes, but it is true of a great many other commodities the American people buy, because it is the average that is 140 and not the top. That situation applies to other things consumed, as well as to shoes.

I agree entirely with the Senator's suggestion made a while ago that we have done nothing in this bill thus far that will aid the farmer, or pretends that it will aid him, without having done something on the other side to take the benefit all away from him and even add to the burden which he now bears.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky, and I am pleased that the Senator from Idaho is here participating in this particular debate, because I am sure there is no difference between us—that we desire to do for the American people what is the right thing to do. I am sure it is the Senator's attitude, and I know it is mine.

I am not here at this moment to discuss particularly the tariff on shoes, but I am concerned about the tanneries, about the leather part of the schedule. I thank the Senators from Kentucky and from Massachusetts for speaking about shoes; but as regards the tanneries, let me say to my friend from Idaho that there can be no question of the distress of the tanning industry. May I ask the Senator from Utah if he believes that?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have stated on the floor of the Senate several times during this discussion that the tanning industry is in a very, very poor condition financially at the present time, more so than any other industry in the United States that I know of, I suppose.

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

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. I have been led to believe that the tanning industry is in an unfortunate condition, but I have not been able to determine why it is in an unfortunate condition, in view of the figures with reference to importations which the Senator from Kentucky has given and which have not been disputed.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us take the exportations of tanning products. The tanners export leather—kip leather, we will say—at about 23 or 24 cents a pound, and they import at 59 cents a pound. In other words, the kip that is used in high-priced shoes they import, but the kip they make here—from about 40 per cent of the hides in the United States, I think the testimony shows—they export. They are two different articles entirely; not by name, but by quality. That is how a great part of these exports come about.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is also true that a considerable portion of the leather imported into this country is of a type that we do not make in this country, so that it does not come in competition with the products of the American tanneries.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the highest-priced kip leather. The prices themselves show that. The price of the leather the American concerns make and export averages about 24 cents a pound, and the average of the kip leather that is imported into the United States is 59 cents a pound.

Mr. BORAH. But the kind of kip leather imported into the United States we do not make here.

Mr. SMOOT. We make it, but we do not make a great quantity of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. We do not make the type that satisfies the American shoe wearer who wants a shoe made of kip leather.

Mr. SMOOT. We can make it.

Mr. BARKLEY. But we do not make it.

Mr. SMOOT. No; because of the fact that it is the highest-price kip leather found in the world that is imported into the United States and goes into the shoes which perhaps cost the manufacturer of the shoes five to eight dollars, and I will assure the Senator the retailer makes a good profit on the shoes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I was advised by some importers from Boston that they imported the kind of leather used for the inside of the shoes—lining, and so forth—which was not made in this country at all and did not come in competition with the production in this country in any manner whatever.

Mr. SMOOT. That does not amount to very much. The great bulk of it that comes in is of the finer grade of leather. The leather of which the Senator speaks is the lining leather, very light leather.

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The Senator from New York knows that in other years Ohio was quite a tanning State, with a large number of tanneries. Those engaged in that business have been gradually going out of business, some of them because of the fact that the material used for tanning purposes is no longer obtainable. I am informed that unless there is some protection afforded the tanning industry the large number who are now running in the red will have to close up. If there is any one industry in Ohio, outside of the pottery industry, that is actually suffering, it is the tanning industry. I have been told by a citizen from Springfield and by another from Youngstown, both largely interested in that industry, that it is absolutely essential that there be protection afforded, or that the industry will disappear.

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

Mr. FESS. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Is that by reason of the heavy importations into this country coming into competition with the tanning industry?

Mr. FESS. I do not have the facts as to whether or not the tanning industry is suffering because the factories are not up to date or whether the suffering is due to the large importations, but I assume it would be the large importations, or those engaged in the industry would not be asking for protection.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to answer that, if I may, before the Senator proceeds further. I refer to the imports and exports of calf and kip shoe upper and lining leather. In the first 11 months of 1929 the imports of calf and kip leather equaled 50 per cent of the domestic production. They aggregated nearly 61,000,000 square feet; and I want to speak about that again in a moment.

The exports of calf and kip leather decreased nearly 30 per cent in the first 11 months of 1929, as compared with the same period of 1928. In 1929 they amounted to 18,989,000 square feet, and in 1928 I am advised they amounted to 26,873,000 square feet.

When we talk about exports, too, we are talking about articles which are measured by the standard of American money, while, on the other hand, the imports which come in are measured on the very much lower standard of Europe. So when we find that the imports have increased, as they have, based on European valuations, and the exports have decreased measured in terms of American money, I think the figures substantiate the position we are taking here to-day.

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. Upon the question of the profits or lack of profits among the tanners, is it not quite clear that the shoe-manufacturing combination is, on the one hand, beating down the price of leather to tanners, and on the other hand putting up the price of shoes to the public? It seems to me it is quite clear from this situation that that is the principal cause of the trouble.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator base his statement on his belief that there is a combination of shoe men?

Mr. BROOKHART. It is admitted that there is a shoe-machinery combination that is dominating the industry in some way. I am not familiar with the details.

Mr. COPELAND. That perhaps is true, but so far as the industry is concerned it is highly competitive. I doubt if there is any other that is more competitive.

Mr. BROOKHART. It does not seem to be competitive in the prices it is charging and the profits it is taking.

Mr. COPELAND. I would like to suggest just one other thing, which is worthy of our attention. There has been a drop of nearly 17 per cent in tannery employment in 1929, as compared with the index year of 1923.

Mr. BROOKHART. There has been more than that much of a drop in the price of hides.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator still contend, regardless of what effect this may have upon the employment of people in the tanneries of the country and the probable effect on the increased cost of shoes, that he still believes, for the small amount the farmer would get, this great burden should be added to the pressure already upon the American people as a whole?

Mr. BROOKHART. Every tariff adds a burden to the American people if it increases the price, and most of them do. This is a part of the system from which the Senator's State is profiting mostly. So far as the tanners are concerned I do not think I am in much disagreement with the Senator from New York or the Senator from Ohio. If they need a protective rate to live, I am ready to give it to them and have been all the time, and I think the farm group has been. I have heard no dispute about the proposition. On the other hand, we are not willing to allow the shoe manufacturer to profit off of the tanners and farmers and everybody else because of a machinery combination of some kind.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORBECK. I want to ask the Senator from Ohio how he is going to defend that statement when those same manufacturers insist that the farmer can produce in competition with the cheapest labor in the world and insist if he can not there is something wrong due to his management, and then they themselves come and ask for a bonus and ask that part of the burden be placed upon the farmer.

Mr. BROOKHART. I think the Senator has figured all right on that proposition.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. Very much has been said this morning in regard to the increased price of shoes in the event a certain tariff is placed upon hides. I think the Senator from Kentucky made the statement that, according to the manufacturers' statement, if the duty went into effect on hides it would increase each pair of shoes by \$2.15. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BARKLEY. To the consumer. That is the increase in the retail price.

Mr. McMASTER. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the year 1922, when the hearings were held before the Finance Committee of the Senate with reference to a duty on hides, Mr. E. W. Rucker, attorney for the National Livestock Association, who made a very exhaustive inquiry into the price of hides and the effect the tariff would have upon the price of shoes, submitted to the committee at that time the statement, and it was not refuted by the shoe manufacturers, that a 15 per cent ad valorem duty on hides would not increase the price of shoes so far as the hides were concerned more than 3½ to 4½ cents per pair.

Now, the duty proposed by the Senator from Nevada is 5 cents a pound. If the present selling price of hides is 14 cents a pound, which is a very low selling price, it would mean that we would have a duty of 33⅓ per cent, and applying that to the formula laid down by Mr. Rucker, we would have an increase of 10 to 12 cents per pair of shoes. Therefore it is evident that the statements made by the manufacturers of shoes are absolutely false.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. In 1922, when we had the tariff bill before us, the same argument was made that the duty on hides would increase the price of shoes. That argument prevailed with me, and I voted for free hides. But I have seen the price of shoes go far beyond the suggested increase which would arise by reason of a duty on hides. I have concluded that this time I shall

try to give the farmer an opportunity to make something out of his hides so as to pay for his shoes, the price of which is constantly rising.

Mr. COPELAND. Surely the Senator does not wish to create a condition by reason of an increase in the price of hides so that the American tannery will go out of business, because if it does, what will become of the farmer's hides?

Mr. BORAH. I have an open mind on the tannery business.

Mr. BARKLEY. The same thing is likely to happen to the farmer's hide that has been happening to it all the time.

Mr. COPELAND. Even the Presidents, the Senator knows, have hides which are sometimes easily irritated!

Mr. BARKLEY. I have obtained from the Department of Commerce the correct figures of the exports and imports of leather for 1929. They are preliminary. They are approximately correct for 1929. I stated yesterday that the importations for 1928 were \$42,000,000 plus in value and the exportations were \$55,000,000 plus in value. The correct figures for 1929 show exports of \$42,939,622 and imports of \$44,542,174. That would indicate that 1929 is the first year for a good many years in which the importations have exceeded the exportations, but that excess was only about \$1,500,000 for 1929.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. My figures are in accord with those of the Senator from Kentucky, and were likewise furnished by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky, that when we measure the value of the imports in money, we are dealing with European values, and when we measure the value of the exports in money we are dealing with United States values.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are dealing with the value of the European product so far as importations are laid down in the United States.

Mr. COPELAND. Could not the Senator get the figures in square feet? That would be quite conclusive, I would say.

Mr. SMOOT. It is given in invoice prices.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. I think there is unnecessary confusion existing in the minds of the Members of the Senate as to the attitude of the tanners. I made a statement several days ago on the floor of the Senate in which I quoted from a letter written January 10, 1930, by Mr. V. G. Lumbard, president of the Calf Tanners Association, of Girard, Ohio, in which he stated:

The calf-and-kip leather industry is a very sick one and its present plight is largely due to the enormous foreign competition, calf leather being on the free list. When raw hides and finished leather were on the protected list under the Dingley law of 1897 both farmers and tanners prospered.

Then I said at that time:

The Tanners' Council of America, comprising 11 different groups of tanners, indicated in the testimony on this bill that the sentiment of their organization was almost unanimously in favor of a tariff on hides. Most of the tanners, therefore, are willing to give the producer of hides just and equitable protection in the belief that it would be beneficial to their industry. Certainly the shoe industry would benefit no less than the tanning industry by the greater stability in hides and leather prices which would prevail in the event that this amendment were to be enacted. The leather and shoe industries should have vision enough to realize the benefits to themselves of adequate protection for the cattle industry, and I sincerely hope that those industries will join in supporting this amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. From what was the Senator reading?

Mr. ODDIE. I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22, containing a statement which I made on the floor of the Senate in which I quoted from a letter from Mr. V. G. Lumbard, president of the Calf Tanners Association of Girard, Ohio.

Mr. COPELAND. Is that the Ohio Leather Co.?

Mr. ODDIE. It is the Calf Tanners Association of Girard, Ohio.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It should be clearly borne in mind in discussing exports and imports of hides and exports and imports of leather that we export cheap or inferior hides, and we import superior hides such as are not produced in this country, chiefly from Argentina—the heavier hides, the hides that come from heavy steers. In considering the imports and exports of leather, to a degree the same factor exists. We import the high class, expensive leather and we export the cheap leather that is not always suitable for use in the shoes which the American public demand. That is a very important factor

to consider in the matter of discussing the exports and imports of hides and leather.

Mr. ODDIE. I stated two or three days ago on the floor of the Senate that a large number of hides imported into this country are of a lower grade and comparable in quality with what we call "country" hides. I showed good authority for the conclusion that these importations regulate the price of the "country" hides. They are being imported at a very low rate and therefore they are bearing down the price of the "country" hides to the farmer and stock raiser.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I think I should say to the Senator from Nevada that for some reason which I do not know, but which the Senator from Ohio could perhaps answer much better, the Ohio Leather Co. in the last two years has made a profit. It had a loss in 1926 of \$78,000. In 1927 it made a profit of \$216,000, but in 1928 its profits dropped to \$145,000. I have no figures for 1929, but I assume from what the Senator from Ohio has just said that in general the tanneries in Ohio are in great distress.

So far as others are concerned, we have merely to note the fact that the American Hide & Leather Co. in 1929 has had a loss of \$1,594,394, while Pfister & Vogel had a loss of \$1,200,000, and the Barnet Leather Co. in six months of the past year lost \$541,000. The Senator need not say to me or attempt by any juggling of figures to create in my mind the impression that the tanneries are prospering. They are not. Every informed person knows this statement to be the fact.

It is because of this fact that I should like to do everything possible to prevent the amendment of the Senator from Nevada from prevailing. I came here yesterday determined to vote for free hides. I was sufficiently impressed during the day to reach the conclusion that the committee have done something for the hide people, and enough. I am willing now to vote for the committee proposal, because it carries with it an increased rate on leather and, if the figures are faithful figures and to be relied upon, there is every reason in the world why an increase should be allowed.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. I said the other day and I state again that I favor an adequate compensatory duty on leather.

Mr. COPELAND. But that is not enough. "Compensatory" is not enough.

Mr. ODDIE. If it can be shown that something extra is needed in the way of a protective duty in order that what is placed on leather should balance what we place on hides, I shall be in favor of it.

Mr. COPELAND. Then how would they be any better off if hides and leather should be continued on the same plane as they are at present, when the tanneries are now losing money and are on the way to bankruptcy? How would they be better off if we should place a tariff on hides and exactly the same compensatory tariff upon leather? They would be just as badly off as they now are, as the Senator must realize.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, the tanners would be benefited by a more stabilized market for hides, a more stable price; and they would be benefited by the increased prosperity which would result from thousands and thousands of our livestock men and farmers being saved from ruin.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I want to call attention to the fact that it is not an evidence of magnanimity on the part of those who advocate a duty on raw material to grant a compensatory duty on tanned leather and shoes. They are obliged to do it; they must do it; or they will nullify their vote for a protective duty on hides. A specific duty upon hides means, if a compensatory duty shall not be levied upon leather and shoes that hides will come in as leather and shoes and the domestic hide producers will suffer the loss of their hide market. No thanks are due for a compensatory duty upon leather and shoes. It is compulsory and necessary, or else the specific duty upon hides will be rendered of no avail. Those who seek a duty on hides have, of necessity, to support that action by a compensatory duty upon all manufactures of hides. To do otherwise is to make a duty on hides destructive to the producers of hides. Compensatory duties on hides as well as all other products is to help the hide or other basic product and not necessarily to help the manufacturer of hide products.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his suggestion, and I want to say further

that what the Senator from Nevada proposes will come back upon his head; because if we shall go so far, I may say to my dear friend from Nevada, as to destroy the tannery industry of America, what will the cattle growers do with their hides? They will hang them on the fence, if there are fences enough to bear them.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. My desire is not to destroy or injure in any way the tannery industry of the United States. I believe, and I have frequently stated, that if an adequate duty on hides shall be adopted, the tannery industry will be stabilized, more business will come to the tanneries, and we shall see an end to the distressed conditions that now exist in the industry. I want to see the tanning industry prosper; I want to see every industry in the country prosper, because the prosperity of our whole country depends upon the prosperity of all of the units of industry. We can not afford to let any one industry suffer. Several industries are sick to-day. One of those industries is cattle raising and another is farming, and here is a practical means of helping them which has been indorsed by the farm organizations all over the country and to a very large extent by the business men who have studied it.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. COPELAND. Just one word, and then I shall yield.

When the employees of the tanneries of my State reach the stage of starvation, I shall feed them with the kind words and hopeful outlook of the Senator from Nevada. Now I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. COUZENS. I was out of the Chamber for a while, and so did not hear the Senator from New York when he began his speech. However, I have repeatedly heard him refer to the very bad financial condition of the tanners, and I wonder if, before I came in, the Senator from New York analyzed the cause of that condition?

Mr. COPELAND. No; I did not.

Mr. COUZENS. Has the Senator from New York analyzed the cause of the depressed condition of the tanning business?

Mr. COPELAND. I have not.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator, then, does not know what is the cause of that condition?

Mr. COPELAND. No; but I find such unanimity in the matter that I should think there must be one particular cause.

Mr. COUZENS. What does the Senator from New York assume that cause to be?

Mr. COPELAND. I assume it to be the importation of leather into this country from abroad.

Mr. COUZENS. If the Senator will yield to me, I should like to point out to him that it has not been the importations which have caused that condition. The fact that the foreign manufacturer underbids the domestic tanner, even though the foreigner does not get the business—and when the foreigner does not get the business, of course, no importations are shown—causes the domestic manufacturer to reduce his price to a point where he has to conduct what business he has at a loss. It seems to me that we lay too much stress on the fact that imports are insufficient to justify a tariff. Certainly, in my judgment, imports are not the principal guide in determining the need of protection to the tanning industry.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, let me say this to the Senator from Michigan, if he will permit me: In the Hudson River Valley brick are made; that is the great industry along that river. The industry is in great distress. The reason for that is because of the price for which foreign brick may be laid down in New York City. The Senator will look at the statistics of importations of foreign brick and will say, "Why, the imports are so small that they can not affect it."

But why are they small? They are small because the Hudson River brick manufacturer has reduced his price in order to maintain his establishment as a going concern and prevent the competition involved in the possible sale of imported bricks. The importations are small, but they are potential; and unless the Hudson River brick manufacturer reduced his price the importations would come in.

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

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. COUZENS. That is exactly the point I am trying to make. I asked the Senator if he had explained to the Senate that the volume of imports is not the chief factor to be considered in determining the necessity of protection. The question

is whether or not, in view of foreign bids for business, the domestic industry can produce at a profit.

Mr. COPELAND. That is correct.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator did not emphasize that which, in my judgment, is the most important reason for a protective tariff on the products of the tanning industry.

Mr. COPELAND. I will say to the Senator I did not catch the point; I am sorry I did not; but he has made clear certainly what the situation is.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. HAWES. I put into the Record yesterday—and nobody has been able to dispute the figures—that the proposed duty, if levied, would add 25 cents to the cost of each pair of shoes and probably 30 cents for all classes of our people, and that it will cost the farmer 50 cents for each pair of shoes because of the character of shoes worn by the farmer. So that under one set of figures, taking the urban population, and estimating three pairs of shoes to each person annually, we can multiply the population by 90 cents and find out what the tax will be upon each State, and we can multiply it by 50 cents and find out what it will cost the farmers. Has anybody disputed those figures?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not dispute the figures, but I do not think the Senator has painted the full picture. I agree with him that the compensatory duty that must be levied if the specific duty shall be written into the law will add about 25 cents increased cost to the shoe manufacturer for each pair of shoes, and pyramiding the cost it will finally be 50 cents to the consumer, as the Senator says for a pair of shoes. That is assuming no protective duty on leather and no protective duty on boots and shoes; but the mere compensatory duty alone will, as the Senator has stated, increase the price of the average shoe at least 50 cents a pair, if not more.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. HAWES. Has anyone been able to dispute the statement that the proposed tariff on hides if adopted will cost the American people at least \$100,000,000 a year? Has that been disputed by anyone?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Because of the compensatory duty alone that will follow.

Mr. COPELAND. I think no one has disputed the statement.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. No; it has not been disputed.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. I should like to know how the Senator from Missouri arrives at the figures given by him. I can not see why a pair of shoes should cost so much more, as has been stated on the floor repeatedly, because of the proposed tariff of 5 cents a pound on green hides, when there are but 3 pounds of hides used in a pair of shoes, and in the case of many shoes the quantity is far less than that. So I can not understand how shoes will cost the American people so much more, unless there shall be an exorbitant profit added by the manufacturers and dealers.

Mr. HAWES. I answer the Senator—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. HAWES. I placed in the Record on Wednesday last two telegrams, one from the president of the largest shoe-manufacturing company in the world.

Mr. ODDIE. What is the name of the concern, may I ask?

Mr. HAWES. The International Shoe Co., of St. Louis, of which the president is Mr. Frank Rand. The other telegram was from Mr. Brown. I also have several other telegrams to the same effect. The shoe manufacturers, as we all know, will simply add the tariff to the price of the article which they produce. They have estimated what the amount will be; they will add 25 cents to 30 cents a pair on the shoes manufactured. They, of course, will not secure any benefit out of the tariff; they have merely stated the facts in their telegrams. They also make the statement that because of the character of leather used in farmers' shoes and in mechanics' shoes such shoes will cost about 50 cents more. I can not understand why a manufacturer would attempt to deceive anyone by misstating the facts. The proposed tariff will be of no benefit to him, if he is left alone, and it will not work any particular hardship upon him if

the duty shall be levied, because it will be passed on to the consumer. However, I have not heard anybody dispute the statement that the proposed duty, if levied, will cost the consumers \$100,000,000 annually.

Three or four weeks ago, to help a situation that confronted the country, we took a burden of \$160,000,000 from the income taxpayers of America, and now we are asked to put back \$100,000,000 upon people who wear shoes.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must insist that if the Senator from New York yields to other Senators for speeches he yields the floor. The Senator has a right to yield for a question.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, let me appeal to the Chair. Here is a question which is a mooted question; the two sides are apart on it, and I appeal to the Chair to let us perhaps reconcile our differences. We ought to do it behind the door perhaps, but I feel that these discussions, especially the one we are now having, are helpful. I am willing to yield the floor at any time, but I do believe that comments are helpful in attempting to bring the two sides together, and I beg of the Chair that this morning the rules may be somewhat relaxed, perhaps, and that we may go on in this informal way. But, Mr. President, it will not embarrass me at any time if the Chair shall rule me from the floor, because I have said practically all I care to say. I think that all of us desire to do what is best for all the people.

I do believe that the imposition of what seems to be an outrageous tax will impose such a burden upon the 120,000,000 of American people that we are not justified in levying it.

The Senator from Nevada can not show that if this tax is not levied the American farmer will go out of business. The great cattle kings may go out of business. It may affect those cattle kings who, perhaps, many of them, live on Fifth Avenue and have large ranches in the West. It may affect them; but so far as the dirt farmer is concerned—the man who has 1 cow or 5 cows or 10 cows—if he kills 10 beasts a year, he will not begin to get out of the increased cost of the hides he sells anything like the amount that he will have to pay for shoes if the amendment is accepted.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. ODDIE. Does the Senator from New York believe that a tariff of 5 cents a pound on green hides, which will add about 15 cents to the cost of a pair of shoes, will not be of benefit to the farmer who kills 10 animals a year, say, and receives \$25 or \$30 extra for the hides from those cattle? Does not the Senator believe that that farmer will be better off on account of the increase in the amount he receives from the hides of those animals?

Mr. COPELAND. No; I do not believe he will. I do not believe the dirt farmer will get a cent more for the hides.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, it has been shown on the floor that if this tariff is adopted, the farmer and stock raiser will unquestionably get the benefit, or almost the entire benefit, that will come from this tariff.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, of course I do not agree to this; however, I want to say a final word to my friend from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART].

First, let me say, of course, that I love the Senator from Nevada. I agree with him sometimes; but this time I feel he is so far wrong that I could not think of yielding to his judgment. I am sure he will accept this apology on my part.

A little while ago, however, the Senator from Iowa scornfully mentioned my State of New York as if it were responsible for all the ills of the farmer and for all the ills of the human race. Does the Senator from Iowa believe that the average citizen of New York is any different from the average citizen of Iowa?

Mr. BROOKHART. No; and I stand for the average citizen of New York. I do not stand for that financial crowd that you have up in New York. They are the fellows who are taking the toll of your average citizen in New York and every other State in the Union. They are the ones who are collecting these gigantic profits under the protective-tariff system of the United States; and I have an amendment to this bill that will take care of those gentlemen, if I can get the support of the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Does that mean that all the citizens of New York must be excluded from the operations of any beneficial legislation which may be passed here?

Mr. BROOKHART. I want the average citizen of New York to be treated the same as every other average citizen; but I have a different treatment for those big fellows in New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me say to the Senator from Iowa that if he lived in New York and ran for the Senate he would get just as many votes from those "big fellows" as I got when I ran for the Senate, probably no more, and certainly no less.

I am not interested in those "big people" in New York. When you talk about the big people in New York, you are talking about five hundred or a thousand men, I assume; but I am interested in the 12,000,000 in the State of New York who are just exactly like the millions in the State of Iowa. Our poverty is worse than your poverty, because out there you can go out and kill an old rooster and stew it long enough to get a food that you can enjoy, or at least that will maintain your lives. But when we have poverty in my State of New York, particularly in the tenement districts of the city of New York—and that is the large part of New York—we have not anything to feed upon, unless it is upon a bit of the sidewalk that we bite off.

Let me say that I resent all this talk about "New York," as if it were a sinful thing to be from New York.

Mr. President, I remember that this matter was dealt with by the great Shakespeare; and I want to quote from *Shylock*:

Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you tickle us, do we not laugh? If you poison us, do we not die? And if you wrong us, shall we not revenge?

My dear friend, I want to say to you and to all others who talk about poverty and distress and the necessity for relief that we have poverty and distress and the necessity for relief. Because the Senator from Iowa or any other Senator cries "New York," the New Yorker must suffer because of the sins of a few men who gamble upon Wall Street, or who control the finances of America.

I hold no brief for them. I am interested in them only so far as their activities may give prosperity to our country. I am interested in them only to the extent that they can go to Iowa and loan their money when Iowa wants to build court-houses and high schools and railroads. I am interested in them only so far as they give employment to the people of America; but it is not fair all the time to talk about "New York" as if it were a sinful thing to be a New Yorker.

We have exactly the same impulses and the same appetites and the same necessities as those who live on the great, wide, plains of America. When I am interested here sufficiently to discuss the matter before us, I am interested not alone to help the farmers of America—and if I believed it would give them great prosperity, I would vote for the pending amendment—but when I know that by voting for the measure proposed by the Senator from Nevada I am going to increase the cost of living of every one of the 12,000,000 people in my State, I can not vote for it. I want the Senator from Iowa and every other Senator to know that the people of my State are just the same kind of human beings as the citizens of every other State; and, because there are more of us, we have more interest in the pending bill than the people of any other State in this great Union of ours.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. BROOKHART. I admire the Senator's magnificent oration just now; but I want to say that yesterday he was defending this little crowd of a few thousand that have made his own people poor, that have brought on the distress of his own people in New York; and he said they paid 30 per cent of the taxes, when that very crowd of people ought to be paying 50 per cent.

We are not collecting taxes here from the common people in New York. They do not even make income-tax returns. It is the big fellows who did not vote for the Senator who pay these taxes. Does the Senator claim that the farmers of Iowa have caused distress in New York by the price they have gotten for their farm products?

Mr. COPELAND. No.

Mr. BROOKHART. No; they have not. The distress is caused by the big processors who control things down around Wall Street, New York, and extort profits not only from the farmers but from your common people.

I know your farmers of New York almost as well as the Senator himself does, and I know that they are just like the farmers of Iowa. They are in worse condition than the farmers of Iowa, and they need this tariff protection on hides. If we

want to control this situation, we shall have to look to the profits of these big men who are selling shoes made out of hides, and to the profits of all of these protected industries. If we take care of the profits of your big fellows in New York, then we can break up this discrimination against the little people all over the United States.

I am with your common people. I hope the Senator is; but I want to see him get on some facts that are on the side of the common people. Your common people in New York are not opposed to a protective tariff for agricultural products.

The laboring organizations—every one you have, everywhere—are supporting us. I have tested them out. I am in touch with them, and they say, "If it helps agriculture, we are for you." I have tested them out in Boston, too; and it is the same story everywhere. The common people are together on this thing; but the common people are not permitted to function, because the machinery of the economics is controlled by the few that are oppressing the common people—East, West, North, and South.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I fear I have lost the floor by reason of the remarks of the Senator from Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from New York for the second time; but at the conclusion of his address the Senator will not be recognized again on the pending amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. The Vice President has been very kind, I am sure. I want to say just this one thing about New York: If the Senator takes a census of the great men that he is talking about—the men who have oppressed the poor, who have borne down upon the farmers of America, who have done so much to ruin our great country—he will find that most of them, perhaps 99 per cent of them, came from other States, and probably a lot of them from the State of Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. They only go down to New York because that is a more favorable place to operate. But, seriously, Mr. President, there is no difference of opinion between the Senator from Iowa and myself.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Iowa for a question?

Mr. COPELAND. I can yield only for a question.

Mr. BROOKHART. My question is, The Senator recognizes, does he not, that Iowa has sent her worst citizens down to New York to join in that same game?

Mr. COPELAND. I hope the Senator is fortunate enough to have sent all of his worst citizens. If he can get rid of them in that way, I congratulate him.

Mr. President, there is no difference of opinion between us. It is the ambition of the Senate and of the entire Congress to do the things that make for the good of the most people of our country. In giving consideration to the pending amendment and all others, we must think not of one class or one group alone but think about the effect of this possible tariff upon all the rest.

So far as my State is concerned, we are glad to help, and the Senators from the State have indicated by their votes that they want to help those who live upon the farms. In turn we ask you, when you vote, not to forget about those who live in the great cities of our country, in order that they, too, may be kept from deprivation and starvation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], as modified. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRATTON (when Mr. CUTTING's name was called). My colleague [Mr. CUTTING] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber. He is paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea" on this question.

Mr. GLENN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. If I were permitted to vote on this question, I would vote "nay," and if the Senator from Arizona were present and voting I understand that he would vote "yea."

Mr. GOFF (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. As he is not in the Chamber, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FESS (when Mr. McCULLOCH's name was called). My colleague [Mr. McCULLOCH] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. I understand that he is specially paired on this question with the Senator from Kansas

[Mr. ALLEN]. If my colleague were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH]. I understand that if the junior Senator from Ohio were present he would vote as I shall vote, and I therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SULLIVAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK]. I withhold my vote.

Mr. PHIPPS (when Mr. WATERMAN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WATERMAN] is necessarily absent. He has a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea," and I understand that if the junior Senator from Alabama were present he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and that the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD] has a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE].

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] has a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN].

I desire to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who are attending the naval conference, have a general pair.

Mr. CAPPER. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. ALLEN]. If present, my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. HASTINGS] is absent, due to illness in his family.

Mr. COPELAND. My colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] is necessarily absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—31

Ashurst	Fletcher	Norbeck	Schall
Borah	Frazier	Norris	Sheppard
Bratton	Howell	Nye	Shipstead
Brookhart	Jones	Oddie	Steiwer
Broussard	Kendrick	Phipps	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McKellar	Pine	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McMaster	Ransdell	Watson
Dill	McNary	Robison, Ky.	

NAYS—39

Baird	Glass	Heflin	Steck
Barkley	Goldsborough	Johnson	Swanson
Bingham	Greene	Kean	Townsend
Blaine	Grundy	Keyes	Trammell
Caraway	Hale	La Follette	Tydings
Copeland	Harris	Metcalf	Vandenberg
Couzens	Harrison	Moses	Walcott
Fess	Hatfield	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
George	Hawes	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Gillett	Hebert	Smith	

NOT VOTING—26

Allen	Glenn	Patterson	Stephens
Black	Goff	Pittman	Sullivan
Bleas	Gould	Reed	Wagner
Brock	Hastings	Robinson, Ark.	Waterman
Cutting	Hayden	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Dale	King	Shortridge	
Deneen	McCulloch	Smoot	

So Mr. ODDIE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Is there not a committee amendment now up for consideration in connection with the paragraph just under discussion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] was to the House text.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask a question for information. The House rate is 10 per cent ad valorem. At what time will it be proper to move to strike that out of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is in order now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. At what time will it be in order to move to strike out the section?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is in order now also.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to enter that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from Idaho intend to move to strike out the whole paragraph or just the item on hides?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are proceeding under an order which permits individual amendments clear through the section.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the only amendment which is in order now, as I understand it, is a motion to strike out the particular item of 10 per cent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; under the order already agreed to it is permissible to enter any motion desired with reference to the text of the entire paragraph.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I move that we strike out of the bill section 1530.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Complete?

Mr. BORAH. Complete.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for a moment before he presses that amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state the question. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho to strike out section 1530. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me to offer a further amendment, making the figures 4 cents and 8 cents, instead of 6 cents and 10 cents, as originally placed in the bill?

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. That is in order.

Mr. ODDIE. I move to substitute the figure "4" for the figure "6" as the rate on wet hides, and 8 cents for 10 cents on dried hides. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ASHURST. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Nevada proposes an amendment to strike out all of paragraph 1530 (a), page 224, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Hides and skins of cattle of the bovine species (except hides and skins of the India water buffalo imported to be used in the manufacture of rawhide articles), green, salted, or wet salted, 4 cents per pound; dried, 10 cents per pound.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the Senator would better perfect his amendment by making provision as to salted or pickled hides.

Mr. ODDIE. That was the intention, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. The Secretary did not read that.

Mr. ODDIE. It should read:

Hides and skins of cattle of the bovine species (except hides and skins of the India water buffalo imported to be used in the manufacture of rawhide articles), green, salted, or wet salted, 4 cents per pound; dried, 8 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the Senator proposing to do as to the pickled hides?

Mr. ODDIE. Were they included in the original language?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; "dried, salted, or pickled." That is in line 24, page 224.

Mr. ODDIE. I agree to that.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator's amendment, the equivalent ad valorem duty on hides would be about 30 per cent.

Mr. ODDIE. I will not attempt to analyze the relation between the specific and the ad valorem. That has been gone into very fully, and I do not think it is necessary to go over it again. I feel that we are ready now to vote on this question. I hope we are.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLENN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay," and if the junior Senator from Arizona were present I understand he would vote "yea."

Mr. GOFF (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. He is not in the Chamber, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as upon the previous vote as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. SULLIVAN (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK]. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CAPPER. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. ALLEN]. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. ODDIE. On this vote and on the previous vote I understand that my colleague [Mr. PITTMAN], if present, would have voted "yea."

Mr. PHIPPS. My colleague [Mr. WATERMAN] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK]. If present, my colleague would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

Mr. FESS. My colleague [Mr. McCULLOCH], while he has a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], is paired on this question with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN]. If present, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN] would vote "yea," and my colleague [Mr. McCULLOCH] would vote "nay."

I also announce the general pair of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

I also wish to announce the pair of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] and the pair of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]; also the general pair of the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE].

Mr. BRATTON. I desire to announce that on this question the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] has a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. If the Senator from New Mexico were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. COPELAND. My colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] is necessarily absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—30

Ashurst	Fletcher	Norbeck	Sheppard
Borah	Frazier	Norris	Shipstead
Bratton	Howell	Nye	Stelwer
Brookhart	Jones	Oddie	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Kendrick	Phipps	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Pine	Watson
Connally	McMaster	Robison, Ky.	
Dill	McNary	Schall	

NAYS—37

Baird	Glass	Heflin	Steck
Barkley	Goldsborough	Johnson	Swanson
Bingham	Greene	Kenn	Tydings
Blaine	Grundy	Keyes	Yandenberg
Caraway	Hale	La Follette	Walcott
Copeland	Harris	Metcalf	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Harrison	Moses	Walsh, Mont.
Fess	Hatfield	Overman	
George	Hawes	Simmons	
Gillett	Hebert	Smith	

NOT VOTING—29

Allen	Goff	Ransdell	Townsend
Black	Gould	Reed	Trammell
Bleasé	Hastings	Robinson, Ark.	Wagner
Brock	Hayden	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Cutting	King	Shortridge	Wheeler
Dale	McCulloch	Smoot	
Deneen	Patterson	Stephens	
Glenn	Pittman	Sullivan	

So Mr. Oddie's second amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I desire to call up the amendment offered by me to paragraph 1530, on page 224, lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, to strike out subparagraph (a).

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am going to move to strike out the entire paragraph 1530, which will cover what the Senator has in mind. I move to strike out the entire paragraph 1530 and to substitute therefor the present law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho is in order, it being broader than the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the vote, but to submit a parliamentary inquiry. Does the motion of the Senator from Idaho propose to strike out that part of

paragraph 1530 at the bottom of page 224, to wit, lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The entire paragraph is to be stricken out under the motion made by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator's motion should prevail, it seems to me the duty that is proposed by the committee on the hides and skins of cattle would be stricken out. Am I correct in that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly on the pending amendment. I am not oblivious to the situation in the Senate. It is clear that a considerable number of the Senators believe that no duty, now as in the past, should be levied on either hides or leather or shoes. On the other hand there are many who realize that conditions have changed and believe that consequently there should be a moderate protective duty on leather and shoes, coupled possibly for consistency's sake with a moderate duty on hides. They believe that the difference in conversion costs of shoes here and abroad entitle them to a protective duty independent of hides. There is still a third group who demand a heavy duty on hides and are not willing to grant any protection at all on leather and shoes unless they can get what they want with respect to hides, namely, a tariff imposition drastically inimical to the interests of the manufacturers and consumers of products made from hides. Heavy and unjustifiable rates of duty on hides having just been rejected by the Senate it is quite apparent what next will happen—the third group is going to combine with the first group and let a moderate duty on hides fail so that in so doing they can defeat the proposal for a moderate duty on leather and shoes. The two extremes of opinion in this body are going to unite and between them pinch out the moderates. I am fully aware, therefore, that I am speaking in a hopeless cause to a majority of Senators whose judgment has already been determined. Consequently I shall make no extended remarks, and shall say nothing about the much distressed leather industry which I have discussed at length already. I do want to say something briefly about shoes before the vote is taken.

The United States of America has produced, and is still producing, the finest boots and shoes in the world. It has led all the countries in the world in giving to the public high-class, attractive, and comfortable shoes. Up to within recent years the machinery and the patents that have made possible the modern shoe were controlled here in America and were sold exclusively to American manufacturers. To-day the situation is changed. The latest and best shoe machinery is available at the same price to every group which desires to manufacture shoes in any country in the world, with the result that within a very recent period we have found evidence of the growing production in foreign countries of women's cheap shoes, the very cheapest that are made, and of men's high-class shoes, the two extremes. The great bulk of shoes consumed by the American middle classes is still made exclusively here in the United States. Competition from abroad, however, is at our door to-day with respect particularly to the cheap low-priced women's shoes made in the relatively small but numerous factories of Lynn and Haverhill in Massachusetts and also, to a degree, to the exceedingly high-priced men's shoes, made chiefly in Brooklyn, N. Y.

The shoe industry has never before asked for a protective duty, because formerly it did not need one. It was willing and able to carry on in a market free to the whole world. At the present time, it does need some slight protection, and when now it asks for it—for the first time asking for any tariff benefits whatever—is it to be denied what other industries enjoy? Is it to be punished now for speaking up because in the past it was not clamorous? Are its statements and proofs of present need to be spurned because in the past it was not avaricious? Is the honesty and decency of the industry in the days when it asked for nothing now to be used as the grounds for a penalty when it makes its reasonable demands? Times have changed for the industry, so that to-day it requires what other industries have had for many years—tariff protection—and getting it sometimes with much less justification. The shoe industry is the most highly competitive industry in the United States, and therefore any protection granted to it is least likely to be abused. Moreover it pays the highest wages of any industry for clean and healthful work. The foreign competition threatening the welfare of our people engaged in this industry is here; we demand what the safeguards long enjoyed by others can afford us.

What does this situation indicate, logically, from the standpoint of those who believe in protection? I am not trying to

convince those Senators who are against the protective principle, but I am making an appeal to the Senators who in this very bill and in the bill of 1922 have voted to levy increased tariff-protective duties on 70 or more articles other than hides, which go into the manufacture of the shoe which is on the free list. In the act of 1922 and again in this bill increased duties are levied upon every material that goes into the manufacture of the shoe except hides. How long can an industry without any protective-tariff duty of its own survive, if the Congress of the United States every time it revises the tariff imposes increased duties upon its raw materials, which means increased cost of production? Where is the breaking point? There was no breaking point so long as we controlled the patented machinery; but that no longer exists.

If for no other reason than that we have imposed protective-tariff duties on these many materials that increase the costs of production, we ought to consider the question of a reasonable protective-tariff duty upon shoes and particularly those classes of shoes that are manufactured here in competition with cheap labor in Europe. If we are indifferent to the proposition of protecting American labor, at least we ought to grant this industry protection against our own tariff laws. I am willing to concede that at present the American shoe industry as a whole does not appear from its earnings or from the standpoint of imports to need a protective duty; but I make the statement that already, unless some protection is afforded to certain groups of domestic producers (I refer especially to the producers of women's cheap shoes), that they are being driven to the wall. Furthermore I make the prediction that other branches of the industry competing with manufacturers abroad who have free hides, cheap labor, and the same high-class, efficient machinery we have, will presently be in the same situation. Because of the loss of the advantage with respect to shoe machinery which we formerly enjoyed, the fight is on from this time forth with respect to the domestic shoe industry as a whole between the cheap labor of Europe and the high-priced labor of the United States. To defeat their request for a moderate protective duty is to take out of the lives of the families of the shoe workers that degree of well-being they now enjoy.

I conclude what I am saying by stating that Senators in this Chamber who profess to stand for protection are proceeding to destroy one of the greatest industries in the country and one that pays the highest wages. One can not walk through the streets of the cities and towns of New England without instinctively knowing when he is in a community where boots and shoes are produced, so much superior is the condition of living, so much better the wage, so much better clothed are the children compared with those in the cities and the towns where the cotton textile and the other industries are carried on.

Senators may pursue the course on which they seem bent, but before another tariff bill shall be here not alone low-priced women's shoes and a few high-priced men's shoes, but shoes of every kind and every class and every character will be coming into this country from abroad. Why not? American capital is not slow in seeking the places in the world where it can produce more cheaply in competition with American-made commodities. That is just the condition that is here now. The advantages of invention and of business efficiency that America once had with respect to this industry are gone; the advantage now is on the other side, because in foreign countries they have not only efficient business methods, not only our machinery, not only our patents, and, indeed, in some instances they have copied exactly the machines that have been produced here; but also above all, they have the cheap labor.

Massachusetts shoe manufacturers paying the highest wages of any in the industry in the United States, and marketing their product in the eastern part of the country are naturally first reached by the new movement of imported foreign shoes, and are to-day protesting. The competition from abroad has only just begun for them—and for others. Before long the imports will extend beyond the Atlantic coast markets, and Missouri and other interior producing States where wages are lower will feel it. Temporarily their lower wages and geographical position may give them an advantage in withstanding the foreign pressure as compared with the eastern shoe manufacturers; but their time will come. We are merely the first-line trench that is subjected to the new assault. It is regrettable that we are not receiving the aid and support we should receive from the rear trenches. But if we fail they will soon themselves experience the force of the attack. They may underpay us but not Europe.

Mr. President, I know it is useless to talk further; I know just what is going to happen here presently. But I want to call attention to the fact that those who are advocates of the

protective principle are by their action giving it a serious blow. They are keeping it to the ear and breaking it to the hope. The working people directly employed by the shoe industry, and others dependent upon it, will not permit that industry to be destroyed, or even to be severely injured, and still keep on voting for the protective tariff as if nothing had happened detrimental to them under it. When the cheap shoes flood into this country from abroad in volume, and work their full competitive effects, you will find those now denied protection against it losing faith in your justice, your equality, and in your protective principle itself.

Mr. President, I do not care to prolong the debate further, but I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD some memoranda and statistics that I have in reference to both leather and shoes.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEW ENGLAND SHOE & LEATHER ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., September 5, 1929.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In compliance with my recent promise, I am sending you a schedule of rates of duty on various products used by tanners in the manufacture of leather, and which I hope will serve your purpose. This is practically the same schedule that was filed by the Calf Tanners' Association with the Senate Finance Committee, with the addition of the present rates of duty, which this statement did not contain.

With best wishes, and again assuring you of our deep appreciation of your friendly cooperation in this very important tariff matter, I am,

Yours sincerely,

THOS. F. ANDERSON, Secretary.

Rates of duty on products used by tanners in leather manufacture under act of 1922 and new rates proposed on bill of 1929

Par.	Item	Rate in act of 1922	Proposed new rate
1	Acetic acid.....	¾ to 2 cents per pound.	¾ to 2 cents per pound.
	Formic acid.....	25 per cent ad valorem.	4 cents per pound.
	Lactic acid.....	2 to 9 cents per pound (not less than 25 per cent ad valorem).	2 to 4 cents per pound (not less than 25 per cent ad valorem).
	Tartaric acid.....	6 cents per pound.	8 cents per pound.
	Nitric acid.....	Free.	¼ cent per pound.
	Oleic acid.....	1½ cents per pound.	1½ cents per pound.
	Stearic acid.....	do.	do.
	Oxalic acid.....	6 cents per pound.	6 cents per pound.
	Other acids.....	25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.
	2	Aldehyde ammonia, butyraldehyde, paracetaldehyde, ethylene dichloride, butylene dichloride, ethylene oxide, butylene oxide, ethylene glycol, butylene glycol, diethanolamine, triethanolamine, ethylene diamine, esters.	6 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem.
Ethyl methyl ketone, homologues, acetone oil.		25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.
4	Alcohol, amyl, butyl, hexyl:		
	Propyl.....	6 cents per pound.	6 cents per pound.
	Methyl.....	18 cents per gallon.	18 cents per gallon.
6	Ethyl.....	15 cents per gallon.	15 cents per gallon.
	Potassium aluminum sulphate, potash alum, ammonia alum.	¾ cent per pound.	¾ cent per pound.
7	Aluminum sulphate.....	¾ to 1 cent per pound.	¾ to 1 cent per pound.
	Ammonium carbonate, bicarbonate.	1½ cents per pound.	2 cents per pound.
8	Ammonium chloride.....	1½ cents per pound.	1½ cents per pound.
	Liquid anhydrous ammonia.	2½ cents per pound.	2½ cents per pound.
11	Antimony oxide.....	2 cents per pound.	2 cents per pound.
	Tartar emetic.....	6 cents per pound.	6 cents per pound.
12	Synthetic gums.....	Free.	4 cents and 30 per cent.
	Resins.....	do.	do.
13	Arabic.....	¼ cent per pound.	¼ cent per pound.
	Barium chloride.....	1½ cents per pound.	2 cents per pound.
17	Barium carbonate.....	1½ cents per pound.	1½ cents per pound.
	Blackings, powders, and liquids for polishing.	25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.
18	Corrosive sublimate.....	45 per cent ad valorem.	22 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem.
	Carbon tetrachloride.....	2½ cents per pound.	2½ cents per pound.
19	Chloroform.....	6 cents per pound.	6 cents per pound.
	Tetrachloroethane, trichloroethylene.	35 per cent ad valorem.	35 per cent ad valorem.
20	Casain.....	2½ cents per pound.	2½ cents per pound.
	Chalk or whiting.....	25 per cent ad valorem.	¼ cent per pound.
28	Chalk, precipitated.....	do.	25 per cent ad valorem.
	Colors, dyes, stains, lakes.....	45 per cent ad valorem and 7 cents per pound based on American price.	45 per cent ad valorem and 7 cents per pound based on American price.
29	Cobalt linoleate.....	10 cents per pound.	10 cents per pound.
	Cobalt acetate.....	30 per cent ad valorem.	30 per cent ad valorem.
30	Liquid solutions of pyroxy-lins, other cellulose esters or ethers.	35 cents per pound.	35 cents per pound.
	All other compounds, cellulose.	40 cents per pound.	45 cents per pound.

Rates of duty on products used by tanners in leather manufacture under act of 1922 and new rates proposed on bill of 1929—Continued

Par.	Item	Rate in act of 1922	Proposed new rate
38	Diethyl sulphate, dimethyl sulphate.	25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.
	Ethyl acetate.	3 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.
	Butyl acetate.	(7)	7 cents per pound.
	Other esters and ethers.	25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.
39	Extracts for tanning—chestnut, cutch, fustic, hemlock, logwood, quebracho, sumac, valonia.	15 per cent ad valorem.	15 per cent ad valorem.
40	Formaldehyde.	2 cents per pound.	2 cents per pound.
	Hexamethylenetetramine.	25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.
42	Gelatin, glue, isinglass.	do.	2 cents per pound and 25 per cent.
43	Glycerin, refined.	2 cents per pound.	2 cents per pound.
50	Epsom salts.	1/2 cent per pound.	1 cent per pound.
51	Manganese borate.	25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.
52	Refined camphor.	6 cents per pound.	6 cents per pound.
53	Oils:		
	Cod oil menhaden.	5 cents per gallon.	5 cents per gallon.
	Sperm (refined).	10 cents per gallon.	14 cents per gallon.
	Wool, wool grease.	1 cent per pound.	1 cent per pound.
	Other.	20 per cent ad valorem.	20 per cent ad valorem.
54	Castor oil.	3 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.
	Linseed oil, flaxseed oil.	3.3 cents per pound.	4.16 cents per pound.
	Olive oil.	7 1/2 cents per pound.	7 1/2 cents per pound.
	Poppy seed oil.	2 cents per pound.	2 cents per pound.
	Rapeseed oil.	6 cents per gallon.	6 cents per gallon.
	Soybean oil.	2 1/2 cents per pound.	5 cents per pound.
55	Turkey-red oil, sulphonated castor oil, sulphated animal oil, sulphonated vegetable oil.	35 per cent ad valorem.	35 per cent ad valorem.
58	Mixtures of mineral, vegetable, and animal oils.	25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.
68	Pigments, colors, stains.	do.	Do.
69	Barium sulphate.	1 cent per pound.	1 1/2 cents per pound.
70	Blue pigments containing iron.	8 cents per pound.	8 cents per pound.
70	Ultramarine blue.	3 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.
72	Chrome yellow.	25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.
73	Lamp black, gas black.	20 per cent ad valorem.	20 per cent ad valorem.
74	Litharge.	2 1/2 cents per pound.	2 1/2 cents per pound.
	Orange mineral.	3 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.
75	Siennas, umbers.	3/4 cent per pound.	3/4 cent per pound.
	Iron oxide pigments, iron hydroxide pigments.	20 per cent ad valorem.	20 per cent ad valorem.
70	Zinc oxide ground in oil.	2 1/4 cents per pound.	2 1/4 cents per pound.
	Lithopone.	1 1/2 cents per pound.	1 1/2 cents per pound.
80	Dichromate.	2 1/4 cents per pound.	2 1/4 cents per pound.
	Potassium bicarbonate.	1 1/2 cents per pound.	1 1/2 cents per pound.
	Manganate.	4 cents per pound.	6 cents per pound.
	Caustic potash.	1 cent per pound.	1 cent per pound.
82	Soap, Castile and other.	15 per cent ad valorem.	15 per cent ad valorem.
83	Sodium bicarbonate.	3/4 cent per pound.	3/4 cent per pound.
	Borax, refined.	3/4 cent per pound.	3/4 cent per pound.
	Carbonate, sal soda.	3/4 cent per pound.	1 cent per pound.
	Salt.	7 cents per 100 pounds.	7 cents per 100 pounds.
	Sodium dichromate.	1 1/4 cents per pound.	1 1/4 cents per pound.
	Caustic soda.	3/2 cent per pound.	3/2 cent per pound.
	Glauber salt.	\$1 per ton.	\$1 per ton.
	Sodium sulphide.	3/4 cent per pound.	3/4 cent per pound.
	Bisulphite.	do.	do.
85	Starch.	1 1/4 cents per pound.	2 1/4 cents per pound.
86	Dextrine.	2 1/4 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.
90	Tin mixtures.	25 per cent ad valorem.	25 per cent ad valorem.
91	Titanium potassium oxalate.	30 per cent ad valorem.	30 per cent ad valorem.

OUR CALF LEATHER INDUSTRY

[From the Boston Herald, August 6, 1929]

To the Editor of the Herald:

Your editorial on The Calf Leather Industry in the Herald to-day was very timely and forceful. As a calf-leather manufacturer I wish to thank you for that editorial for it brought to the attention of the public the present situation of the calf-leather industry which is a basic industry of which the average person has a very poor knowledge.

As I mentioned, the June imports of this year, if continued at the present rate, would exceed 50 per cent of present domestic production. Recent financial statements of American Hide & Leather Co., and Barnet Leather Co., two calf-leather manufacturers, show, respectively, a \$1,600,000 annual net loss, and a \$600,000 six months' loss. Further, the five leading producers of calf leather in this country (American Hide & Leather, Barnet Leather Co., Ohio Leather Co., Pfister & Vogel Leather Co., and National Leather Co.) have not paid any dividends on their common stock since 1922. It certainly can not be said that the calf-leather industry has been asking for adequate protection while earning decent returns on invested capital.

WALTER T. CREESE.

Boston, August 2.

NEW ENGLAND SHOE & LEATHER ASSOCIATION,

Boston, Mass., November 15, 1929.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Some time ago I sent you a list of the principal dutiable articles entering into the manufacture of a leather for use in connection with your arguments in favor of protective duties on this

product, and I now take pleasure in inclosing a partial list of the dutiable articles required by manufacturers in the production of footwear.

This list represents a selection from a longer list furnished me by leading New England shoe manufacturers, and may be assumed to represent the more important items. In this list I am giving you the present duties under the tariff act of 1922, together with the proposed changes, if any, as made in the House bill of 1929.

There may be a few errors in this compilation, but I think that in the main it is a reliable list.

Trusting this will be of some service to you, and again thanking you for your greatly valued aid, I am,

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS F. ANDERSON, Secretary.

Partial list of dutiable articles used in the manufacture of boots and shoes

Commodity	Rate of duty, 1922 law	Rate of proposed duty, 1929 (House bill)
Chamois skins.	20 per cent.	25 per cent.
Seal oil.	6 cents per gallon.	6 cents per gallon.
Grease.	20 cents and 80 cents per pound plus 25 per cent.	20 cents and 80 cents plus 25 per cent.
Bristles, sorted, bunched, or prepared.	7 cents per pound.	7 cents per pound.
Gelatin: Valued at less than 40 cents per pound.	1 1/2 cents per pound plus 20 per cent.	2 cents per pound, and 25 per cent.
Gelatin, valued at 40 cents or more per pound.	7 cents per pound, plus 20 per cent.	8 cents per pound and 25 per cent.
Glue, valued at less than 40 cents per pound.	1 1/2 cents per pound plus 20 per cent.	2 cents per pound and 25 per cent.
Glue, valued at 40 cents or more per pound.	7 cents per pound plus 20 per cent.	8 cents per pound and 25 per cent.
Sponges.	15 per cent.	15 per cent.
Beeswax.	25 per cent.	30 per cent.
Wheat flour.	\$1.04 per pound.	78 cents per 100 pounds.
Vinegar.	6 cents per proof gallon.	6 cents per proof gallon.
Rubber cement.	25 per cent.	25 per cent.
Camphor, crude and synthetic.	1 cent per pound.	1 cent per pound.
Camphor, refined.	do.	6 cents per pound.
Gum arabic.	3/4 cent per pound.	1/2 cent per pound.
Linseed oil.	3 1/4 cents per pound.	4 1/2 cents per pound.
Starch.	1 cent and 1 1/4 cents per pound.	1 1/2 cents and 2 1/2 cents per pound.
Cotton sewing thread.	0.005 cent per yard.	25 per cent.
Cotton labels.	50 per cent.	50 per cent.
Bags, of jute.	1 cent per pound plus 10 per cent.	1 cent per pound plus 10 per cent.
Jute bags, bleached or printed.	1 cent per pound plus 15 per cent.	1 cent per pound plus 15 per cent.
Jute cordage and twine.	3 1/2 cents and 11 cents per pound.	3 1/2 cents and 11 cents per pound.
Thread and twine made from yarn.	18 1/2 cents and 56 cents per pound.	18 1/2 cents and 56 cents per pound.
Bindings.	55 per cent.	55 per cent.
Sewing silk.	\$1 and \$1.50 per pound.	55 per cent.
Packing boxes.	15 per cent.	15 per cent.
Baskets.	35 per cent.	35 per cent.
Cork, manufactures of.	30 per cent.	45 per cent.
Paper board.	10 per cent.	10 per cent.
Cartons, of paper or paper board.	35 per cent.	35 per cent.
Pumice stone.	\$2.24 per ton.	\$2.24 per ton.
Grindstones.	\$1.75 per ton.	\$1.75 per ton.
Emery wheels.	20 per cent.	20 per cent.
Asbestos for packing.	30 per cent.	30 per cent.
Chalk.	25 per cent.	25 per cent.
Salt.	0.07 cent and 11 cents per pound.	0.07 cent and 11 cents per pound.
Graphite.	20 per cent.	25 per cent.
Nails.	15 per cent.	15 per cent.
Tacks.	do.	do.
Buckles.	0.05 cent and 15 cents each plus 20 per cent.	0.05 cent and 15 cents each plus 20 per cent.
Alcohol.	6 cents per pound.	6 cents per pound.
Alcohol, ethyl.	15 cents per proof gallon.	15 cents per proof gallon.
Alcohol, wood.	18 cents per gallon.	18 cents per gallon.
Ammonia.	1 1/4 cents and 2 1/2 cents per gallon.	1 1/4 cents and 2 1/2 cents per gallon.
Glycerin.	1 cent and 2 cents per pound.	1 cent and 2 cents per pound.
Acetone.	25 per cent.	25 per cent.
Chloroform.	6 cents per pound.	6 cents per pound.
Ethers.	25 per cent and 3 cents and 15 cents per pound.	25 per cent and 3 cents and 15 cents per pound.
Blackings and polishes.	25 per cent.	25 per cent.
Soap.	15 per cent.	15 per cent.
Buttons, shoe.	45 per cent.	1 1/2 cents per gross and 25 per cent.
Inks.	20 per cent.	20 per cent.
Candles.	do.	35 per cent.
Wax, manufactures of.	10 per cent and 20 per cent.	10 per cent and 20 per cent.
Brushes.	45 per cent.	45 per cent.
Emery paper.	20 per cent.	20 per cent.
Silk ribbons.	55 per cent.	55 per cent.
Electric globes.	20 per cent.	20 per cent.
Rubber heels.	35 per cent.	35 per cent.
Shoe lacings.	15 cents per pound plus 20 per cent.	30 per cent.
Rivets for shoes.	30 per cent.	Do.
Varnishes.	\$2.20 per gallon plus 25 per cent.	

Importation of women's shoes based on figures furnished by the United States Department of Commerce

	Pairs
1922	47,973
1923	115,119
1924	264,762
1925	272,937
1926	434,895
1927	982,220
1928	2,018,269
1929	5,514,499

Total importation of all shoes—Free

	1928	1929
January	162,982	424,531
February	275,061	507,005
March	316,925	660,495
April	309,160	645,777
May	252,465	566,192
June	169,038	344,109
July	122,417	287,754
August	135,028	408,360
September	154,508	525,465
October	211,876	487,122
November	225,045	676,952
December	282,379	649,021
Total	2,616,884	6,182,783

Importation of women's shoes

	1928	1929
January	126,471	372,029
February	206,874	442,672
March	269,432	587,683
April	266,936	600,647
May	208,534	514,421
June	117,098	310,769
July	80,278	230,937
August	70,532	339,736
September	107,036	460,897
October	169,160	429,097
November	168,386	627,989
December	228,538	597,622
Total	2,019,275	5,514,499

BRIEF OF THE NATIONAL BOOT AND SHOE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION REGARDING PROPOSED DUTIES ON HIDES AND SHOES THE INDUSTRY AND THE ASSOCIATION

In 1927 there were in the United States 1,357 establishments engaged in the manufacture of leather shoes. They employed 203,110 wage earners and paid wages in excess of \$225,000,000. The industry produced in that year 343,976,000 pairs of shoes, valued at nearly \$1,000,000,000.

The members of the association manufacture over 70 per cent of the leather shoes produced in the United States, including over 80 per cent of the shoes for men and women.

POSITION OF THE ASSOCIATION

The association agrees to the rates of duty on hides and on leather shoes which are comprised in paragraph 1530 of H. R. 2667 as introduced into the Senate and referred to the Committee on Finance, to wit:

	Per cent
Hides	10
Boots and shoes of leather	20

The association agrees to these proposed rates of duty, not because it believes them to be ideal, but because in its opinion they represent the most acceptable compromise possible at this time between the conflicting interests that are represented before Congress.

DUTY ON HIDES

The association, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, opposed a duty on hides. The grounds of its opposition were that such a duty

- (1) Would result in an increase in the cost of leather and of shoes, since we need to import 30 to 40 per cent of our requirements of hides and calfskins (as is not the case with shoes), and a duty would therefore be reflected in the price of the domestic supply;
- (2) Would injuriously affect our declining export trade in shoes, since we would be obliged to compete, in the limited market that remains to us, with countries imposing no duty on hides;
- (3) Would increase the cost of living for all our people;
- (4) Would encourage the use of substitutes for leather; and
- (5) Would not add to the income of the farmer to the extent that it would increase his living costs, since, on account of the way in which hides are handled and marketed, the farmer would realize but a small portion of any increase in their value, but would be obliged to pay increased prices for all articles of leather that he uses.

The association has found no reason to modify its views in these respects. It has decided, however, not to oppose at this time a duty of 10 per cent on hides because—

(a) The association realizes that one of the principal objects of the present session of Congress is the relief of agriculture, and that if the farmer still believes that he will profit from a duty on hides Congress may be obliged to yield in some degree to his demands in this regard.

(b) A duty of 10 per cent is two-thirds of the duty on which the arguments of the association were based and is less than the rate first urged by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

NECESSITY FOR COMPENSATORY DUTY ON SHOES

It will probably not be denied that if there is to be a duty on hides, there should be compensatory duties on leather and on shoes. Briefly, the argument is that in the case of raw materials like hides, the domestic supply of which is insufficient for the domestic demand, the price at which the imported article is sold in this country determines the prices of the domestic supply. If it were not so, the farmer would have no possible case for a duty on hides, for such a duty would not increase the value of hides that are produced here. If the price of the imported raw material is increased by reason of a duty, the price of the domestic raw material rises accordingly. The only question is who profits by the increase, whether the farmer, the packer, the middleman, or some other handler of the hide in its path from the animal to the tanner.

Since all tanners in this country would therefore be obliged to pay for all their hides, both foreign and domestic, a price higher than at present, approximately to the extent of the duty, their costs of production are correspondingly increased, and they must sell their finished product at a correspondingly higher price. Yet they must compete with foreign tanners for the American market, and foreign countries which are considerable exporters of leather or shoes (for example, Czechoslovakia, France, Austria, Great Britain, and Germany) impose no duty on hides.

If there is a compensatory duty on leather to safeguard our tanners, the cost of such leather to the manufacturer of shoes will be increased, and for the same reason that operates in the case of the tanner the manufacturer of shoes must himself have a compensatory duty upon his own product.

The great majority of our shoe manufacturers, manufacturing the greater part of our shoes, do business on a very slender margin and can not absorb the effect of a 10 per cent duty on hides.

How large a compensatory duty on leather and on shoes will be necessitated by a 10 per cent duty on hides is a complicated question that the Tariff Commission can best answer. At any rate a part of the proposed duty of 20 per cent on shoes is compensatory as the bill now stands, and while essential if there is to be a duty on hides, does not constitute genuine protection to the shoe industry.

PROTECTIVE DUTY ON SHOES

The association contends that shoes of leather should be taken off the free list and given a protective duty, in addition to a proper compensatory duty in case duties are placed on hides and on leather. Its argument for protection is fully contained in its brief before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, a copy of which is appended hereto. We would add the following:

(1) The platforms of the parties in the campaign of 1928 justify protection for this industry.

The Republican platform read:

"However, we realize that there are special industries which can not now successfully compete with foreign producers because of lower foreign wages and a lower cost of living abroad, and we pledge the next Republican Congress to an examination, and, where necessary, a revision of these schedules, to the end that American labor in these industries may again command the home market, may maintain its standard of living, and may count upon steady employment in its accustomed field."

While at present imports of leather shoes amount to a small per cent of our domestic production, such imports are increasing at a rate exceeding 100 per cent a year, and it seems that they will find no limit except the capacity of efficient foreign factories.

The Democratic platform read:

"The Democratic tariff legislation will be based on the following policies:

"(a) The maintenance of legitimate business and a high standard of wages for American labor.

"(b) * * * Actual difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguard for the wage of the American laborer, must be the extreme measure of every tariff rate."

There seems to be no doubt that the average wage in the shoe industry of Czechoslovakia is about one-third that prevailing in the shoe industry of this country, and to that extent at least the cost of production abroad is less than the cost in this country.

(2) Our industry needs and the country in general will benefit from a protective duty.

The astonishing rate at which imports of shoes into this country are increasing has already been referred to. Statistics to and including the year 1928 are comprised in the brief prepared for the Ways and Means Committee. They show that from 1923 to 1928 imports of leather shoes increased 655 per cent and imports of leather shoes for women 1,653 per cent. We need only bring such statistics down to date.

In the first four months of 1929 there were imported 2,237,808 pairs of leather shoes; of the aggregate value of \$6,450,252, as compared with 1,064,128 pairs of the value of \$3,289,020 during the same four months of 1928. The increase in the number of pairs was 110 per cent, and the increase in value 96 per cent.

Continuing the tendency displayed in previous years, the growth in imports was most noticeable in connection with women's shoes. Imports of women's leather shoes in the first four months of 1929 amounted to 2,003,031 pairs as compared with 869,634 pairs during the same months of 1928, an increase of 130 per cent.

By far the greater part, namely 71 per cent, of the leather shoes imported into this country during these four months of 1929 come from Czechoslovakia, whose imports of shoes into the United States increased 163 per cent over the same months of 1928. Czechoslovakia has become the principal shoe exporting country of the entire world.

If the rate of increase indicated in the first four months shall be maintained during the whole of 1929, imports of leather shoes into the United States during this year will be nearly or quite 6,000,000 pairs.

As this statement is being completed, information is received to the effect that there were imported during May, 1929, 565,342 pairs of leather shoes. This means that the imports for the first five months of 1929 were 2,804,150 pairs, an increase of 113 per cent over the same months of 1928.

These shoes manufactured abroad take the place of shoes that would be manufactured here if none were imported. Of course, all shoes of foreign manufacture will not be barred by any duty that is likely to be imposed. Some wearers will buy foreign-made shoes whatever their price or quality. But it is fair to assume that two-thirds, or perhaps 4,000,000 pairs, might perhaps be shut out by a 20 per cent duty. The labor cost of a pair of such shoes is estimated to be about 70 cents, which would mean, in the case of 4,000,000 pairs of shoes about \$2,800,000 in additional wages paid to the American shoe operative. This is exclusive of the labor employed in the manufacture of supplies, including leather, which enter into the shoe. This additional purchasing power would indirectly benefit all industries, including agriculture, which produce what the shoe operative needs to buy.

(3) A protective duty on shoes, at the proposed rate, will not increase their cost to the American wearer.

It has been variously asserted, and has not been denied, that the productive capacity of our American shoe factories exceeds by from 50 per cent to 100 per cent the demands of our domestic and export trade. It naturally follows that there is a severe and gruelling competition among our manufacturers. No one manufacturer makes any large part of our requirements. There are no large combinations in the shoe trade as in so many others, and our manufacturers of shoes number over 1,300. Monopoly or anything like monopoly or price control are impossible.

Under these conditions prices can be trusted to remain at the lowest possible level consistent with costs of production in this country. It is altogether unlikely, if not absolutely impossible, that a protective duty will have any other material effect than to remove the foreign producer to some extent from this market and to place his products on a cost basis more nearly comparable with that of the American manufacturers.

To-day the price at which an American retailer can buy women's shoes produced in Czechoslovakia makes them attractive to him. He is able to sell such shoes at the American retail price and to make an excellent profit. If, however, the imported article is made more expensive by a duty, the retailer will buy American-made shoes. His prices to the consumer will generally be no higher.

(4) The duty of 20 per cent, some of which is merely compensatory for the proposed duty on hides and leather, is the very lowest that will be effective.

Labor costs in Europe, outside of Great Britain, run from about 60 per cent to about 75 per cent less than labor costs in this country. Since labor represents approximately 25 per cent to 30 per cent of the costs of manufacture of a shoe, foreign manufacturers have a material advantage of us in this respect. This is in addition to probable advantages in other directions, such as a freedom from duty on certain of the supplies that enter into the manufacture of the shoe, and the lower cost of such supplies, due to lower labor cost in their production.

We would rest content with such findings as the Tariff Commission might make with regard to the differences in the cost of production to which we have referred.

(5) It is no valid objection to a duty on shoes that our imports have heretofore constituted no large percentage of the domestic consumption or of domestic production.

The answer is:

(a) That protection is at present given to many commodities where the percentage of imports to domestic production or consumption is smaller than in our case, and to some commodities where imports are not appreciable. This is true even with respect to a number of products of agriculture. Instances in point, among many, are some steel products, automobiles, corn, dairy products and livestock.

(b) That imports of approximately 6,000,000 pairs of shoes valued at approximately \$17,000,000 (the estimated imports for 1929, if present rate of increase continues), are not a negligible item and are sufficient to reduce American factories to part-time operation and unsettle the industry.

(c) That most of the imported shoes are for women, it being women's shoes upon which the foreign manufacturer has thus far seen fit to concentrate. The result is that imports of women's shoes may this year represent 4 per cent to 5 per cent of our own production of women's shoes. Most of these shoes, again, are of one variety of women's shoes—namely, that known as McKay-sewed. The injurious effect of these imports is therefore felt much more keenly than if it were spread more evenly over shoes of all descriptions.

The importation of leather shoes for women alone increased from 1926 to 1927, 102 per cent; from 1927 to 1928, 105 per cent; and from the first four months of 1928 to the first four months of 1929, 130 per cent.

(d) That at the present rate of increase imports of leather shoes will, by the time the next tariff revision may be expected, reach a very material figure.

In 1932, if the present rate of increase should have been maintained, at least 48,000,000 pairs of leather shoes will enter this country.

(e) The American manufacturer is increasingly confined to his domestic market. Exports have been declining steadily of late years. From 1926 to 1927 exports of leather shoes declined nearly 200,000 pairs, and from 1927 to 1928 nearly 1,200,000 pairs. This year they will undoubtedly fall below the amount of our importations, for in the first four months of 1929 we exported only 1,683,488 pairs as against imports of 2,237,808 pairs. Our imports for the four months were about one-half our exports for the entire year 1928.

Between 1923 and 1928 our exports of leather shoes declined to the extent of about 3,000,000 pairs, and our imports of leather shoes increased to the extent of over 2,000,000 pairs. It may be said, therefore, that the industry is worse off than in 1923 to the extent of the total of at least 5,000,000 pairs of shoes, of which the labor cost at 70 cents per pair would amount to \$3,500,000, not to mention the labor concerned with the manufacture of leather and other supplies.

(f) That the shoe industry is not, like so many industries that are represented before Congress, asking for an increase in an existing protective duty. It merely asks that it be given like consideration with other manufacturing industries. It doubts whether any other industry in this country, where labor represents as much as 25 per cent of the manufacturing cost, is without protection and is left to compete with the cheaper labor of Europe on unequal terms.

The statement has been made that American manufacturers have on the average about 40½ per cent protective tariff, and agriculture 22 per cent. Shoes have no protection whatever in this country. They are protected in all foreign countries, except Great Britain, which ship them to us in considerable volume. Canada, for example, imposes a duty of 30 per cent.

CONCLUSION

The National Boot & Shoe Manufacturers' Association therefore asks that the duty of 20 per cent placed on shoes by House Resolution 2667 be enacted into law, and firmly believes that such will be for the best good of the people of the United States.

The association would not normally favor a duty on hides, but if the proposed duties on shoes and leather are retained it will not oppose the duty of 10 per cent on hides.

We append hereto for the information of this committee copies of the briefs which were presented by the association to the House Committee on Ways and Means (a) in favor of a duty on shoes and (b) in opposition to a duty on hides.

NATIONAL BOOT & SHOE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

Duties on leather and shoes—Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Canada

BRAZIL

Upper leather, \$0.8983 per 2.204 pounds (\$0.243 per square foot.)

Shoes—average import duties for seven kinds of shoes, \$2.92 per pair.

ARGENTINA

Upper leather, 32 per cent ad valorem.

Shoes, 32 per cent ad valorem.

CHILE

Upper leather, \$2.43 to \$3.65 per 2.204 pounds (\$0.675 to \$0.1138 per square foot).

Shoes, \$3.65 to \$6.08 per pair.

CANADA

Upper leather, 15 per cent.

Shoes, 25 to 30 per cent.

GIRARD, OHIO, January 22, 1930.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

How can Massachusetts and other manufacturers of calf and kip upper leather in the United States continue to exist when over 61,000,000

square feet of this leather was imported in 1929. This represents over 50 per cent of total domestic production. No other industry has had to face such ruinous foreign competition. Published financial statements of leather companies continue to show discouraging losses, evidence having been furnished you by our statistical charts. Numerous plants are closing their doors, bringing distress to many communities through loss of employment to thousands of workmen. Eighteen calf and kip upper leather tanneries with an investment of over \$50,000,000 now working less than 60 per cent capacity with mounting costs due to reduced production. We beg your support for adequate duty on calf and kip leather.

V. G. LUMBARD,
President Calf Tanners Association, Girard, Ohio.

[From Hide and Leather, January 18, 1930]
THE WEEK'S RECORD

European trade publications note that several countries have raised tariff rates on imports. A new tariff comes into effect in Egypt on February 17. Revised duties on boots and shoes will be 20 per cent. The revised German tariff is considerably increasing the duty on shoes. Italy has practically doubled duties on calf, horse, goat, and sheep leathers. Even the "unspeakable Turk" is revising rates upward on practically all leathers. While the Senate delays its tariff vote, United States Trade Commissioner Woods, at Prague, reports to the Department of Commerce that Tom Bata, the Czechoslovakian shoe manufacturer, will reach a shoe output of 100,000 daily within a few months.

LEATHER

- (1) Practically all other countries have a tariff against leather made in the United States.
- (2) It is our understanding that the average labor cost of the most important tanning countries averages nearly 60 per cent less than the amount paid for tannery labor in this country. It is our understanding that other important tanning countries have untaxed tanning materials. In order to make a merchantable piece of leather, it is necessary for us to import certain tanning materials, which are not produced in this country. One of these materials, quebracho extract, of which a considerable quantity is used, and must be used by sole and belting leather tanners, has a 15 per cent duty. Other important leather-producing countries have no tax on tanning materials of any kind, yet in the face of this, sole leather can be imported into this country, without any protection whatsoever to leathers produced in the United States.
- (3) Other leather-producing countries have free access to hides produced in the United States and other countries, so we have no protection from that standpoint.
- (4) Our foreign competitors have free hides, free tanning materials, and an average labor cost of 58 per cent less than the labor cost in this country; in addition to all of which our exports are blocked by a foreign tariff on American leather.
- (5) From statistics, we learn that leather imports have increased over 100 per cent during the past seven years and leather exports have shown a substantial decline.
- (6) English, German, Japanese, and Canadian leather can and is coming in appreciable quantities into this country and sold at a price for which the American tanner can not manufacture it due to existing conditions. That this is a fact and not a theory is shown by the financial position of the industry to-day. During the past several years, a period of great general national development, available figures from five representative heavy-hide tanners show a capital and surplus shrinkage of 34 per cent.
- (7) This has resulted in American tanning capacities producing only at the rate of about 60 per cent, which in turn has thrown thousands of tannery workers out of employment, and on account of decreased production, naturally tanning costs have increased.
- (8) On leather, we are asking for a reciprocal duty with other countries. Canada, which is our principal competitor, has a duty of 17½ per cent plus 3 per cent sales tax, making a duty of 20½ per cent. Due to the difference in labor costs—the foreign labor cost being on an average of about 58 per cent less than ours—and free tanning materials which Canada enjoys, we are asking for a duty of 10 per cent on sole leather, based on the assumption that hides will remain free, or 20 per cent on sole, rough, and belting leather, if hides remain at 10 per cent duty.

BRIEF ON LEATHER
PARAGRAPH 1530 (B)

Leather (except leather provided for in subparagraph (d) of this paragraph), made from hides or skins of cattle of the bovine species:
1. Sole or belting leather (including offal), rough or partly finished, finished, curried, or cut or wholly or partly manufactured into outer or inner soles, blocks, strips, counters, taps, box toes, or forms or shapes

suitable for conversion into boots, shoes, footwear, or belting.
Present law, free.
House, 12½ per cent ad valorem.
Senate, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Domestic production

Domestic production of sole leather is stated in the number of backs, bends, or sides, or according to the size and method of cutting. In 1919 total production amounted to 19,715,821, as compared with 16,138,229 for 1928. Production in general has increased over 1924, 1925, and 1926, but is still somewhat below the production from 1919 to 1923.

(There is a distinction in import and export records between sole leather and belting leather.)

Imports

In 1919 imports amounted to 1,945,356 pounds. For the past four years imports have totaled:

	Pounds
1925	6,356,269
1926	7,773,982
1927	10,257,414
1928	9,420,976

Canada and the United Kingdom are the principal import sources. In 1927 the imports from Canada were 65 per cent of the total quantity imported, and the imports from the United Kingdom 28 per cent of the total.

The value of imports in 1924 was \$1,748,874 while in 1928 they were worth \$4,444,987.

Exports

Exports from 1925 to 1928 totaled:

	Pounds
1924	22,467,476
1925	19,327,445
1926	13,458,885
1927	9,817,425
1928	10,184,934

Exports to-day are about the same as they were in 1900.

Of our exports Japan takes one-third and China 23 per cent.

Belting leather—domestic production

Domestic production of rough butts were—

1919	2,090,000
1924	1,231,312
1928	846,569

Domestic production of curried butts (no statistics prior to 1926) were—

1926	994,355
1927	962,235
1928	778,797

Imports

Imports in 1919 totaled 177,135 pounds.

For the past four years importations have been—

	Pounds
1925	273,806
1926	285,615
1927	828,370
1928	660,893

In 1925 importations were valued at \$189,411, while in 1928 they were worth \$531,109.

Belting leather—exports

Statistics of exports of belting leather are not reported separately.

Remarks

The American tanning industry is in a very precarious condition. Prior to the war the United States enjoyed a favorable balance of trade in sole leather, and the exports averaged more than 38,394,000 pounds annually. Import statistics do not show the amount of this leather imported in pre-war years but estimates place the total at much less than 2,000,000 pounds yearly. With the exception of 1928, when there was a slight increase over the previous year, there was a consistent decline in the sole-leather exports from the United States. Imports on the other hand have shown a consistent increase in the same period and in 1928 preliminary figures place the imports at almost 10,408,000 pounds. Therefore, American sole-leather producers are not only losing considerable trade in foreign countries, but have also met with keener competition on the domestic market. Exports of sole leather from this country have declined from an average annual volume of 38,324,000 pounds in pre-war years to less than 10,185,000 pounds in 1928. Imports have increased from an average yearly total of less than 2,000,000 pounds in 1919, to more than 10,400,000 pounds in 1928." (Department of Commerce—Special Circular No. 1103.)

The domestic tanning industry has been in a depressed condition since the World War. Many large tanneries have been scrapped because they could not operate except at a heavy loss. Those continuing operation have not enjoyed the almost widespread prosperity of American industry but have operated on a profit basis of 2 and 3 per cent.

Foreign competition is keener. This loss in competitive power on the part of domestic leather is not due to any inefficiency in the American tanning industry but to certain advantages aiding the foreign tanner. Not only lower labor costs favor the tanners of other countries, but they have untaxed tanning materials, free hides, and a tariff protecting them against imports of American leather. The situation is precisely this: American leather is at a disadvantage when competing for either the domestic or the foreign market for, in the domestic market, it must compete with leather sent in duty free from countries where production costs are decidedly lower, while in the foreign market American leather is confronted in most cases by an insurmountable tariff barrier.

The tanning industry, a key industry and one vital to our national defense, must not perish. Its need of help is apparent in light of the facts.

The bill, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, carries a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on hides and one of 15 per cent ad valorem on sole and belting leather. Providing the 10 per cent ad valorem duty is to be retained on hides, leather would require a 17 per cent compensatory duty, a 3 per cent protective duty, or a total duty of 20 per cent ad valorem. However, in case rational action is taken and the duty on hides is totally eliminated, a duty of 10 per cent would prove helpful to resuscitate the American tanning industry.

PARAGRAPH 1530 (B) (2)

Leather welting

Present law, free.

House, 12½ per cent ad valorem.

Senate, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Uses

Leather welting is used in welt shoes built by the Goodyear welt machine. In the welt shoe the upper is stitched to the welt; the welt stitched to the sole. This is the most durable and comfortable type of shoe and one on which the outer sole can be easily replaced. It is used largely in the construction of men's shoes. It was formerly used in many women's shoes, but due to a change in style the McKay and turn shoe has been adopted for feminine wear.

Domestic production

This industry is represented by 11 manufacturers producing approximately 125,000,000 yards of welting per year, with a volume of business valued at \$10,000,000 and employing about 1,000 workmen.

Imports

Imports of this leather in the act of 1922 are classified under paragraph 1606 with many other classes of leather. Consequently import statistics on leather welting are not available. The principal source of importation is Germany.

Exports

Exports—the data on exports—is unavailable for the same reason as that given on imports.

Remarks

The general unhealthy condition of the leather industry has already been considered in the remarks pertinent to articles listed under previous subdivisions of this paragraph. Leather welting, produced from leather, is naturally experiencing conditions similar to those of other allied leather industries.

Foreign competition is a thing of recent years, coming as a result of the tremendous efforts of other countries to augment their foreign trade. Germany exports the bulk of the leather welting imports of this country. Production costs prevailing there in this industry as in other industries are decidedly lower than the production costs of the American producer, principally due to the lower wage scale.

Not only has the German producer of leather welting an advantage in production costs; he is also protected by a tariff of 22 per cent ad valorem.

Leather welting is a finished product; a more advanced stage than sole leather. It seems logical to place a higher duty upon the finished article than upon the raw material. A duty equalizing differences in costs of production here and abroad should, it seems, be the justifiable expectations of this industry from the legislative bodies of our Government. Such an equalizing rate would depend entirely upon the rate retained on hides and leather.

PARAGRAPH 1530 (B) (3)

Side upper leather (including grains and splits), patent leather, and leather made from calf or kip skins, rough, partly finished, or finished, or cut or wholly or partly manufactured into uppers, vamps, or any forms or shapes suitable for conversion into boots, shoes, or footwear.

Calf and kip leather

Present law, free.

House, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Senate, 17½ per cent ad valorem.

Domestic production

Total production of calf and whole kip skins tanned into leather in 1928 amounted to 15,617,325 skins. About a third of the skins tanned by domestic tanners were imported.

Production of calf leather in 1928 amounted to about 132,000,000 square feet, while in 1923 it totaled over 160,000,000 square feet. A chart issued by the Department of Commerce based on actual figures for the first six months of 1929 estimates that production this year will be between 110,000,000 and 120,000,000 square feet of calf leather.

Imports

Imports in 1928 in calf and kip leather amounted to 54,000,000 square feet, while estimates by the Department of Commerce based on the actual figures of imports for the first six months of 1929 place the total imports for this year at 65,000,000 square feet.

Exports

Exports in 1928 amounted to 28,502,268 square feet, valued at \$10,945,803.

Remarks

The comparison between domestic production and imports will reveal the prevailing condition in the calf and kip leather industry. Domestic production is decreasing at about the same pace that imports are increasing. Imports amount to 41 per cent of domestic production, a dangerously large proportion.

The calf-leather industry is in distress. There has been a slackening of production in this basic industry, still overexpanded from war demands. Unemployment has been extensive, sales have fallen off, and decent profits have not been realized.

Its unflourishing condition is largely due to the advantages favoring foreign producers. Foreign labor costs are not more than 50 per cent, in most countries they are less, of what they are in this country, while the amount of leather produced per man is about the same, due to a good knowledge of chemicals and use of machinery. They are in closer proximity to the world's rawhide markets, tanning extracts and chemicals, all of which they obtain free of duty. Here it is different. The American tanner must pay a duty on nearly all of the chemicals and extracts used in the tanning processes, and it is proposed in the bill as reported by the Finance Committee to place a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on hides. The high rates on many of these essential commodities augment greatly the American producers' competitive handicap.

The specific difference in costs of production here and abroad was demonstrated by a Boston calf-leather tanner. He purchased rawhides abroad and sent them to a tanner in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and the Prague tanner tanned the goods and sent them with freight paid into the port of Boston, delivering them at 7 cents a foot, his profit included. That was the manufacturing cost. The manufacturing costs of the same heavy calf-leather tanned by the Boston tanner was 11 cents a foot.

This great discrepancy between foreign and domestic costs of production have diminished and in many cases demolished calf-leather industries in this country. Calf-leather tanners insist that they need a duty of 20 per cent to offset duties on essential tanning materials and equalize differences in costs of producing the imported and domestic article. According to a table prepared by the Tariff Commission calf and kip leather would require a compensatory duty of 6.65 per cent if the 10 per cent duty on hides is retained.

Side upper leather (except patent leather), domestic production

Present law, free.

House, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Senate, 17½ per cent ad valorem.

Production of this type of leather increased beginning with 1928, 40 to 50 per cent over previous years. The increase was partly due to the demand for lower-priced shoes, and partly to improved methods of splitting the hides, and better tanning and currying processes.

Since then, however, domestic production has declined. In 1919 production totaled 16,693,073 sides, while production for the years 1926, 1927, 1928 amounted to 15,476,197, 13,459,212, 11,484,943, respectively.

Imports

Imports of side upper leather for the last four years have totaled:

	Square feet
1925	702,440
1926	473,127
1927	5,934,838
1928	8,949,449

At the same time the average value per square foot has steadily declined, from 30.5 cents in 1925, to 20.6 cents in 1928.

The United Kingdom furnished 53 per cent at a unit value of 15.9 cents; Canada ranking second furnished 17 per cent, unit value 18.8 cents per square foot.

Exports

Exports are decreasing. In 1928, 17,650,272 square feet were exported compared with 50,451,517 in 1919.

The value per unit has been steadily increasing on all kinds of cattle leather from which side upper leather is made.

Remarks

Again decreases in imports and increases in imports are indicative of the depression in this industry, a decline in domestic production. Domestic upper leather of high value (the value is steadily increasing) per unit, is disadvantageously compelled to compete with foreign

upper leather entering duty free and worth considerably less per unit (the value of the foreign product showing a consistent tendency to decrease.) Under the present condition it seems inevitable that imports will continue to increase and exports to decrease.

Chief competition comes from the millions of feet of India-tanned kip and cattle hide upper leather imported annually. The upper leather imported from India is tanned by what is probably the cheapest labor in the world and placed on the American market to compete with upper leather produced by probably the highest-paid labor in the world. American labor needs protection in this case.

The 10 per cent duty on hides would require a compensatory duty of 10.19 on side upper leather according to a table of compensatory duties on leathers required by the 10 per cent duty on hides as prepared by the Tariff Commission.

Patent leather—domestic production

Domestic production of patent leather has been very steady since 1919. Factors upsetting production in other branches of the leather industry seem not to have affected adversely the domestic production of patent leather.

Imports

Imports have gained from 1,809,306 square feet in 1923, to 5,815,547 square feet in 1928. The increase has been steady both in quantity and value.

Germany and Canada are the principal sources of patent-leather imports. In 1927 Canada imported 67 per cent of the total and Germany 29 per cent.

Exports

The export business has been very steady in the last 7 years. In 1928, it amounted to 33,818,203 square feet, valued at \$12,628,208; 35,781,934 square feet, valued at \$12,555,608 in 1927. This was a decrease in quantity over 1927 but an increase in the unit value.

Remarks

It would seem that this branch of the American leather industry has escaped the depressing effects felt by other branches of the trade. Although imports have gained steadily in recent years, the export market has held its own; foreign markets of the domestic product have not been lost. The gain in imports should not disturb American patent-leather producers, because imports are relatively insignificant in comparison with the large volume of exports. Imports in 1928 totaled 5,815,547 square feet, as compared with the foreign sale of 33,818,203 square feet.

Indications are that the domestic industry will retain its foothold in the world markets. Markets in other countries are not likely to be lost, because the superior quality of the American product is widely recognized. Its excellence has made countries like the United Kingdom and Germany, which lead in foreign production, our best customers.

**SOLE, BELTING, AND ROUGH LEATHER
REASONS FOR INCREASED RATES**

- (1) Other countries have free access to domestic and foreign hides.
- (2) Other countries have lower labor costs, averaging 58 per cent less than the United States.
- (3) Other countries have untaxed tanning materials and free hides.
- (4) Other countries have a tariff against imports of American leather.
- (5) American tannery workers are unemployed. (See statement below.)
- (6) America's heavy leather tanning capacity is only partially used; in 1927, 42 per cent was idle; in 1928, 39 per cent; and during the first four months of 1929, 42 per cent was idle.
- (7) In the past five years sole-leather exports have decreased 61 per cent below pre-war years. Pre-war figures are not available on sole-leather imports, but in the past six years these imports have increased 127 per cent above 1919 to 1922, inclusive.

Exports on rough leather are practically nil—less than half a million pounds yearly. Against this we have rough-leather imports steadily increasing to the extent of 11,000,000 pounds per annum for the past four years.

(8) May we call your attention to the very important fact that imports of sole and rough leather to-day represent approximately 10 per cent of present domestic operations? In our judgment, this very substantial dumping of foreign-made leather duty free in the American markets has a dominating influence on our price structure, contributing greatly to the unsatisfactory results in our industry.

(9) The importance of the tanning industry was fully demonstrated in the late war. The drastic curtailment in sole, rough, and belting leather tanners brought about by the industry having been placed upon the free list by Congress in 1913, so far as its finished product is concerned, and a further continuation of this policy without an adequate protective tariff, is an actual menace to the needed preparedness for the country's national defense in the future.

EARNINGS ON INVESTED CAPITAL

In an analysis recently issued by the Standard Statistics Co. of New York City and based on the balance sheets and income statements

of 545 American corporations it was shown that earnings on invested capital were 10½ per cent in 1926 and 9 per cent in 1927 for this wide list of companies.

Three leading leather companies, on the other hand, showed an average of only 2.52 per cent earned on invested capital in 1926 and 1.10 per cent in 1927.

REDUCTION IN TANNING CAPACITY

A number of tannery establishments formerly producing sole, rough, and belting leathers which have been closed, scrapped, or abandoned during the past 10 years for the reason that they could not operate profitably indicates that the following States are affected by the shutting down of these tanneries:

	Tanneries
Pennsylvania	32
Wisconsin and New York	5
California and Michigan	4
Maine, Georgia, West Virginia, and Virginia	3
New Jersey, Missouri, and Maryland	2
Tennessee, Kentucky, and Connecticut	1
Total	71

Even with this great reduction in capacity, current production statistics of the United States Bureau of the Census for the first four months of 1929 show that 42 per cent of to-day's rated capacity is idle.

AMERICAN TANNERY UNEMPLOYMENT

Through a combination of factors such as decreased exports, increased imports, and idle tanneries, a most conservative estimate indicates that more than 15,000 tannery employees have been eliminated. Assuming four members to the average family, we have an excess of 61,000 people who must look for their livelihood in other industries. It is plainly evident, therefore, that this branch of the tanning industry is seriously endangered and unless adequate protection from foreign competition is granted, it faces almost complete extinction.

COMPARISON OF WAGES PAID

Wages paid in foreign tanneries are 58 per cent less than in the United States. Figures contained in Senate Document No. 9, Seventy-first Congress, first session, confirm this great difference.

NEED FOR 10 PER CENT DUTY ABOVE COMPENSATORY DUTY

In event of 10 per cent duty on hides and together with existing duty on tanning materials, our need for 17 per cent equalization duty on sole, rough, and belting leather is plainly shown below.

Leather costs

	10 per cent hides (United States)	12½ per cent leather (foreign)
54 pounds hide, at 17 cents	\$9.18	\$9.18
10 per cent duty	.92	
Weighing and freight	.42	.42
36 pounds leather (60½ per cent), at 12 cents tanning, cost	4.32	
36 pounds leather at 8½ cents tanning (30 per cent less), cost		3.03
Freight on leather	.25	.25
	15.10	12.92

Divided by 36 pounds means in leather 41.94 cents hides (United States); 35.89 cents leather (foreign), or 16.85 per cent, less 12.50 per cent proposed duty, leaves 4.35 per cent still needed.

CAMPELLO, MASS., September 4, 1929.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Following our talk at the Union Club last week, I am very glad to submit a few figures in regard to the foreign business of the Geo. E. Keith Co. Our company is the largest exporter of high-grade men's and women's shoes in this country, and exported last year 10 per cent of the total exports of the United States; as a very large percentage of our country's exports are cheap shoes to Cuba, our proportion is a rather heavy one.

The peak of our foreign sales was in 1920 and they were approximately \$4,500,000. However, that was a war year. In 1916 we exported \$2,700,000. Last year, 1928, our exports were approximately \$1,000,000.

We know that this drop in exports has been largely due to the duties imposed by foreign countries on American shoes. It is, of course, fair to state, however, that these foreign countries are improving their product year by year, and this is, of course, a contributing factor.

I will give you certain selected countries, showing the duty and the drop in our volume in those countries:

Australia:	
Sales 1916	\$68,000.00
Sales 1928	28,000.00
Duty at present, 45 per cent; previous duty, 20 per cent.	
New Zealand:	
Sales 1913	\$12,000.00
Sales 1928	6,000.00

Duty at present, 45 per cent; previous duty (previous to 1921), 22½ per cent.

Brazil:
Sales 1912-----\$70,000.00
Sales 1928-----500.00

Duty, 1910, \$3 per pair. We have no records of present duty. We understand they have been doubled twice in the last 20 years.

Peru:
Sales, 1918-----\$47,000
Sales, 1928-----12,000

Duty in 1910, \$1 per pair; duty in 1923, \$2 per pair; \$3 on patent-leather shoes and certain women's shoes.

South Africa:
Sales, 1918-----\$489,000
Sales, 1928-----None.

Duty previous to war, 15 per cent; 1925, 30 per cent.

Chile:
Sales, 1913-----\$25,000
Sales, 1928-----3,500

Present duty, \$2.75 per pair.

As you know, the duty into France is approximately 30 per cent, and into Canada the same.

Perhaps you would want to check these duties up with the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as our records are not as correct as theirs.

To us as manufacturers it does seem rather unfair that we should be shut off from the foreign markets, and at the same time have our own, the greatest market in the world, free to foreign competition.

Yours very truly,

GEO. E. KEITH, Co.
HAROLD C. KEITH, President.

UNITED LEATHER WORKERS
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
Peabody, Mass., January 21, 1930.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: With the realization that the honorable Senate will soon reach for consideration and discussion the hide and leather schedules of the pending tariff measure I would like to bring to your attention the dire necessity of the leather manufacturing industry for some beneficial remedy to stimulate it into life and activity such as prevailed previous to 1922, when belching smokestacks and humming machinery bespoke a busy and progressive industry, spreading contentment among the thousands who derived and depended to a great extent on the industry for their sustenance and livelihood. We of the industry, both employer and worker are sanguine that if the tax on importations of hides and finished leather that was voted by the House, and is listed in the schedules now under deliberation by the Senate, should be enacted into law and put in force the relief asked and needed would be realized by a trade that has borne its share of suffering because of the unjust competition imposed by the ever-increasing amount of leather imported through our ports of entry since the Fordney-McCumber bill became law in 1922. Trusting, dear Senator, that your voice and vote on the above-mentioned schedules shall be heard and cast, firstly, of course, as conscience dictates, and, secondly, with a thought and care for the aspirations and hopes harbored in the hearts of your friends back home here in eastern Massachusetts. I am

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN J. GRIFFIN,
Secretary National Executive Board,
United Leather Workers of America.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have listened, as the Senate always listens, with interest, with respect, and with instruction to the earnest speeches of the exceedingly able and genial Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and since the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] resorted to the classics this morning that would seem to be in order; and I would commend to the Senator from Massachusetts a line from the classics. I shall begin with Spenser:

Who will not mercy unto others show,
How can he mercy ever hope to have?

Then to quote from Alexander Pope, over a century later:

That mercy I to others show,
That mercy show to me.

Some Senators saw no injustice in requiring the cowboys and the farmers of this country to compete with the Argentine, Brazil, and Mexico on hides, but they rend the air when we ask their constituents to compete with Czechoslovakia in making shoes.

Mr. President, he who lives by free trade shall die by free trade, and if the hides produced upon the farm go upon the free list shoes should go upon the free list. Justice should be done. The great fundamental error, as I conceive, in the dogma of the Republican Party on the tariff question is that it has always

considered the tariff to be merely for the protection of the factories. We say that the Republican tariff policy will fail, and ought to fail, if the benefits of the tariff are to go only upon the products of the factory. We say if this is to be a tariff country, then the benefits of the tariff should extend also to the products of the farm, of the field, of the forest, of the mine, of the ranch, and of the quarry.

Mr. HAWES obtained the floor.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for one moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HAWES. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. I want to make one comment, Mr. President, upon the statement just made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. The Senator mentioned the American cowboy. The cowboy in the Argentine, who has much to do with the raising of cattle that produce a large quantity of the hides that come into this country, has an easy time compared with the American cowboy. I know something of his life; I know what the American cowboy has to go through in the winter. He frequently has to make his bed on the ground and to lie there in the snow during blizzards when the temperature is below zero. He has to go without meals time and again; he has to undergo many hardships.

I merely desire to make that brief comment in favor of the man who raises the American cattle and who is discriminated against when the cattle of other countries to the south of us are brought into the United States to compete with ours and which cause our cattlemen serious loss.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, between Arizona and Massachusetts lies the State of Missouri. In the State of Missouri there are made more shoes than are made in any other State in the Union, and in the State of Missouri where more shoes are made than in any other State the manufacturers of shoes are for free hides and free shoes. So I can not join with my friend from the West or with my friend from the East.

We have just saved the American people from the imposition of a tax of \$100,000,000. The great shoe manufacturers of the central West when they opposed a duty on hides did not ask for a tariff on shoes. They are consistent; they are willing to face competition.

So I can not agree with my friend from Massachusetts, nor can I agree with the distinguished Senator who would punish the Senator from Massachusetts because he does not favor high-priced hides.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HAWES. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have been disposed to favor the rates recommended by the Finance Committee on hides, which were arrived at, I assume, by the majority party members of the Finance Committee after careful consideration of the claims of those asking for duties upon hides and leather and boots and shoes. Frankly, I have not been convinced that any duty proposed on hides would benefit the cattle raiser. It has seemed to me any duty on hides would benefit the packers and prove most burdensome to the various manufacturers of leather and the vast group of consumers who use and wear leather goods and leather footwear.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, we can put a tariff on some commodities and add to their cost for the benefit of sections, but shoes are an absolute necessity; to levy a tariff tax on them is like levying a direct tax upon every household; it constitutes a tax from which there can be no escape.

We have defeated a proposal to tax the American people \$100,000,000; let us defeat the entire proposal and keep the price of shoes from going beyond the point where they are to-day, which we know is altogether too high.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. DILL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator from Washington desires to speak, I yield to him. I was simply going to call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I have listened with much interest to the statements of the able Senator from Massachusetts. I recall most distinctly that the Senator from Massachusetts led the fight on this side against a tariff on forest products in my section of the country, and I commend to him now, to his own lips, the chalice which he would have us drink, in the form of free trade on the products of the section he represents.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the able Senator from Massachusetts deprecates the fact that the Senate is disposed to vote down any tariff on shoes whatever. If a 5 cents specific duty on hides for which we asked had been granted, the compensatory duty on the kind of shoes to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred would amount to but 4 per cent ad valorem, and yet there is in the bill a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on shoes, and if the same rate on hides that is proposed by this bill, 10 per cent ad valorem, should be retained, the compensatory duty would be only 1.3 per cent. The Senator was not willing to give to the farmer even 4 cents specific duty on hides, but he wants the 20 per cent protection carried in this bill for shoes manufactured in Massachusetts. That is the situation.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOWELL. Many are indifferent or are not willing to do what is fair and right by the farmer in the West, but the industrialists in the East want and are usually granted about all there is in the locker. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Was the Senator in favor of a protective duty upon leather and shoes in the event of a specific duty of 5 cents a pound on hides being incorporated in the bill?

Mr. HOWELL. I stood for a 6-cent specific duty, because hides can be produced in Argentina and laid down in the port of New York for 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents a pound less than they can be produced in this country. I stood for a 6-cent duty on hides, but I was willing as a compromise to accept 5 cents.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the Senator did not understand my question. I asked him if he was in favor of protective duty—not a compensatory duty, but a protective duty—on leather in the event of a 5-cent duty upon hides being incorporated in the bill.

Mr. HOWELL. I was and I am, if the farmer is granted his just deserts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So the Senator would have voted for a protective duty on shoes?

Mr. HOWELL. I would have voted for a compensatory duty on shoes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is what I understood; but not for a protective duty.

Mr. HOWELL. I might have voted for a protective duty upon a certain class of women's shoes, and I was willing to be more than fair to the tanners, but there is no tendency to be fair to the farmer in connection with hides.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I will not take more than a minute or two, because I think the Senate desires to vote on the amendment now pending. I fear, however, that I might be misunderstood by my colleagues because of what I said yesterday and because of my vote to-day.

I know that it is the desire of every individual Senator to do what is right by all industries, including the farmer. I have been in favor of a duty on hides provided such duty would be carried on to the manufactured articles made out of hides, but I thought that a duty of 6 cents or 5 cents or 4 cents on hides was higher than could be justified.

In the House in 1922 we voted for a duty on hides when the bill was considered in Committee of the Whole, and I was strongly for such a duty, but when the bill was considered in the House the very gentlemen who had supported the duty on hides when the bill was in Committee of the Whole voted against the compensatory duty on the products made from hides. I thought it was wholly illogical and inequitable, because, if a protective tariff is ever to be applicable, it is primarily to take care of the labor; and if the finished product is regarded we must regard the labor that is in it. For that reason I reversed my vote in the House after the bill got out of the Committee of the Whole into the House itself, because of that inconsistency.

I am standing in the same place to-day. I desire to vote for a reasonable protective duty on hides. I think it is a subject that is logically carried by the protective-tariff argument. It is one of the items which lend themselves to the protection of this sort of legislation; but I could not go along with the size of the protection that is being offered.

I had hoped that we should be able to give the protection that is offered in the committee's report. Now comes a proposal to strike that out, which means that it will go back on the free list; and, of course, if we put hides on the free list, it is quite logical that we will put on the free list things made out of hides, unless the labor employed in the finished product is in such competition with the labor producing the competing article in Europe that it becomes necessary to protect the article to save the industry. In that case, I should vote for protection to make up the difference in the cost of labor on the two items.

I am quite convinced that there is justification in placing hides on the dutiable list, and I had hoped we might be able to do it. I am certainly convinced that there ought to be protection to the tanning industry. That industry is especially hard hit, as the testimony shows. I am ready to consider in detail whether shoes should be protected, even though we place a duty on hides. There is a possibility that an organization might be so efficient that with an additional duty on the raw material it might not be required on the finished article; but I assume it will be required on the finished article. I had hoped that the situation would be such that we could vote a duty upon hides, a reasonable duty on leather, and, if the facts justify it, a duty on shoes, making up not only the compensatory duty but what the competition would demand.

I am logical and consistent in my view; but having voted against the high rate proposed on hides, and since it now looks as if we may not have a chance to vote for the committee amendment, I wanted to make this statement to show that there is no inconsistency between what I stated the other day and my position to-day.

I hope that the proposal of the Senator from Idaho, which would place hides on the free list, will not be accepted. Then I hope we will do the same thing with leather, and leave open the question of shoes for consideration as to what should be the rate.

That is my attitude on this whole subject. I understand that the proposal of the Senator from Idaho is to strike out the whole thing, which would place hides, leather, and shoes on the free list, as they are to-day.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; the proposal of the Senator from Idaho is to incorporate equity and conscience in this matter by putting all the paragraph upon the free list.

Mr. FESS. The Senator does not do that in all items of industry and farm products.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Idaho certainly believes that where we can not have protection upon the raw material we can not sustain protection upon the manufactured product.

Mr. FESS. It might be possible that we can. As a general proposition, I doubt the possibility of doing that. My position is that hides, being a product of the farm and a product the production of which might be increased if properly encouraged, invites us to protect it. I am willing to do that. There may be a dispute as to how large the protection should be.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator wants to give a 10 per cent ad valorem duty on hides. The farmers do not profess to be experts about the tariff, but they do know that that is a delusion; that that means no protection whatever; but it will be used for the purpose of putting a very highly increased duty upon leather and upon shoes.

Mr. FESS. The Senator from Idaho will agree with me that every industry ought to stand on its own bottom, and if an industry is in danger of being driven out by virtue of foreign competition, that industry ought to be protected to that degree. I assume that is the view of the Senator. It is my view, at least. Now, it may be that we could not reach that conclusion either by keeping the raw material on the free list, on the one hand, or by increasing the cost by placing a duty on it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the argument which was made against the duty on hides was that it would increase the price of shoes—

Mr. FESS. That did not have any effect on me.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know that it did, because I think the Senator's mind was made up before we started in.

Mr. FESS. No.

Mr. BORAH. But that was the argument which was produced here. The only argument against it was that it would increase the price of harness, the price of saddles, the price of shoes, and so forth. If that was the argument, the only way to answer it is that when we put hides upon the free list, we put those articles also upon the free list in order that the people may not be mulcted with increased prices.

Mr. FESS. If the Senator will permit me, much of my correspondence from the shoe manufacturers has been on behalf of free hides.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and free shoes.

Mr. FESS. Yes. A great many of them want protection on shoes, but a greater number want free shoes.

Mr. BORAH. I have here a very long list of shoe manufacturers who say that if they can have free hides they are quite willing to have free shoes.

Mr. FESS. I confess there is some confusion where the demand for the protection of shoes is limited to a particular shoe made in Czechoslovakia and worn by women.

Mr. BORAH. The Czechoslovakian proposition is a bugaboo. They are sending in a particular kind of shoe which we are not even manufacturing.

Mr. FESS. With the possibility, however, that competition in our own production will have a deleterious effect on that production.

As I was about to say, the argument to protect only one class of shoe, and, in order to do it, to put on a tariff that must apply to all shoes, may not be very strong; but at the same time I will resolve the doubt in favor of the industry, because, after all, that is the thing we want to maintain, not in the interest of capital invested in the industry so much as in the interest of the labor employed in the industry, without which there is going to be genuine suffering throughout the country.

Mr. President, I will say to the Senate that my hope is that we will adopt the committee amendment that has been recommended, which will protect hides, leather, and shoes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, does the Senator really think that a 10 per cent ad valorem duty will protect hides?

Mr. FESS. It will protect hides to that degree.

Mr. BORAH. To what degree?

Mr. FESS. Ten per cent.

Mr. BORAH. No degree whatever, because it never reaches the farmer at all. With an ad valorem duty of that amount, the difference between the price which he will receive for his cattle and that which he receives without it would be absolutely nil.

Mr. FESS. That is the Senator's statement, and it has been repeated by a good many Senators; but, on the other hand, a great many Senators refuse to accept that statement, including the Finance Committee.

Mr. BORAH. Where is the Senator who thinks otherwise who is familiar with the subject from the standpoint of that portion of the country where they produce hides?

Mr. FESS. All the correspondence I have had on the matter of hides, outside of the shoe manufacturers, has been urging protection on hides; and I have had no complaint against the committee report from any of them.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. STEIWER. I merely desire to make the observation, from my own experience in a modest investment in the cattle business and my knowledge of what western cattlemen have been doing, that a 10 per cent ad valorem rate yielding possibly 40 or 50 or 60 cents per hide would not be regarded as any protection at all, for the reason, first, that an appreciable part of the hides comes from animals that are not slaughtered but may die on the range. The hide can not be removed for the amount that the ad valorem tariff would produce. The greater proportion of the hides would come from animals that are sold to the packers; but I do not know of any buyer of livestock anywhere that I have seen operate who would find it possible to pass on to the producer a little increment of 50 or 60 cents per head. Such an increment would be absorbed by the packer without any question at all.

If the amount of duty could be more substantial, the packers could not absorb it. The farmer would know that that value was there. He would know that it was guaranteed by tariff protection, and I am very confident that he would get it, or would get the major portion of it.

The difference between the figure suggested in the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada in the two different proposals, 4 or 5 cents on green hides, and the other proposal of 10 per cent, is a difference between a possible range of \$3 on the one hand and 30 or 40 cents on the other hand.

The thing we are considering, therefore, is not a slight difference in the rate, or a question of an adjustment in order to arrive at what might be the correct figure; it is the proposal to substitute for a duty that might yield something like \$3 another duty that might yield something like 30 or 40 cents in theory, and in actual practice would yield nothing at all to the farmer.

I know of no farmer and no livestock association in the West that has asked me to support the committee rate of 10 per cent ad valorem. They have uniformly requested that I give most careful thought to the support of an adequate duty on hides; but they do not regard a 10 per cent ad valorem duty as being adequate. They do not regard it as being anything more than nominal. They do not consider that it will bring any benefit to them. They look upon it as a sop, and they would regret very much to see Congress pass it and then use it as a foundation for giving higher and higher protection to the tanners and to the shoe industry.

May I add—and then I shall not impose further upon the Senator's time—that as far as I was concerned, I had hoped to vote for a tariff upon hides, and then for an adequate tariff for the tanner; and, if necessary, a tariff upon the manufactured product. I regret very much the course that this matter

seems to be taking, for to my mind it seems inevitable that the situation will lead to nothing save free trade for everybody in all of those allied industries. I regret it very much; but it seems to me that if the producer of the hide can not have protection, and must sell in the world market, he ought to be permitted to buy in the world market.

I therefore reluctantly shall withhold my support to the duty upon leather and upon shoes, and shall support the proposal made by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. FESS. The Senator from Oregon submitted the proposition upon which I stand when he expressed the hope that he would have the opportunity of voting for protection all along the line. That was my hope. But the difference between the Senator and myself is that if the legislation does not provide the protection I might want, I am not going to accede to the proposition that the protection that is offered by the committee is no protection at all. It is a matter of degree, and I hardly think such a contention is supported by the facts.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, may I say in answer to that suggestion, if it were truly a matter of degree, we all might be willing to take a more generous attitude toward it; but when it is a difference between an adequate amount, we will say, for illustration, \$3 per hide, and a nominal amount, which means nothing, then we can no longer regard it as a question of degree.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to this fact, that with live steers at \$14 per hundred pounds, a 600-pound steer would be worth \$84, and the hide on that steer would weigh about 40 pounds. We were informed by tanners this morning that the price of hides is 14 cents. That being the case, the value of that hide to the farmer would be \$5.60, if the farmer got the full price therefor, which he does not. The 10 per cent ad valorem on hides carried in this bill would mean that 56 cents additional should accrue to the farmer on an \$84 animal. Does the Senator think the farmer would ever know it?

Mr. FESS. I assume, Mr. President, that the farmer would be very glad to get 50 cents more than he would get otherwise. If a man can sell his wheat for \$1.05, when it is selling generally for only a dollar, he feels that he is 5 cents to the good.

Mr. HOWELL. Does the Senator feel that the Senate would be generous in giving the farmer 56 cents protection on an \$84 animal, so far as the hide is concerned?

Mr. FESS. The Senator knows that the Senate does not act from motives of generosity when it enacts legislation. It seeks to do justice. Generosity has no place here.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, with 20 per cent afforded by the Senate Finance Committee on shoes, and 10 per cent to the farmer on hides, certainly there was no generosity for the farmer, but there was generosity for the shoe manufacturer.

Mr. FESS. That would wholly go to the labor.

Mr. HOWELL. Is not the farmer entitled to something for his labor?

Mr. FESS. Certainly, and that is what we are trying to accomplish, that is what we have been seeking all along the line in connection with the farm schedule. People keep saying that we are not paying any attention to the farmer. The farmer has always been in the mind of the legislators when they have been dealing with the protective tariff.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, on a \$6 shoe, a man's dress shoe, which costs \$6 to-day, 20 per cent ad valorem would amount to \$1.20. On that pair of shoes the Senator from Ohio would give the manufacturer \$1.20 protection, but when it comes to an \$84 animal which the farmer grows, the Senator calls it justice to grant him 56 cents additional on the hide from which six or seven pairs of shoes might be made. If that is what the tariff means to him, certainly the farmer ought to turn his back on the tariff.

Mr. STECK obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. STECK. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I want this problem in mathematics settled. The Senator contends that 10 per cent on \$84 is so much, and 20 per cent on \$6 is twice as much. Where does the Senator get his mathematics?

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator does not realize this hide situation. The hide of an animal weighing 600 pounds would weigh about 40 pounds. The price of hides to-day is 14 cents. Multiply 40 by 14 and you have \$5.60. On that \$5.60 hide, the Senator from Ohio feels that all the farmer ought to have is 10 per cent ad valorem, or 56 cents, while on a \$6 pair of shoes, the product of an industrialist, the Senator would give the manufacturer \$1.20 protection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield further?

Mr. STECK. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The confusion of the Senator is that in one case he is talking about shoes worth \$6, and in the other case he is talking about a hide, and he mentions \$84, which includes the meat which the hide covers. Why does not the Senator say \$5.60 instead of \$84? The farmer can not raise the hide alone. If the Senator is going to talk about the investment in hides, then it is \$5.60, and not \$84.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the Senator has been suggesting that this tariff would mean something to the farmer, and yet I am showing that on an \$85 transaction, it might mean at the maximum 56 cents so far as the hide is concerned. That is the point I am making.

I want to state further, Mr. President, that for the 21 years ending with 1920 that \$6 pair of shoes could have been bought with 18 pounds of green hide, to-day the farmer must pay the equivalent of 44 pounds of the same kind of hide to buy an identical pair of shoes. That is why in this connection we have been trying to afford a real aid to the farmer. But all we could prevail on the Senate Finance Committee to do was to grant him the possibility of getting 56 cents additional on account of a hide from an \$84 steer and now the Senate has refused to do any better.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GLASS. If we are to have an explanatorial lament upon every vote after it has been taken, how soon will we get through with the tariff bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a question the Senator from Virginia can answer as well as the Chair.

Mr. STECK. Mr. President, it appears to the Senator from Iowa rather remarkable for the Senator from Ohio, who has just been addressing the Senate, to be arguing that he is in favor of this or any other measure as a measure of farm relief. As I recall, the Senator from Ohio led the fight against most of the farm bills that have been before the Senate which the farmers said would do them some good. But I am not going into that any further.

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

Mr. STECK. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The Senator from Ohio mentioned nothing about farm relief. He spoke about encouraging a product of the farm by protective tariff and said we had always done that.

Mr. STECK. That the Senator had always favored that as a measure of farm relief.

Mr. FESS. I did not say "farm relief."

Mr. STECK. That was the natural conclusion to be drawn from the Senator's remarks.

Mr. FESS. "Farm relief" has come to be a phrase to which a great many people attach one meaning and to which others attach another meaning. It has come to be largely a political catchword that has very little effect on me.

Mr. STECK. The Senator is splitting hairs over a definition which I do not care to go into.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. STECK. I would like to get started and conclude; but if the Senator wishes to say something to the Senator from Ohio, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BRATTON. I just wanted to observe that apparently the way to aid the farmer, according to the views of the Senator from Ohio, is to give him a duty of 10 per cent on what he sells and charge a duty of 20 per cent on what he buys.

Mr. STECK. I think that is the theory the Senator is supporting, according to his statement on the floor.

Mr. President, I will admit that there was ground for reasonable difference between those who did really favor some plan for aiding the farmers, through a revision of the tariff, in the consideration of the two amendments which have been voted down. I voted against both of those amendments, because I could not convince myself that if they were adopted, during the further consideration of the leather schedule the rates would not be jacked up so high that in the end the farmer and the other consumers, as has so often happened, would come out at the little end of the horn. But there was reasonable ground for a difference of opinion among the representatives of the agricultural States as to how they would vote on the amendments proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

I want to say that, in so far as the measure now before us is concerned, paragraph 1530 as it is now in the bill, and as reported from the Finance Committee, as a measure of farm relief has absolutely no merit. Not only that, but the Finance Committee reported that paragraph bearing a 10 per cent duty on hides and other duties which I say are outrageous duties on

affiliated products, and they reported that in the face of the testimony before their committee of representatives of farm organizations and representatives of cattle organizations that a tariff of 10 per cent would do them absolutely no good.

I believe I am justified in saying that the paragraph as it now stands is in no sense and to no degree a measure of farm relief, that it will not give the farmer any help, but that it is entirely a protective measure in favor of the manufacturers of leather and leather goods.

It has been proven here by statistics put into the Record by the Senator from Missouri what it would cost every State in the Union should we adopt the increases in these various paragraphs. As I remember the figures pertaining to my State, it will cost the State of Iowa approximately \$1,000,000 if we adopt the recommendation of the Finance Committee, with 10 per cent on hides, and 15 to 17 or 20 per cent on leather goods, and 20 per cent on shoes.

I stated that the various representatives of the cattle and farm organizations testified before the Senate Finance Committee that a 10 per cent duty would do them no good, and I want to read from the testimony of some of these representatives.

Mr. W. R. Ogg appeared before the Finance Committee, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, and he testified in part as follows:

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we do not feel that the rate of 10 per cent ad valorem, which is contained in the House bill is anything like adequate to protect the domestic producers, and we feel that after consideration, the rate of 45 per cent as a basis, accompanied with the appropriate specific rates, should be given as a means of protection to the domestic hide industry.

The 10 per cent rate is so low that in the case of a by-product such as hides, it is very doubtful whether much of that benefit would come back to the farmer. There must be a sufficient rate placed upon hides not only to protect the domestic industry from the importations from abroad, but so that that benefit can be reflected back through the various agencies to the producer of the cattle.

I quote now from Mr. W. F. Vass, representing the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association. In the brief which he filed in connection with his testimony appears the following:

The 10 per cent ad valorem duty suggested by the House is looked upon with disfavor by our stockmen. In the first place it is too small to be of much value, and in the second place an ad valorem duty is not satisfactory because, first, it introduces an additional factor which is subject to error, namely, the placing of the proper value on the goods. There is a strong probability of undervalue of imports when it means a loss to the Government and a profit to the importer; second, there is a variation in the amount of the duty with every change in price and the duty thereby fails to fulfill the purpose for which it was levied, in that it does not represent the difference in the cost of production in foreign and domestic countries; third, it affords a low tariff when tariff is most needed and a high tariff when there is the least need for it.

I placed in the Record yesterday a statement from the brief of the United States Leather Co. in which it was said that they are the largest single producers of leather in the United States. They control 31 per cent of the industry. They said:

As we are the largest independent tanners in the world, a duty on hides of even 10 per cent places our competitors, the packer-tanners, in a decided advantage, as they have first call on their hides in quantities sufficient for their requirements.

I also want to quote the opinion of Mr. Florsheim, of the Florsheim Shoe Co., who appeared before the committee:

Senator THOMAS. You say that 10 per cent on raw hides would amount to about 90 cents per hide.

Mr. FLORSHEIM. On the average

Senator THOMAS. That 90 cents would be an additional profit to some one other than the farmer?

Mr. FLORSHEIM. Very likely so; yes.

Senator THOMAS. Of that 90 cents, in your judgment, how much would the farmer receive, if anything?

Mr. FLORSHEIM. If you ask my opinion, I can not see how he would get a cent.

The testimony of Mr. Henry W. Boyd, representing the J. K. Mosser Leather Corporation, of Chicago, is interesting. He said:

I am president of the J. K. Mosser Leather Corporation, a corporation engaged in tanning and merchandising of leather. The company I represent has some 5,000 stockholders, the majority of the stock of the company being held by Armour & Co., of Chicago, Ill.

It is an Armour subsidiary controlled by the Armour Packing Co. On the question of whether the farmer would get any benefit from the 10 per cent duty I quote Mr. Boyd as follows:

Further than that—speaking further about hides—I know that against every bullock that is killed, as far as Armour & Co. is concerned, the market price of the hide is figured against the cost of the beef. It either goes to the farmer or the consumer of meat, I do not know which. It is not going to Armour & Co.

Again he said, in answer to a question by Senator THOMAS:

Senator THOMAS. If a sufficient duty is placed on hides to double the present price for a cow's hide, in your judgment would not that added price of the hide be paid by the packer to the producers of the animal?

Mr. BOYD. It would either go to the producer or the consumer of the meat; I do not know which.

Mr. Boyd, according to his own testimony, has been engaged with Armour & Co. in the leather business since January, 1909. Certainly, he should know the facts with reference to the leather and hide business. Mr. Boyd stated that he does not know where the additional price would go, whether the farmer would get any of it or not. Others stated that a 10 per cent duty on hides would not be reflected a bit in the price the farmer would receive for his live animal because of the fact that a great majority of the hides that are produced are marketed on the hoof and not as hides.

Since the American Farm Bureau has taken an interest in this matter I want to quote from a report of theirs before the Finance Committee when this same matter was up in 1921. I am justified in making this further statement. So far as the packer and the tanner are concerned there are interlocking relations and there is no different situation now than there was in 1921.

Mr. Gray Silver appeared before the Finance Committee representing the American Farm Bureau Federation on the question of hides. He testified in part in 1921 as follows:

Cattle hides are a by-product of the production of animals for meat or dairy purposes in the United States. Animals are not produced for their hides alone, and the variations in the price of the hide has little influence on the rate of cattle production.

Most of the hides produced in the United States are sold by the producer on the animal and not as hides, but as a part of an animal, the price being largely determined by the value of the meat of the animal.

In conclusion he said:

Whether the increased price of hides would be partially or wholly reflected in the price of live cattle by the packer buyers is open to question. The common practice of buying cattle on the basis of meat value alone would lead to the conclusion that the packer might or might not add the increased value of the hide to the price of the animal as he chose.

Since the packers have about one-third of the hides under their control in their packing storehouses, and more in the tanneries which they control, and yet others under their control in South America, their control of the situation is evident.

So far as my information goes the situation is exactly the same now with reference to the packer-tanners and their control of the industry as it was back in 1921. Mr. Silver went on to say:

Cattle production needs stimulation, but the increased return from 15 per cent on $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the weight of the animal is so small as to be of no importance as a means of increasing cattle production.

Previously in his statement he had figured out that that is the way to figure the probable value of the duty on hides to the farmer. He said further:

The cost to consumers of leather products would more than offset the increased return to hide producers even if all the increased price was passed on to the producers, of which there is no assurance. Therefore, we believe that hides, leather, and leather products should remain on the free list.

That was the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation in 1921. It is not their position now, but they do agree now and it is their testimony before the Finance Committee that a 10 per cent duty on hides would not be of any material value to the farmer.

What I am protesting against, and I am going to evidence my protest by voting for the motion of the Senator from Idaho, is putting forth a 10 per cent duty on hides and calling it a measure of farm relief when the farmers and the stockmen say it will do them no good at all, and at the same time using that as an excuse to impose upon the farmers and the consumers generally in the country high rates on leather goods and shoes which, as has been demonstrated, will cost the farmer and the general consumer millions and millions of dollars over and above any possible good that might result to the farmer from the adoption of a 10 per cent duty on hides which are now on the free list.

Mr. President, I believe that hides should be left on the free list as the situation now exists in the Senate. With hides on the free list I believe that the affiliated products named in section 1530 should also be left on the free list as they are in the present law.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I wish to have two telegrams inserted in the Record, one from the Central Trades Labor Council of greater New York and the other from the State organization, requesting and pleading for an adequate tariff on shoes.

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

The telegrams are as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 24, 1930.

HON. ROYAL S. COPELAND,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Central Trades and Labor Council of greater New York respectfully request that you vote for adequate tariff on shoes imported from Czechoslovakia and other countries where low wages prevail.

JAMES C. QUIN,

Secretary Central Trades and Labor Council,
Greater New York, 287 Broadway.

ALBANY, N. Y., January 24, 1930.

HON. ROYAL S. COPELAND,

Senate Office Building:

New York State Federation of Labor requests you support bill to give adequate tariff on shoes in interest of shoe workers in this State.

JOHN M. O'HANLON,

Secretary-Treasurer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho to strike out all of paragraph 1530.

Mr. BORAH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAPPER (when Mr. ALLEN's name was called). I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN]. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK]. If present, my colleague [Mr. ALLEN] would vote "yea."

Mr. BLEASE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GLENN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. On this matter a special pair has been arranged for him, and accordingly I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and vote "yea."

Mr. COPELAND (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent from the Chamber. If he were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. PHIPPS (when Mr. WATERMAN's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea" on this question.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRATTON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. CUTTING] is unavoidably detained and is paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. FESS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am not advised how the Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] would vote on this question.

I also wish to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]; and

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. GOFF. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. He not being in the Chamber, I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence, and not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] is necessarily absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—46			
Ashurst	Glass	Norbeck	Simmons
Barkley	Glenn	Norris	Smith
Borah	Harris	Nye	Steck
Brookhart	Harrison	Oddie	Steinwer
Broussard	Hawes	Overman	Sullivan
Capper	Heflin	Phipps	Swanson
Caraway	Howell	Pine	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	Jones	Ransdell	Thomas, Okla.
Dill	Kendrick	Robison, Ky.	Trammell
Fletcher	McKellar	Schall	Walsh, Mont.
Frazier	McMaster	Sheppard	
George	McNary	Shipstead	
NAYS—28			
Baird	Gillett	Johnson	Smoot
Bingham	Goldsbrough	Kean	Townsend
Blaine	Greene	Keyes	Tydings
Bratton	Grundy	La Follette	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hale	Metcalf	Walcott
Couzens	Hatfield	Moses	Walsh, Mass.
Fess	Hebert	Shortridge	Watson
NOT VOTING—22			
Allen	Deneen	McCulloch	Stephens
Black	Goff	Patterson	Wagner
Blense	Gould	Pittman	Waterman
Brock	Hastings	Reed	Wheeler
Cutting	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.	
Dale	King	Robinson, Ind.	

So Mr. BORAH's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to move to strike out paragraph 1531 and to substitute therefor the paragraph of the present law covering the subject matter.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to make an explanation of the paragraph.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say to the Senator from Idaho that the Chair is informed that the agreement relative to offering amendments applied only to the previous section.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator from Idaho will allow me to make a statement before he asks for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand the Chair, I can not move the amendment at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. It is a committee amendment which is pending.

Mr. NORRIS. If the unanimous-consent agreement did not extend to this paragraph it should be made to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I should like very much to have that done, because I desire to complete the entire schedule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Will the Senator from Idaho please send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. BORAH. I move to strike out paragraph 1531 and to substitute therefor the paragraph of the present law covering the subject matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will merely make a brief statement, if the Senate will permit me.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the rate of duty fixed in the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator.

Mr. President, the act of 1922 carried a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem for ordinary bags, and so forth, and for those permanently fitted 45 per cent ad valorem. In the pending bill the House provided in the case of ordinary bags a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem, and in the case of permanently fitted bags 50 per cent ad valorem. The Finance Committee reported a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on ordinary bags and on permanently fitted 55 per cent ad valorem, and in the case of those made of parchment 30 per cent ad valorem.

The last-named rate represents a reduction and the others represent increases.

On bags, baskets, belts, and satchels made of leather the House raised the duty 5 per cent in each of the brackets, using the language of the act of 1922. The Finance Committee raised the rates in the House bill by 5 per cent, but in case the articles in the first brackets are wholly or in chief value of parchment the Finance Committee inserted new language, which reduced the House rate to 30 per cent ad valorem.

The testimony indicated that there was a wide difference between foreign and domestic labor costs, and that labor represented from 30 to 35 per cent of the selling price of the manufactured article. The Finance Committee considered it more desirable to assess the fitted cases as an entirety rather than to provide that the articles should be assessed separately, as it

would be difficult to determine the value of the individual units in the fitted case. That has been the difficulty in the administration of this paragraph since the act of 1909.

Mr. BORAH. If we shall strike it all out, it will eliminate that difficulty.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the present law presents the same difficulty in the case of the fitted articles. Take an article, whether it be a pocketbook or a hand bag, fitted with a looking-glass mounted in silver or gold, it is almost impossible to determine the value of the leather that is in the article. This paragraph is framed to obviate the difficulty of administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are the rates of present law lower or higher than those of the pending bill?

Mr. SMOOT. The rate in the bill in the case of articles made of parchment is the same as in present law. The ad valorem rate in the existing law on ordinary bags is 30 per cent, and on permanently fitted, 45 per cent. The House bill provided a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on the ordinary article and on the permanently fitted 50 per cent ad valorem, which is 5 per cent increase in both brackets of the paragraph.

The Finance Committee fixed the duty at 40 per cent ad valorem on the ordinary bag and on the permanently fitted at 55 per cent ad valorem; but in the case of parchment we reduced the rate to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. McKELLAR. As a whole, however, there is an increase?

Mr. SMOOT. As a whole, there is an increase; but I wish to say that we ought to make provision with respect to the permanently fitted articles. I would not object especially to the action proposed if we could do that.

Mr. BORAH. We can do that afterwards.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho is subject to amendment.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask the Senator are the increases carried in paragraph 1531 due to the action of the committee in putting a tariff on hides and leather?

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. HARRISON. The committee did not recommend the rates in this paragraph on account of the leather tariff which was proposed.

Mr. SMOOT. Take some of the articles that fall in paragraph 1531, such as a purse costing \$5, or a bag selling for from \$3 to \$10 or \$15; the amount of leather in it does not amount to much.

Mr. HARRISON. That is contrary to the argument which was made during the consideration of the leather schedule.

Mr. SMOOT. In the case of a pair of shoes, of course, it is different.

Mr. HARRISON. But leather enters into the articles under this paragraph to some extent.

Mr. SMOOT. To some extent; but I want to say frankly to the Senator that that was not the reason for the increases proposed.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator give us a justification for the proposed increased duties in this paragraph?

Mr. SMOOT. From the Summary of Tariff Information it appears that the articles under this paragraph are divided into groups. The imports of bags and satchels, and so forth, increased from \$43,012 in 1919 to \$2,782,932 in 1923.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is referring to the imports?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The imports do not seem to be very heavy; they are relatively small, I should say. The Senator has not given us the figures as to the total production in the United States, but I assume that the imports are a mere fraction of the total domestic production.

Mr. SMOOT. They are perhaps but a fraction.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator hold that whenever there are small importations, and the volume of importations slightly increases, there must be an additional duty imposed for the purpose of preventing not only an increase but of excluding as far as possible any imports whatsoever?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will remember when we had under consideration the tariff bills in 1909, 1913, and 1922 he will recall that this same question arose. The existing law and previous laws have brought about the condition I have indicated. For instance, take a traveling case containing scissors

or a thermos bottle inclosed in leather. In the past the scissors have been shipped in separately and are fitted in the case afterwards. That has been done right along.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no doubt there are tricks in all trades, including the importation business as well as that of exportation; but does the Senator recall any insistent demand for these increases? Of course, I understand, Mr. President, that there grew up in this country last year a feeling that this was a mighty good time for the industrialists of America to ask for additional tariff rates, and they came here in great numbers and asked for a great many increases in rates.

I desire to ask the Senator a question: If nobody had come here asking for these increases, and the committee had acted solely upon this slight increase of importations, does the Senator think the committee would have suggested any increase?

Mr. SMOOT. Based upon the amount of importations it is a little doubtful whether the committee would have done it. I will frankly state that.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think so. Then you must have done it upon the importations of these gentlemen, who are always anxious to get enough tariff to exclude any importations whatever of the articles they produce.

Mr. SMOOT. I really think that the most important part of the amendment is the part where the Finance Committee considered it more desirable to assess the fitted cases as an entirety than to provide that the articles should be assessed separately. I think the Senator will agree to that.

Mr. SIMMONS. No, Mr. President; it seems to me that no case has been made out which would justify any increase. I doubt very much whether a case has been made out to retain the duties of the present law. I am inclined to think they were too high, very much too high. We do not seem to think in this country that a 50 per cent duty amounts to anything; but when the purchaser of that article goes to pay for it, and has to pay this 50 per cent in addition to what he otherwise would have to pay, he realizes what it means. He realizes that it is not only a tax burden, but a tax burden of the most onerous character.

I really do not think the Senator ought to insist upon retaining those increases.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me suggest to the Senator, then, to leave the existing law, with the exception of the part up there where it says "permanently fitted and furnished with traveling, bottle, drinking, dining or luncheon, sewing, manicure, or similar sets." Change the 45 per cent of the existing law to 55 per cent and leave the others just exactly in the wording that they are.

I think that would reach the situation, although the rate is lower than the House had it, and it is lower than the one we have reported; but, as I understand, the Senator moves to strike out this paragraph and insert the existing law. If that were done I should like to have the existing law read as follows:

Any of the foregoing permanently fitted and furnished with traveling, bottle, drinking, dining or luncheon, sewing, manicure, or similar sets, 55 per cent ad valorem.

That is all that would be changed from existing law; and it would take care of just those permanently fitted and finished articles.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me ask a question, so that I may be clear: We have now rejected in toto paragraph 1530, have we not?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. That is all gone?

Mr. SMOOT. That is the present law.

Mr. COPELAND. So we have already invaded the homes of the workingmen and decided that labor must be poorly paid, with unemployment; in other words, the same conditions that prevail at present. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] prevails relative to paragraph 1531, then what happens as regards all these items?

Mr. SMOOT. I say then we could return to the act of 1922 as far as—

Bags, baskets, belts, satchels, cardcases, pocketbooks, jewel boxes, portfolios, and other boxes and cases, not jewelry, wholly or in chief value of leather or parchment, and moccasins, and manufactures of leather, rawhide, or parchment, or of which leather, rawhide, or parchment is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Then the present law goes on:

Any of the foregoing permanently fitted and furnished with traveling, bottle, drinking, dining, or luncheon, sewing, manicure, or similar sets, 45 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the present law.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. All I ask is to go back to and agree to the present law, as suggested by the Senator from Idaho, with the exception of having the 45 per cent raised to 55 per cent on the permanently fitted and furnished traveling bags, and so forth.

Mr. COPELAND and Mr. HARRISON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment. This is what happens: For the administrative feature, in the first place, the department wants some action upon this matter; and, for another thing, this is what can be done and is being done:

They can have a traveling bottle imported here, and under existing conditions they take off the leather case of the traveling bottle; they ship that in as a piece of leather now, at a very low rate, indeed, and then they will ship in the glass bottle as a glass bottle; and then, when both of them get here, they put them together and avoid the duty of 45 per cent ad valorem. It seems to me that we ought to take care of that if we can.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senate committee did not change that language, except that they increased the rate from 45 to 55 per cent. Is not that true?

Mr. SMOOT. Let me see.

Mr. HARRISON. That is in the present law.

Any of the foregoing permanently fitted and furnished—

And so forth, is in the present law.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. The only difference between this provision and the present law is that you have increased the duty from 45 per cent in the present law to 55 per cent here. In the present law it was 30 per cent ad valorem on all these things. In other words, there was a differential of 15 per cent. If we go back to the present law of 30 per cent, and put 45 per cent on this, then you still have a differential of 15 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. But, Mr. President, the 30 per cent ad valorem in the case of parchment is the amendment we now have offered here, and 40 per cent ad valorem in the case of leather or rawhide.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand; and the present law is 30 per cent on all of them.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; the present law is 45 per cent, and that is why we put this decrease in here.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; the present law is 45 per cent instead of 50.

Mr. SMOOT. That is on the permanently fitted and furnished bags and cases.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I mean.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is right.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator was not talking about that. He was talking about the present law as to the other things mentioned in the beginning of that paragraph.

Mr. SMOOT. I am aware of that; and therefore I said the Senator was wrong in the rate.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, I want to ask the Senator from Utah a question. Here we have 30 per cent ad valorem in the case of parchment.

Mr. SMOOT. And the House had 35 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. What is the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. The present law is 30 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. In the next paragraph, 40 per cent ad valorem in the case of leather or rawhide, what is the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. Thirty per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. When you fixed these additional rates upon the finished product, you made the rate 55 per cent in connection with a 40 per cent duty on the raw material, rawhides. When you go back from 40 per cent to the present law on rawhides, which is 30 per cent, ought you not to reduce that rate somewhat from the rate you fixed in the committee?

Mr. SMOOT. These permanently fitted and furnished traveling bags and bottles are not made out of parchment, Mr. President. This has reference to 30 per cent ad valorem in the case of parchment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator mean to say that all of the articles that are described here on page 229, I believe—

Mr. SMOOT. Page 228.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; page 229. That all of the articles described on the two and a half lines on page 229 are made from the raw materials described in the beginning of paragraph 1531, upon which you fixed the rate of 30 per cent?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to read the present law? I think it will clarify the whole situation.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not the present law before me, and I should like very much to have it read.

Mr. SMOOT. I have already read the present law.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, let me get this straight. The Senator from Utah read one thing, and he contended with me that I was incorrect about it. I want to read it and show that the Senator was wrong about it.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I misunderstood the Senator; that is all.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I think there is just a misunderstanding.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the trouble I have with the matter. I think the Senator from Mississippi has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. SMOOT. He did not correctly state it as I understood him to make the statement; that is all.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator stated that in the present law on all these matters with the exception of articles made out of parchment the duty was 45 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President.

Mr. HARRISON. I stated that on all these matters it was 30 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. That is right.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but if "any of the foregoing" were "permanently fitted and finished with traveling, bottle, drinking, dining or luncheon, sewing, manicure, or similar sets," then it was 45 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not understand the Senator, then, or the Senator did not understand me.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say that I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. What the Senator wants to do now is this: We say that the rate on these bags, baskets, and things made out of rawhide, parchment, or what not, should be 30 per cent—that is the present law—and that the rate on those in this other classification, where they are fitted with bottles, drinking, dining or luncheon, sewing, and manicure sets, and all those things, ought not to be over 45 per cent, as in the present law, because there is a 15 per cent differential in the present law, and there is no necessity to give them 25 per cent in this law.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the only question; and in voting on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho, if that amendment is adopted, the existing law becomes effective as far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. HARRISON. The only difference between the Senator and myself is that he takes the position that these bags can carry a duty of 30 per cent, just as in the present law, if they are made out of parchment or rawhide; but if they are fitted out with these traveling bottles, drinking and manicure sets, and so forth, he contends that they should have a 25 per cent additional duty. We contend, on the other hand, that they should have only a 15 per cent additional duty.

Mr. SMOOT. The only difference is this, Mr. President: That would be ample if they came into this country in completed form; but wherever there is a lower rate on any of the permanently fitted articles provided for here, the importers will take them out of the permanent fittings, ship them in separately, and get the advantage. That is all there is to it.

Mr. HARRISON. How could they ship them in separately? The duty on an article coming in as a leather bag would be 30 per cent. If it came in under the other classification, they would have to pay a duty on it.

Mr. SMOOT. All I care about is that we shall understand it. If the Senate desires to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Idaho, well and good; and that will take it back to the existing law.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry as to whether we are not getting into some confusion here. I desire the attention of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. I wish the clerk would state the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho, so that we may know exactly what it is that we have before us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will please read the existing law.

Mr. SMOOT. I read it once.

Mr. COPELAND. Just a moment; I want to see what the Senator from Idaho has moved to strike out.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Idaho proposes to strike out paragraph 1531, "Bags, baskets, belts," and so forth, down to and including line 3, on page 229, and insert the following:

Bags, baskets, belts, satchels, card cases—

Mr. COPELAND. I have no desire to have that read. I wanted to know the wording of the amendment that is proposed.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, that satisfies me. We struck out section 1530, but I did not understand that we had substituted the present law, and I was wondering whether there would be anything before the conference on this paragraph, unless when we strike out we substitute the paragraph in the present law touching this subject.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. FESS. I did not so understand.

Mr. BORAH. Both before and at this time.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, paragraph 1530 was stricken out?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. Without any substitution?

Mr. FESS. And the present law substituted. I understood there was not anything substituted.

Mr. COPELAND. I understand now that the Senator from Idaho proposes to strike out paragraph 1531 as it now appears in the bill, and to substitute the similar paragraph in existing law.

Mr. FESS. I was trying to get at the parliamentary situation with reference to the request of the Senator from Utah. It would be to substitute the present law, with a change from 45 to 55 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. That was what I asked, but if we have the existing law, it will be 45 per cent, as it is to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Utah suggest his amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMOOT. I take it for granted that if the motion of the Senator from Idaho shall be agreed to, the existing law will be substituted.

Mr. FESS. The Senator would have to offer his amendment first.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to offer it, because the committee amendment provides for 55 per cent, and if anyone does not want the 55 per cent, he will vote against the amendment of the Senator, and if he wants the existing law, he will vote for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 229, line 7, after the words "extreme length," to strike out "(including the unfolded length of cuffs or other appendages)," so as to read:

PAR. 1532. (a) Gloves made wholly or in chief value of leather, whether wholly or partly manufactured, shall be dutiable at the following rates, the lengths stated in each case being the extreme length when stretched to their fullest extent namely.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is not that paragraph in principle the same as the one we considered before? This covers gloves made wholly or in chief value of leather.

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator just exactly what changes there are from existing law.

Mr. BORAH. This increases the rates in existing law, does it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; in this particular: The rate on men's gloves not over 12 inches in length is increased from \$5 to \$6.50 per dozen, on women's and children's gloves not over 12 inches in length the rate is increased from \$4 to \$5.50 a dozen. "For each inch in length or fraction thereof in excess of 12 inches 50 cents per dozen pairs." That is the same.

The next increase would be on gloves "when lined with cotton, wool, silk, or other fabrics." The House rate is \$3.50 and the Finance Committee rate is \$2.40 per dozen pairs.

The next is the rate on gloves "when lined with leather or fur." In the House text it is \$5, in the proposal of the Senate committee it is \$4 per dozen.

We strike out of existing law the words "when embroidered or embellished, 4 cents per dozen pairs." That is stricken out entirely.

The next change is as follows: The House provided "That all the foregoing shall be dutiable at not less than 50 per cent." The Senate Finance Committee bill provides "That all of the foregoing shall be dutiable at not less than 50 nor more than 70 per cent." Those are the changes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to state that the pending amendment is in lines 7 and 8.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph be considered as a whole, to the end that the whole subject may be discussed, and perhaps we can act on it as a whole when the discussion is completed.

Mr. SMOOT. The motion of the Senator from Idaho will be to strike it out and to substitute the language of the act of 1922, as I understand it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think I shall have to ask unanimous consent to make that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORAH. I move that we strike out paragraph 1532 and substitute therefor the similar provision in the present law.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, that is a proposition on which I desire to take some little time, and I think that when I get through the Senator from Idaho will agree that a motion could be made that would better serve his purpose than the one he has just made.

The Dingley Act, passed some years ago, provided a specific duty on gloves of \$3 per dozen. That provision was carried in the Payne-Aldrich law, \$3 a dozen. In the Underwood bill the rate was reduced to \$2 a dozen.

When the Fordney-McCumber bill was proposed, a change was made from a specific duty to an ad valorem duty, and at that time the rate was doubled, the lowest rate being on gloves up to a value of \$8, and after that, 50 per cent.

The ad valorem duty has not proven satisfactory. It is not satisfactory to customs officials, it is not satisfactory to the importers, it is not satisfactory to the consumers. Everyone agrees now that it would be better to return to a specific rate, and I desire to call attention to the report of tariff information. From page 53 in a publication entitled, "Tariff Information Surveys" I read the following:

Ad valorem rates proved so unsatisfactory that both manufacturers and importers favored the retention of specific rates. Some persons in the trade doubt the possibility of retaining ad valorem rates even to the extent of substituting a minimum ad valorem duty.

Since everyone agrees that it will be better to return to a specific rate, I have prepared an amendment to this section, which I desire to offer at the proper time, returning wholly to a specific rate. For the information of the Senate I now present my amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute for the entire section. I ask that the same be read for information.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have been temporarily out of the Chamber. I would like to inquire whether the paragraph under consideration is paragraph 1532.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; it is.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I would like to call attention to the fact that this is the paragraph in which the House levied very excessive accumulative duties upon various classes of gloves. Although the duties are high in the present law, there is at least this saving clause, namely:

Provided further, That all the foregoing shall be dutiable at not less than 50 nor more than 70 per cent ad valorem.

Anticipating that it might not be discovered, the House struck out the words "not more than 70 per cent," and left these exceedingly high accumulative duties levied on various classes of men's and women's gloves and putting no limit, such as the present law contains, as the maximum duty that could be levied.

The Senator from Oklahoma and I called attention to this "nigger in the wood pile," a serious omission from the present law in the House text, and I note that the Finance Committee have restored the language "not more than 70 per cent," so that the clause reads now, after the enumeration of the accumulative duties upon the various types of gloves:

Provided further, That all the foregoing shall be dutiable at not less than 50 nor more than 70 per cent ad valorem.

I thought I ought to call attention to that fact in connection with the discussion of this paragraph.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. The amendment the Senator has offered as a substitute returns to the specific rate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Is that specific rate the same as the rate in the present law?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It reduces the rate in the present law in some particulars, to which I will call attention later.

The amendment which I have sent to the desk would reduce the rates now appearing in the section before the Senate, and would return to the specific rate desired by the customs officials, by the manufacturers, and by the consumers.

I ask that the amendment be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GLASS in the chair). The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

PAR. 1532. Gloves made wholly or in chief value of leather, whether wholly or partly manufactured, shall pay duty at the following rates, the length stated in each case being the extreme length when stretched to their fullest extent, but not to include unfolded length of cuff or other appendages. Men's gloves not over 12 inches in length, \$6 per dozen pairs. Women's and children's gloves made of leather, goat, or kid origin, up to 14 inches, \$5 per dozen pairs. For each inch in excess thereof, 25 cents per dozen pairs. Women's and children's gloves made of leather, of sheep or lamb origin, up to 14 inches, \$4 per dozen pairs. For each inch in excess thereof, 25 cents per dozen pairs: *Provided*, That in addition thereto, on all of the foregoing there shall be paid the following cumulative rates:

When lined with wool, cotton, or silk, or any other fabric of whatever name or kind, \$2 per dozen pairs.

When lined with leather or fur, \$4 per dozen pairs.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator from Oklahoma be kind enough to explain to the Senate just what is the difference between his amendment and the provision of the present law which the Senator from Idaho seeks to have incorporated?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall try to do so. We can simplify the situation by one or two statements.

At the present time we are not bothered with the importation of men's gloves. We can eliminate from this argument all consideration of men's gloves, since only 4 per cent of the men's gloves used in the United States are imported. So the American factories have a virtual monopoly in that class of merchandise. It is not figured in the equation, as less than 4 per cent of the total imports are of men's gloves, and they come from England, in the main.

Ninety-six per cent of the importations are of women's and children's gloves, and, in the main, that is all this bill undertakes to deal with.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senate committee amendment increases the rate in the present law in that respect.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senate committee amendment increases the rate in the present law materially.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have not seen the Senator's amendment, but from just hearing it read I judge the Senator has provided specific rates instead of ad valorem rates.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Absolutely.

Mr. SMOOT. I judged so from hearing the amendment read. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that that would provide an equivalent ad valorem in some cases quite high and in other cases quite low? That is the effect specific rates have always had in connection with gloves, and that is why we have kept away from them just as far as possible on this item.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Women's gloves and children's gloves imported are made from three kinds of leather—sheepskin, lambskin, and the kid skin. The better quality of gloves are made from kid. The cheaper quality are made from sheep and lamb.

The amendment suggested by me places a \$5 duty upon the better quality of women's gloves, \$5 upon the kid gloves, and \$4 upon the sheep and lamb gloves. In the event of gloves longer than those specified in the first requirement, the Senate committee provides an additional duty of 50 cents per dozen pairs. My amendment reduces that additional duty to 25 cents.

The Senate committee amendment as it now stands before the Senate provides a maximum rate of \$5.50 per dozen pairs. My amendment reduces that to \$5 per dozen. The Senate committee proposal, in the event the gloves are more than a certain length, gives a rate of 50 cents additional for each additional inch. My amendment reduces that to 25 cents additional for each additional inch.

The gloves that we have to deal with are made only in four States. Fifty per cent of the gloves covered by this section are made in New York State, at Gloversville and Johnstown. The other 50 per cent are made in the States of Illinois, Wisconsin, and California. There are about 10,000,000 pairs of gloves im-

ported into the United States annually. Those 10,000,000 pairs are valued at \$1 a pair in the rough, so the imports are approximately \$10,000,000 per year. A tax of 50 per cent brings the Treasury about \$5,000,000 a year as the duty upon gloves imported into this country.

Inasmuch as the customs officials and the Treasury Department and the Tariff Commission recommend a specific duty, inasmuch as the women's organizations of the country which have made a special study of this section recommend a return to a specific rate instead of ad valorem, inasmuch as the importers and the manufacturers themselves I think would prefer the specific rate, I have introduced my amendment in such form as to give a rate where there can be no difference, no distinction, no difference of interpretation. The present law is unfair. The present law based upon an ad valorem rate permits of a class of dealing between foreign manufacturers and American agents which is entirely unfair to the American glove manufacturer. For example, a glove factory in France or in Italy or in Belgium can have an agent in New York city. They can make their gloves abroad and bill them to their agent in New York city at any price the conscience of the factory agent will permit. They then pay a duty in New York upon the valuation as fixed in the invoice. When the agent of the factory gets the gloves into the warehouse, he can remake their value and sell the gloves upon their real value or upon any value they can obtain from the trade and thus escape the difference between the figure at which they are willing to invoice them for invoice purposes and what they are willing to sell them for to the American trade.

I think that is something to take into consideration. It is unfair to the American factory. It is unfair to the American concern who buy their gloves abroad.

If an honest importer goes to France, Belgium, or Italy to buy gloves, the invoices are made there, and they must pay duty at New York upon the invoice price as fixed on the paper. Some of the glove manufacturing concerns abroad are not as honest as the importers, and they will actually send the gloves here on a one-half or two-thirds or three-fourths basis of value and pay a duty upon that basis. Thus, of course, they save a large percentage of their overhead.

The amendment submitted by myself is not susceptible of misinterpretation. When the gloves come here they pay a fixed, definite specific rate, and that eliminates the possibility of the foreign factory representatives reducing the valuation in their invoices in order to escape the payment of the tariff duty. At the same time the amendment submitted will reduce the tariff rate and enable the gloves that are now in use by the women of America to be purchased at a lower price than under the existing law.

There is a certain class of gloves that can not be made in America, a certain class that are not made here. They have tried to make a glove that would be comparable to the French or Italian or Belgian glove, but they have been unable to do it. In this country gloves are made from leather that is dyed by dipping the leather in the dye, so that the color of the glove both inside and outside is the same. The better quality of French glove is not made in that way. It is made from leather that is brush dyed. They take the skin in its natural color and a brush with a dye and paint the outside of the glove leather. The inside is still white and it remains white. They can not make that kind of a glove in this country.

Here [exhibiting] is a glove that has been worn for four years. It is a French glove. It is brush dyed. The dye in the glove was put on with a brush like it was being painted. The inside of the glove is still white. The ladies of the country prefer to wear a glove of this kind, a French or Italian or Belgian glove, and will not buy the glove that is dip dyed; that is, with the same color on the inside as on the outside. There is no competition in America for the glove I have just exhibited. Even the amendment suggested by the chairman of the Finance Committee proposes to put a higher duty upon a class of goods that is not made in America and can not be made in America.

I understand that when the Fordney-McCumber bill was passed the American glove-manufacturing concerns promised the American people that if the Congress would double the tariff the glove industry then would make this glove dyed as I have explained. They have not done so, however, and I understand they can not make this quality of glove. To-day the 10,000,000 pairs of gloves that come in from abroad, as a rule, are gloves that are not comparable to any glove made in an American factory.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I want to ask the Senator a question. I may have asked it before, but I want to ask it again. Does the

specific rate which the Senator proposes reduce the duty below that of the present law?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It does. The present bill provides for a higher rate than my amendment. My amendment proposes to reduce the rate in both the amendment pending before the Senate and the rate of the present law.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I notice the Senator's amendment does not contain the proviso that is in the present law and that is in the present Senate text, namely, the fixing of a minimum and maximum rate beyond which no duty may be levied. I think it very important that a proviso be incorporated in the amendment putting a maximum limit upon the cumulative duties. I believe the Senator from Oklahoma will agree to that suggestion unless his amendment keeps the accumulative rates below 70 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. My amendment makes it entirely a specific duty, and the basic rate on kid gloves is \$5 per dozen. In the event the glove has cotton or silk or woolen lining, there is so much added and there can be no mistake about it. In the event the glove is lined with leather or fur another amount is added and there can be no mistake about it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What is the ad valorem equivalent in the various brackets?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It would depend upon the price of the glove.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is why I think a maximum provision should be incorporated.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is the very thing from which I am trying to get away.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I figure that under the House provision, if there is not a maximum rate, some of these duties would be three or four hundred per cent.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the rates are lower than the present section before the Senate and are lower than the rates in the present law, then my amendment is better for the consumer than either the bill before the Senate or the present law.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I would like to inquire of the Senator from Utah if a great many of the gloves which have been imported have not fallen within the ad valorem maximum proviso?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If it were not for the proviso putting a maximum ad valorem rate on the gloves, a good many of them would have borne a much higher duty.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only that, but with a specific duty it may run some classes of gloves up to a higher rate than we have ever had. The gloves of which the Senator speaks, imported by Marshall Field & Co., are the brush-dyed gloves. That is what the Senator's amendment will affect in the glove paragraph, as I see it. I do not want to say that positively until I have heard the amendment read again. As I understood the wording of the amendment, that is why the change is proposed. The change is made because these people who have the brush-dyed glove, such as Marshall Field and some few houses in New York, want it. They are a class of gloves that none but the rich of the country can buy. That is why the change is made, I am quite sure.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. My suggestion is simply for the purpose of making a helpful suggestion to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Before we get away from the statement just made by the Senator from Utah, he said these brush-dyed gloves can only be worn by the ultra rich. Here [exhibiting] is a pair of gloves brush dyed, black on the outside and white on the inside. It is a glove that is imported. This glove paid a rate of duty of 50 per cent. The glove is listed at \$9.50 per dozen, so the glove paid a duty of \$4.75 per dozen. It retails at \$2.25. Of course, one would have to be extra ultra rich to wear that glove, I presume, according to the argument of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows there is a cheaper glove like that, which comes in direct competition with the domestic manufactured glove. The gloves, generally speaking, to which I have referred, are imported by the houses I have mentioned. The Senator knows that they are the ones who want the change in the law and a reduction on that class of goods. Most of them that are coming into the United States are of the high-priced kind of gloves.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Here [exhibiting] is another brush-dyed glove that sells abroad for \$8 a dozen, pays a duty of \$4.40 per dozen, and retails in the United States for \$1.95 a

pair. Of course, that is a very expensive glove and only the ultra rich could wear it, according to the Senator from Utah. But if the duties provided in the original text reported by the Senate Finance Committee should go into effect, no one could get that glove for that price. If my amendment should be adopted the price of the glove would not be increased. It would remain practically as it is now.

Here [exhibiting] is the class of glove made in America. The leather is the same color on the inside as it is on the outside, but ladies do not care to wear this sort of glove. The Senator from Utah knows why. If the lady's hands perspire a little the Senator knows what the effect is.

Mr. SMOOT. Is that a lady's glove?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It does not make any difference. The effect is the same. Here [exhibiting] is a lady's glove. I refer this to the Senator from Utah as to whether it is a lady's glove or not. It is large enough for a small man and small enough for a large woman.

Mr. SMOOT. The situation now in effect has been the same for 50 years or more, and nobody complained of it until this matter came up.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. For 150 years we have had tariff rates on gloves. The Fordney-McCumber bill applied a specific rate and I have proposed an ad valorem rate on gloves. The specific rate upon gloves has been in effect since 1922. They have had trouble during the last 10 years in dealing with gloves on an ad valorem basis.

Mr. SMOOT. The ad valorem rate has always been in force, and that was to take care of gloves that were high priced. If we put on this specific duty of \$1 per pair of gloves, which the Senator proposes, then the same specific duty on a \$4 or \$5 or \$8 glove, where would we land?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Here [exhibiting] is a glove that has a \$5.50 per dozen specific rate, a higher rate than my amendment would levy, and yet that glove sells for \$2.25 a pair. Here [exhibiting] is another glove that has a specific rate of \$4.40 per dozen pairs and sells for \$1.95 a pair.

Mr. SMOOT. I am talking now about the difference between the specific duty and the ad valorem duty. The reason for the ad valorem duty is because it makes the importer pay upon the value of the glove.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If they did that, it would be all right; but it does not make them do it.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me give an illustration. Suppose a glove manufacturer over in Brussels makes gloves that cost over there \$12 a dozen pairs. The manufacturer in Brussels has an agent in New York City. He bills the gloves to New York City at \$6 a dozen and pays a duty on the basis of \$6 a dozen. He could not do that under my amendment, but he can do it under the provision proposed by the Senator's committee, and it is being done every day. That is discrimination and unfair discrimination.

Mr. SMOOT. We have said that often and we always took the same position, and the Senator took just the opposite position when we were trying to have rates provided. Does the Senator think now that our officials at the ports of entry here do not know the difference between a \$6 glove and a \$12 glove, or a \$3 glove and a \$9 glove?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If they could open each box and examine every glove, that would be a different proposition; but they take the declaration and assess the value upon it in the main. They may take a few samples.

Mr. SMOOT. They have to take a sample out of every case. That is required by law. We compel them to do that. The importer does not know from which box or case the sample will be taken.

The importer does not know which box is going to be taken out in order that the gloves may be examined. Every box is marked with the kind of gloves it contains, and if there is any question every box is taken out of the package; but no box can pass through the customs unless a pair of gloves is taken out of the case in which they are shipped.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Does the Senator desire the Senate to understand that each pair of the 10,000,000 gloves imported annually is examined?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I do not want the Senate so to understand. I say that in a case of gloves there may be a hundred dozen, all supposed to be exactly alike, and there is always one box of the hundred dozen taken out of the case and the gloves in that box are examined. No one can tell which box of gloves is to be examined. That is the way the examination is conducted in the case of all merchandise. It is done with cotton goods of all kinds which are shipped here in cases, although each case is supposed to contain exactly the class of goods labeled on the invoice.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I realized when I offered the amendment proposing to reduce the rate on gloves that it would be fought.

Mr. SMOOT. It is an increase on some of the gloves and a decrease on others which Marshall Field & Co. want to sell.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The House bill provided as it came to this body that every pair of gloves should be measured, and if the glove had a cuff, the cuff should be turned up and measured, and if with the cuff the glove were over 12 inches in length it should pay so much for each additional inch or fraction thereof. That did not suit the Senate committee; so the Senate committee made it better by levying the duty at so much on "each major fraction thereof"; but they still provide that a glove that is longer than the basic length shall pay 50 cents an inch tax or duty per dozen. I do not think it is fair to add 50 cents to a glove that is five-eighths of an inch longer than the basic measurement.

My amendment provides that 25 cents shall be added; I cut the added rate 50 per cent. The amendment I suggest provides a specific definite rate; it will treat the importer fairly; it will prevent the foreign manufacturer from imposing upon the honest American storekeepers, and it will keep them from imposing upon the American trade.

I submit, Mr. President, that the amendment which I have offered as a substitute for the Senate provision should be adopted.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should like to have a vote upon my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma takes precedence over the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho because it is a substitute for the present law which the Senator from Idaho seeks to substitute for the provision now found in the bill. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are demanded.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, if we are going to have the yeas and nays, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that Senators may know what the amendment is that they will vote on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Allen	George	Kean	Simmons
Baird	Gillett	Keyes	Smith
Barkley	Glass	La Follette	Smoot
Bingham	Glenn	McKellar	Steck
Blaine	Goff	McMaster	Steiner
Blease	Goldsborough	McNary	Sullivan
Borah	Greene	Metcalf	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Grundy	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Brock	Hale	Norbeck	Townsend
Brookhart	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Oddie	Tydings
Caraway	Hastings	Overman	Vandenberg
Connally	Hatfield	Phipps	Walcott
Copeland	Hebert	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Howell	Robson, Ky.	Watson
Fess	Johnson	Schall	
Fletcher	Jones	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator from Utah wishes to speak, I will yield to him, but I should like first to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question. The Senator from Oklahoma has offered an amendment to change the present law and to change the duties from ad valorem to specific. I myself would be disposed to favor that amendment were it not for the fact that I understand, if adopted, the rates under it will weigh more heavily upon those who wear the cheaper gloves.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In answer to the Senator, Mr. President, let me say that under the bill as reported by the Finance Committee, the lowest rate at which gloves can come in through the customhouse at New York is \$5.50 a dozen. Under my amendment they can come in as low as \$4 on the cheaper class of gloves, made of lambskin or sheepskin, which are a good glove but not the highest class of gloves. On women's and children's kid gloves the highest tax under my amendment is \$5 a dozen, which is 50 cents lower than the rate provided by the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The tax is fixed at \$5 a dozen, which is less than 50 cents apiece.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. That is for gloves not over 12 inches long; that is where the difficulty arises. The rate under the bill as proposed on gloves 12 inches in length is \$5.50.

This is the history of the glove situation: Originally a specific duty or a compound duty was placed upon gloves. Now, the Senator proposes instead of an ad valorem duty in certain brackets to have a straight specific duty which will apply to gloves costing \$20 a dozen as well as to gloves costing \$5.50 a dozen. If the Senate wants to do that, it can accomplish it by adopting the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, no Senator on this side of the Chamber can hear a word which the Senator from Utah is saying.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senators are talking all around the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senate will not go back to a specific duty upon gloves. A specific duty of \$3 on a glove costing \$24 per dozen would be only 12½ per cent. The duty on a glove costing \$11, carrying the same specific duty, would be nearly 30 per cent. Why should we not provide for the same ad valorem on the cheaper glove and on the expensive glove? In other words, a specific duty applied to the cheap glove means that the person who buys the cheap glove pays a higher rate of duty than the one who buys the expensive glove.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Will the Senator tell the Senate the lowest possible rate of duty that can be paid upon a glove imported under the bill now pending before the Senate?

Mr. SMOOT. Five dollars a dozen pairs.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, the amendment suggested by myself reduces that to \$5 and \$4, which is a lower rate than is possible under the provisions of the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but after the Senator gets over a 12-inch glove, that is where the expensive gloves come in. That is what these importing houses want. That is the object of the amendment offered by the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah further yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If I may be allowed just a moment, the Senator from Utah objects to my amendment, not because it is going to raise the rate on the cheaper gloves, but because it is going to lower the rate on the more expensive gloves, because, under the provisions of his section, on a dozen pairs of gloves that cost \$20 the rate will be not less than 50 per cent, which is \$10. My amendment cuts that down to \$5.

That is the objection the Senator from Utah has to my amendment. It lowers the duty on the expensive glove.

Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what I have said, Mr. President. On the expensive glove the Senator's amendment lowers the duty. That is exactly what I said it did.

Mr. GLASS. But, Mr. President, the Senator has not made it clear that it raises the duty on the cheaper glove.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the point.

Mr. SMOOT. It lowers the duty on a glove that is not over 12 inches in length.

Mr. GLASS. But still the Senator does not answer the question whether it raises the duty on the cheaper glove.

Mr. SMOOT. On the few that would come in under 12 inches in length; but as soon as the glove goes above 12 inches, then, instead of taking the value of the glove and placing an ad valorem duty upon that, the Senator has a specific duty of \$3.

Mr. GLASS. I have understood the Senator to say that under the proposed law reported by the Finance Committee no gloves can come in for less than \$5.50 per dozen.

Mr. SMOOT. Not over 12 inches in length.

Mr. GLASS. Five dollars and fifty cents?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; under this amendment.

Mr. GLASS. What is the extent of importations under 12 inches? Is not the lowest rate on the cheapest gloves \$5.50?

Mr. SMOOT. I could not say it is the cheapest gloves. Some times the glove under 12 inches—

Mr. GLASS. I mean the cheapest glove that comes here in volume in competition with American manufactured gloves. Is not \$5.50 the lowest possible rate on a glove of that kind?

Mr. SMOOT. I will see in just a minute.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment and I will get the importations.

Mr. NORRIS. While the Senator is answering that question I desire also to put a question to him along the same line, if he will permit me.

Mr. SMOOT. What is it, Mr. President?

Mr. NORRIS. I am trying to get at the truth in regard to this matter. I am asking for information.

I desire to ask the Senator whether it is not true that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma would reduce the duty on all gloves, both cheap and high priced? Is not that true, although it might reduce the duty on the high-priced glove in a larger ratio than the duty on the low-priced glove?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is true, Mr. President, that the Senator's amendment would reduce the duty; but the great reduction would be on the high-priced gloves. That is where the ad valorem duty will come; and the high-priced glove will receive the great, great advantage.

Mr. NORRIS. I rather think that is true, and if we make an amendment on a specific-duty basis I do not know how we can avoid that; but it does make a reduction on the low-priced gloves as well as it does on the high-priced gloves?

Mr. SMOOT. That is, as to the length.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, as to anything—length or anything else.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. The fact that the proportionate reduction is greater on the higher-priced gloves does no harm to those who wear the lower-priced gloves; does it?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know that it will do any harm at all, but I do not see why they should not pay the duty.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not, either.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all I am talking about. If the Senate wants to reduce all of them, well and good. The Senator's amendment will do it. There is not any doubt about that.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah further yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator must admit, it seems to me, that the duty we are talking about now, being a specific duty, it would be an impossibility to change it and impose a lower specific duty without reducing a high-priced glove more in proportion than a low-priced glove. The point I want to be clear about—and I think that is the object of the Senator's amendment, if I understand it—is that his amendment reduces the duty on all gloves.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; it reduces the duty, I think, on all gloves. I think that is so; but the great bulk of the advantage, Mr. President, is on the glove that sells for \$2.50 and \$3 and \$5; and the higher the price goes, the more advantage the amendment gives. In other words, if the glove is 16 inches in length, the importer has to pay an additional rate on the 4 inches. If the length went to 22 inches, or if it went to 28 inches, the same \$3 would apply to that glove. In other words, if the glove went to the shoulder, \$3 is all that would be imposed on the glove.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the Senator is not stating correctly the amendment suggested by myself. There is nothing in my amendment that says anything about \$3 per dozen. My amendment divides the gloves into two classes. The Senator's amendment has only one class.

The Senator's amendment charges the same duty upon a sheepskin glove as it charges upon a kid glove. My amendment divides the gloves into two classes—first, sheep and lamb, the cheaper gloves; second, kid, the more expensive.

The Senator's amendment puts a \$5.50 rate on the kid glove basically, upon the sheep glove basically, and upon the lamb glove basically. My amendment puts a \$5 rate upon the higher-priced kid glove, and a \$4 rate upon the cheaper glove, the sheep and the lamb. There is nothing about \$3 in it. Then, if the glove is longer than 12 inches, the Senator's section charges 50 cents a dozen for each inch or major fraction of an inch in addition to 12 inches. My amendment charges only 25 cents for each additional inch. So, if the glove is as long as your arm, subtract the additional inches from the basic rate, multiply by 25 cents, and you get the additional rate to the basic rate. It is the same principle that the Senator has, but it reduces the rate 50 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, it reduces it upon the very highest-priced glove that there is.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this whole controversy arises over what are known as light-weight brushed-dye women's gloves. The importations are almost entirely of that type.

In the Fordney-McCumber Act the duty upon these gloves was increased 100 per cent, in the expectation that the domestic industry would be able to make for sale in the retail stores these gloves that are popularly worn by the women of America. The House text increased the duty and did what is indefensible by removing the proviso that put a limit on the maximum duty that could be levied upon these accumulated rates that were levied upon various classes of goods.

The Senate committee at least did this: They restored the proviso fixing minimum and maximum duties. They should be given credit for that, and they cut the rate somewhat; but the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma lowers the rates even below those of the Senate Finance Committee, recognizing what even the glove manufacturers themselves now recognize and what the retail merchants of the country recognize—that these gloves can not be made here at a reasonable price for our women. Recognizing that fact, the Senator from Oklahoma has proposed an amendment levying specific duties, lowering the rates of the present law, the House bill, and the Finance Committee amendment, and his amendment should be adopted.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if it would not be better to lower this rate on the ad valorem basis rather than the specific basis. Why has he not proposed an ad valorem rate that is lower instead of a specific rate?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. For the reason, may I say to the Senator from Iowa, that an ad valorem rate is susceptible of handling or manipulating. You might say that it defeats the good intentions of the honest American importer and the honest American storekeeper, who even sends his agents abroad to find the goods, over and against the dishonest man.

Mr. BROOKHART. Does the Senator refer to true valuation?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. True valuation.

Mr. BROOKHART. I do not know but that there is about as much trouble there as there is the other way.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is any danger of that, Mr. President. We have never had any trouble at all in the past with an ad valorem rate; and whether that ad valorem rate is applied on high-priced goods or low-priced goods, that is the proper way to do, rather than to have a specific duty.

If this is done, I want to congratulate the lobby for the importers on having won this fight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho. Is the demand for the yeas and nays seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOFF (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. He not being in the Chamber, I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PHIPPS (when Mr. WATERMAN'S NAME was called). My colleague [Mr. WATERMAN] is paired with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I transfer the pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SIMMONS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN];

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE];

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. STECK].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] are detained from the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—38			
Ashurst	Copeland	Johnson	Sheppard
Barkley	Couzens	Jones	Simmons
Blaine	Dill	La Follette	Smith
Borah	Fletcher	McKellar	Sullivan
Bratton	George	McMaster	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Glass	Norris	Trammell
Capper	Harris	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Harrison	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Heflin	Ransdell	
	Howell	Schall	
NAYS—24			
Baird	Grundy	Keyes	Smoot
Bingham	Hale	McNary	Steiwer
Fess	Hastings	Metcalf	Thomas, Idaho
Gillett	Hatfield	Moses	Townsend
Goldsbrough	Hebert	Phipps	Vandenberg
Greene	Kean	Robison, Ky.	Watson
NOT VOTING—34			
Allen	Goff	Oddie	Stephens
Black	Gould	Patterson	Swanson
Bleuse	Hawes	Pittman	Tydings
Broussard	Hayden	Reed	Wagner
Cutting	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Walcott
Dale	King	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Deneen	McCulloch	Shipstead	Wheeler
Frazier	Norbeck	Shortridge	
Glenn	Nye	Steck	

So the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to the amendment of Mr. BORAH was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senate wants to put a duty of \$5 a dozen pair on gloves wholly or in chief value of leather made from horsehide or cowhide. The Senate committee fixed the rate at 10 per cent. As it now stands, gloves of that character will fall under the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. I do not want that to happen, and I shall reserve the right, when the bill gets into the Senate, to offer an amendment to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, under the section in the original bill gloves made from horsehide, cowhide, and pigskin were reduced from 25 per cent to 10 per cent ad valorem. Inasmuch as the committee saw fit to reduce the rate to 10 per cent, I saw fit to offer my amendment placing them on the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator's amendment does not place them on the free list. The Senator's amendment gives them the same duty the others bear.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. When the ladies of the United States begin to wear cowhide and pigskin gloves they will pay the rate provided in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the effect of the Senator's amendment. It does not say anything about ladies' gloves. It says "gloves made wholly or in chief value of leather."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I offer as an amendment to the amendment just agreed to the following:

(b) Gloves wholly or in chief value of leather made from horsehides or cowhides (except calfskins), whether wholly or partly manufactured, 10 per cent ad valorem.

The House provided 25 per cent ad valorem, and the Senate committee cut that rate to 10 per cent.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, subdivision (b) is a part of paragraph 1532. My amendment was a substitute for the entire paragraph and takes the place of the paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct, and the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah is not in order.

The Secretary will state the next amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. The next amendment is found on page 234, subparagraph (c), covering carillons and parts thereof.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Page 234, line 5, "Carillons, and parts thereof," the committee proposes to strike out "20 per cent" and insert "40 per cent," so as to read:

(c) Carillons, and parts thereof, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I understand that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] wants to be present when this is taken up for consideration, and the Senator from Utah does not want to proceed with it in his absence. I will offer an amendment, which I have already given notice of offering, and have it pending, but I will not object if the Senator from Utah wants to have the amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 234, at the end of line 5, amend the committee amendment by striking out "40" and inserting "20"; and by adding, at the end of line 6, a colon and the following:

Provided, however, That any society or institution incorporated or established solely for religious or education purposes, or any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in the United States, may import free of duty any carillon instrument, consisting of not less than 25 bells of different sizes and weights, together with the keyboards, action, frames, mounting, accessories, and parts thereof, for installation and use in or on one building, and not for sale, under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Nebraska that the amendment is not in order at this stage except by unanimous consent.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think there will be any objection, but the Chair will notice that in the amendment I have proposed to amend the committee amendment, and then to add certain other words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proviso is added at the end of the line and is not in order.

Mr. NORRIS. Unfortunately, the way the committee amendment is proposed, my amendment can not be offered without passing up those two words "ad valorem," which are not amended by the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to permitting the amendment to be offered? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is received.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I would like to strike out lines 5 and 6 entirely. That perhaps would not be in order now except by unanimous consent.

Mr. NORRIS. In my judgment, if we strike that out it would put it back under the basket clause where it was before. The effect of my amendment would be to reduce—

Mr. FLETCHER. My idea was to put it on the free list.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me state what the effect of my amendment would be. The effect of my amendment would be to restore the house rate of 20 per cent on all carillon bells where the number is less than 25. Then it would add a proviso that carillon bells established by colleges, universities, churches, or organizations of that kind, where the bells number 25 or more, not for resale for profit, should come in free of any duty under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury should prescribe. That would mean that practically all of them would come in free because I do not suppose there has ever been an instance where there has been any importation of such bells except on behalf of colleges or universities, educational or religious institutions.

Mr. FLETCHER. That would be entirely agreeable to me. I would consent to that except that it ought to cover individuals who might for some philanthropic reason bring in the bells. For instance, the late Mr. Edward W. Bok, of Philadelphia, erected a carillon tower in Florida. It is a beautiful structure. I think there are 62 bells in that carillon.

Mr. NORRIS. But that was for an educational institution.

Mr. FLETCHER. It was not for his own benefit.

Mr. NORRIS. No; and none of them are for the benefit of an individual. The language of the amendment would be broad enough to cover every instance the Senator mentions.

Mr. FLETCHER. I thought the Senator referred to churches, schools, and organizations. I wanted to cover any philanthropic situation.

Mr. NORRIS. If it is not broad enough to cover them I should be very glad to modify it so it would.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let us have the amendment reported. I should like to know just what it provides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 234, at the end of line 5, amend the committee amendment by striking out "40" and inserting "20," and by adding, at the end of line 6, a colon and the following:

Provided, however, That any society or institution incorporated or established solely for religious or education purposes, or any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in the United States, may import free of duty any carillon instrument, consisting of not less than 25 bells of different sizes and weights, together with the keyboards, action, frames, mountings, accessories, and parts thereof, for installation and use in or on one building, and not for sale, under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the Senator ought to insert the words "or any individual."

Mr. SMOOT. Then put them on the free list.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me suggest to the Senator from Florida that we insert, in addition to the educational and religious societies, "philanthropic or charitable."

Mr. FLETCHER. "Or individual." We would have to put in the word "individual" there.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think there has ever been an instance where any individual has imported or attempted to import any carillon bells for his own individual account.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would like to bring to the attention of the Senator one instance of which I happen to know. The Doctors Mayo, of the Mayo Clinic, imported a very fine set of carillon bells and presented it as a memorial to the American Legion of Rochester, Minn., where the clinic is located. I am not fully advised concerning all the facts, but it is my impression that the Doctors Mayo purchased that set of carillon bells out of their own private fund and made the dedication of this splendid memorial to the American Legion. It would seem to me that language should be incorporated which would cover instances of that kind.

Mr. NORRIS. I quite agree with the Senator, and I want to do that. If the present language does not do it, I want to modify the amendment so it will cover such instances. For instance, I have suggested that we insert the word "philanthropic." Let us put in also the words "charitable or patriotic."

Mr. FLETCHER. And "societies or individuals."

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to the word "individuals" going into the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Then there would be nothing left outside.

Mr. NORRIS. This will only apply to carillon bells where the number is 25 or more. I seek to make them entirely free in that kind of a case.

Mr. FLETCHER. Where they are not for resale at all.

Mr. BRATTON. Let me suggest to the Senator that in line 7, following the words "United States," he insert "or individual for philanthropic purposes."

Mr. NORRIS. That is a good suggestion. I will insert those words very gladly. After the words "United States," in line 7, insert the words "or individual for philanthropic or charitable or patriotic purposes."

A question is asked about the amendment. I would like to have the clerk read again the words that I inserted after "United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 7, after the words "United States," insert the words "or individual for philanthropic, charitable, or patriotic purposes, may import free of duty any carillon instrument," and so forth.

Mr. FLETCHER. The only suggestion I would make would be to add the word "educational."

Mr. NORRIS. That is in already.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can take his time and go through the dictionary and get them all.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no need to indulge in sarcastic remarks about this. This is a serious matter and an important matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. I can not see why any individual willing to invest \$100,000 in carillon bells for the public benefit should be required to pay the United States \$40,000 tariff duty.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am not going to yield further at this time, because I desire to go over the history of the matter. It would take some time and would require the reading of quite a number of documents which I have here; but before the debate is over, if any serious objection is offered to the amendment, I intend to take the floor again and go into the subject at some length.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NORRIS. Let me explain the amendment first. At the present time I desire briefly to state the real object of the amendment. I think I shall be able, with documentary evidence, to demonstrate every assertion that I make in regard to it, although I am not going to stop now to do it, and shall not do it at all unless my statements are questioned.

Carillon bells, where the number is more than 23, have never yet been manufactured in the United States, although for seven years we have had a tariff of 40 per cent upon such bells. It is an industry which, like some other industries, has developed by slow stages. One generation after another generation engages in it, until there are localities and peoples who are able

to make these bells. They are very difficult of construction. The large bells are several tons in weight, and they vary down to small-sized bells, covering several octaves in tone. There are very few of them in the United States; indeed, very few of them in the world.

When they are placed in a church tower or an individual tower in a community or village or city, they make very beautiful music, something that is in a world all by itself. Heretofore no one has been able to establish them here except very wealthy men doing it for charitable or religious purposes; but when they are once established, when they are installed, it is impossible to prevent the whole community from getting the entire benefit of the music from the bells. In other words, when they are played they are heard for miles. The poor and the rich alike get the benefit without any discrimination whatsoever.

In the first place, if my amendment is agreed to, as I understand and believe I could demonstrate, we do not interfere with any American industry. These are not chimes. They are a different thing entirely. I think we have had a duty of 40 per cent on them, and religious organizations and educational institutions have had to pay that 40 per cent duty because they had to import the bells from foreign countries or go without them. I believe there is but one instance where such bells have been manufactured in this country; that is, there is one instance, as I believe to be true, although I understand it will be disputed, where carillon bells of the number of 23 or more have been manufactured in this country. It is necessary that they all be in perfect harmony with each other; otherwise there is confusion and distortion and discord, and there is no music in them.

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

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. I want to finish my statement before I yield.

Here is an opportunity for us to permit any educational institution, any church, and now under the modified amendment any individual who wants to present such a set of carillon bells to any charitable, patriotic, or religious organization, to import them without duty. He would have to import them. They can not be purchased in America to-day. Although as I said, we have had a duty of 40 per cent, there is not a single instance now in the United States, as I understand and believe the fact to be, where there has been a set of carillon bells put in any church or university or other organization of more than 23 in number that has not been imported and necessarily imported.

So that, without doing any benefit to anybody, we put a tax upon religion, a tax upon education, a tax upon any endeavor on the part of a community to have the most beautiful music in the world played for the benefit of the entire community. For instance, in the past on quite a number of occasions after bells of this kind have been installed in different places we have remitted the tax. A number of bills have gone through Congress to remit such taxes.

A church in the capital city of my State desires to install such bells. That is not an instance where a rich man is going to buy the bells, but the money is going to be raised by subscription in the community, from the rich and the poor alike, for a set of carillon bells, 35 in number. The only place that church can buy a carillon is abroad; the church can not get it in America. I have abundance of testimony here from men who have been interested in the question for years, who live in different places where carillons have been installed, and who say, "We would like to buy them in America, but it has been an impossibility to do so; we had to go abroad; they are not made here." Under existing law the tariff on the church in Nebraska to which I have referred for those 35 bells would be \$7,500. That is the penalty the men and the women who contribute to the raising of the money to buy those bells will have to pay for giving to that city and the surrounding community a blessing in the way of the most beautiful music in the world.

It is the same way on a larger scale in the case of the University of Chicago. That institution has installed or is about to install a carillon costing \$200,000, on which, under the existing law, the tax would be \$80,000.

I understand that one of the arguments constantly made in favor of this tax has been that a carillon is something that only a rich man can afford; that only millionaires can buy one. To a great extent that has been true, although in the case to which I am referring no millionaire is involved. Let us assume, however, that only rich men can buy carillons; when they buy them, when they install them and they are used, the poor as well as the rich, whether members of the church or outsiders, in fact, everybody within hearing distance, receives the full benefit of every piece of music that is played upon them. It seems to me we should not even penalize our rich men if they

want, for charitable, religious, or educational purposes, to import a carillon of bells for the benefit of any community.

So to my mind, Mr. President, there is not any excuse whatever when we go above 23 bells of not putting them absolutely on the free list. For the present, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has made so many extraordinary misstatements that I do not know just where to begin. I tried to stop him at the beginning, when he said that he would of necessity speak at considerable length if the amendment were opposed, to tell him that I should oppose his amendment and hoped he would speak at length, so that we might know just what he was going to say. However, he declined to yield to me at that time.

He has said that no educational institution of this country could buy a carillon of domestic manufacture. I have here a copy of a letter from the president of Dartmouth College, which reads as follows:

Dartmouth College is very definitely indebted to the Meneely Bell Co., of Troy, N. Y.—

I may say that the Meneely Bell Co., of Troy, N. Y., has been making carillons for a great many years. As a matter of fact, there is one in the city of Lincoln, Nebr., in the church to which the Senator has referred, but the church is desirous of buying a carillon of some 35 bells from England. The minister of that church has written a letter, of which I have a copy, in which he states that the carillon furnished by the Meneely Co. is so unpleasant that the people do not like to hear it ringing, and, therefore, they have got to buy English bells. The Meneely Bell Co. informed me that the people who are responsible for that carillon have never asked for any adjustment or spare parts or attention for a period of over 20 years—I do not remember the exact number of years—that the carillon or chime of bells—and "carillon" is merely the French word for chime—is in bad condition; that all carillons need constant attention; that the adjustments are very delicate; and that if those in Lincoln who own one of these American-made carillons would only secure the necessary adjustments—perhaps they have done so in the meantime—the bells would sound better.

But to go on with the letter from the president of Dartmouth College. He says:

Dartmouth College is very definitely indebted to the Meneely Bell Co., of Troy, N. Y., for their interest, cooperation, and accomplishment in a carillon of bells—

According to the Senator from Nebraska, the president of Dartmouth College does not know what he is talking about, because he refers to the fact that Dartmouth College has bought a carillon of bells made in America; but the Senator from Nebraska states that there is no such thing ever made in America and no educational institution ever bought one except one that was made abroad.

Mr. NORRIS. How many bells are there in that carillon?

Mr. BINGHAM. The word "carillon" does not apply to the number of bells.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator does not want to answer the question. He has made a misstatement as to what I said.

Mr. BINGHAM. I think there are 23 bells in it; but—

Mr. NORRIS. I said that none were made here of over 23 bells. If the Senator will answer my question fairly, and tell me how many bells are there, he will show whether he is right or whether I am right; but he dare not do it. I challenge him to do it in the interest of honesty.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator's voice is louder and more continuous than mine; otherwise I should have been able to finish my sentence.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BINGHAM. I should like to finish reading the letter referred to, but I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I understand there is quite a material difference between chimes and carillons or carillons, as the Senator pronounces the word.

The carillon—

And that of itself has a definite meaning; it does not mean chimes at all; it does not mean bells merely—

The carillon must consist of at least 23 bells, each perfectly tuned within themselves and in tune with each other and their chromatic scale so as to produce two complete octaves, the larger carillons contain up to five complete octaves, so that there may be played on the carillon any music written for the piano or organ; whereas a chime has only certain notes, not a chromatic scale, and the music has to be transposed for the purpose of chime playing and the note intended by

the composer of the music is not always obtainable in the chime; whereas it is always obtainable in the carillon.

Carillons are quite distinct from chimes. I do not think the American manufacturers have been making carillons in that sense. They have been making bells, I grant you, and perhaps chimes, but not carillons. I do not believe they can make them, and I think they have said so.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am not an authority on the definition of the word "carillon"; I am merely quoting what the president of Dartmouth College is saying, and I assume that the president of Dartmouth College knows what he is talking about when he says that they bought from the Meneely Bell Co., of Troy, N. Y., a carillon, however it may be pronounced—and I am not an authority, as is the Senator from Nebraska; but, however it may be pronounced, the president of Dartmouth College says they have a carillon of bells which the Meneely Co. made for Dartmouth College and which is now installed in the library tower. He goes on to say:

It is one of the most valued of the recent additions to the Dartmouth College plant, and I should not expect a better quality of bell or a finer tone from any manufacturer, abroad or at home.

Mr. President, that statement of the president of Dartmouth College would seem to be sufficient to contradict most of what the Senator from Nebraska has said. If what the president of Dartmouth College says is true, if he knows what he is talking about, they do make in this country the bells which go to constitute carillons. The men who work on them are skilled laborers; they need protection, because it has been testified in the hearings that it costs a great deal more to make these bells in America than it does in England or on the Continent of Europe. If the principle of protection is sound—and I know perfectly well that the Senator from Nebraska does not agree with me in regard to most of the items of protection which have been voted on on this floor, but I believe in the principle of protection—in my opinion, if there are American workmen who can make these bells and who get more wages than do the workmen in England who make them, even though the bells may go into a church, at least the American workmen should be protected; even though the bells may go into an educational institution, American workmen should have an opportunity to make these bells, which they will not have if the motion of the Senator from Nebraska or the motion of the Senator from Florida shall prevail. As a matter of fact—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I will yield in just a moment. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, we put a tax on church organs, and yet the church organ is for the benefit of the rich as well as the poor; it is for the benefit of anyone who chooses to go in a church. Merely because it is purchased for a religious institution, we do not permit an organ to come in free of duty. So it is with other things on which we put a tax. As a matter of fact, the communities in which the church is located very properly free the church from taxation because it is for the benefit of all the people. So the bells that ring in the tower of the church in Lincoln, Nebr., or those proposed to be brought in from England to ring in that tower, will undoubtedly be of benefit to that town, and the city of Lincoln will undoubtedly impose no tax on the bells or on the church; but the laborers in Troy, N. Y., who would like to have an opportunity to make these bells, will not get any benefit from the sweet music which the imported bells may make in Lincoln, Nebr.; and, as a matter of fact, they are likely to lose their jobs if the proposal shall be adopted to permit carillons to come in free of duty. Now I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to inquire of the Senator how many concerns in this country are making these bells?

Mr. BINGHAM. So far as I know, there is only one concern that is at the present time engaged in making and is equipped to make large chimes or carillons, although there are bells made in other parts of the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that concern make bells exclusively for churches, or do they make other commodities?

Mr. BINGHAM. Perhaps the Senator from New York can answer that question, but the Meneely Bell Co., I should assume, makes many kinds of bells.

Mr. BARKLEY. Other than ordinary church bells?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, in my own time I want to say something on this subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. How many men are employed by this concern exclusively in the manufacture of carillons?

Mr. COPELAND. I can not answer the question at the moment.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, my information is, if the Senator from Connecticut will allow me, that there are 125 people so employed by the concern mentioned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are they employed exclusively in the making of these bells?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; but in the whole chime business.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have a great deal of correspondence on this subject. However, I should like to get a vote to-night, and, therefore, I am not going to take very much time.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. I wish the Senator would not try to have a vote to-night. I have material on this subject which I wish to present to the Senate. I had not realized that the matter would come up this afternoon. My State, as has already been said, is very much interested in the question, and I desire to have an opportunity to express the views of her citizens on it.

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps, then, I had better proceed and the Senator can speak to-morrow.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I felt rather inclined to propose some kind of an amendment here to take care of carillon bells for a special purpose. To that end I took up the matter with Doctor Rice and a few of the leading men interested in this subject matter who desired free bells.

I do not know who is telling the truth. Some say that there are no carillons made in the United States above 23 bells in number. The manufacturers say they not only make them but they name the places where the bells are. I have not examined into the matter personally. I am speaking only from the letters and information I have received, and I feel that I want to give them to the Senate so that they will know what the facts, or supposed facts, purport to be.

I have a letter from Meneely & Co., of Watervliet, N. Y., dated October 31, 1929, reading as follows:

Your letter of October 29 regarding carillons of bells is received, and we thank you for the opportunity of placing before you facts in connection with the subject.

On separate sheet we are listing the important carillons which have been imported into the United States from England, with notation of the heaviest bell in each set, as taken from the advance sheets of the new edition of Carillon Music and Singing Towers of the Old World and the New by William Gorham Rice, Albany, N. Y.

We have just installed a set of bells at the Greater University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.—Dr. Rush Rhees, president—with the largest bell weighing approximately 8,000 pounds. This bell is tuned by the 5-point harmonic system, just as all of the English bells are tuned. Let us refer to the list of carillons and see how many of the 20 carillons listed there have heavier bells than our large bell at Rochester:

	Pounds
Albany, N. Y.	11, 200
Indianapolis, Ind.	11, 200
New York, N. Y.	40, 926
Cohasset, Mass.	11, 760
Mountain Lake, Fla.	23, 520
Princeton, N. J.	12, 880

Six of the twenty carillons have larger bells—the other fourteen of equal or lighter weight bells.

We have cast in our foundry bells as heavy as 12,800 pounds, which means that we have had experience and can again cast bells of that weight. Referring again to the list, there would be but two imported carillons in the United States with heavier and larger bells than we have actually cast in our foundry, namely, Mountain Lake, Fla., 23,520 pounds, and New York, N. Y., 40,926 pounds. If we have and can cast 12,800-pound bells, there is no reason in the world why we can not cast 20,000-pound or 40,000-pound bells just as well as our English competitors. They never cast the heavy bells before they had orders for them, and their experience has all been during the past few years while making the Bok and Rockefeller carillons. The conclusion from the foregoing is that we have cast bells of equal weight and size of 18 of the 20 carillons listed.

A good example of the trend regarding the tariff and carillons is the note published in the New York papers that the "New carillon of 21 bells at St. Thomas Church, New York City," will be played for the first time November 1. The testimony before the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee was that a carillon should consist of not less than 37 bells; yet because an English bell founder made a 21-bell chime, it is called a carillon. We feel very certain that you will hear from St. Thomas Church representatives requesting lowering of the duty on carillons so their chime, called carillon, can be considered under lower rates of duty. The next thing

will be that all sets of attuned bells of any number from England will be called "carillons." Webster's definition of a "carillon" is "a chime of bells originally consisting of four bells."

We do not believe that either the Senate Finance Committee or the House Ways and Means Committee have any such definition of "carillon" in mind, yet the 21-bell chime of St. Thomas Church, New York, because it came from England, is called a carillon. If it had been made in the United States, it would be called a chime.

Last Christmas time we installed a set of 21 bells at the Unitarian Church, Winchester, Mass. If St. Thomas Church has a carillon, then the Unitarian Church also has a carillon.

We realize the influence which is being brought to bear on the Senators as a result of the efforts of gentlemen interested in the English carillon manufacturers; and we, as the representative American carillon manufacturers, can hardly ask our clients to protest against lowering of the duty, as the customers of the English bell foundries are asking for a lower rate or free listing.

The gentlemen appearing at the hearings in favor of a reduction in the tariff rate on carillons state that a carillon must consist of at least three chromatic octaves of bells, which would be 37 bells. It is claimed that American bell founders can not make the largest and smallest bells of "master carillons." It is granted that American bell founders can make the intermediate-sized carillon bells; therefore, on this basis, would it not be fair to both the American bell founders and also grant the appeals of the Senators for their constituents to give a definition of "carillon" as follows:

"Master carillons of more than 37 bells, and parts thereof, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Carillons and chimes of 37 or less bells would then come in under the present heading of musical instruments at 40 per cent ad valorem.

It is necessary for the bell founders of the United States to have protection or else the United States will be flooded with bells made by cheap foreign labor.

The lowering of the duty on carillons which is advocated in behalf of two English carillon manufacturers will reflect to the benefit of all foreign bell founders. German bells, Spanish bells, Italian bells, French bells, and Belgium bells will all get the benefit of lower rates of duty.

We grant that the two representative English bell founders make excellent bells of equal quality with our bells, but the other English bell founders and the bell founders of the Continent make correspondingly poor bells. The lowering of the duty on carillons as noted would permit all of the cheap grades of bells from Europe to be thrown on the market at prices which would be lower than our bare cost of production.

To summarize:

Meneely & Co. (Inc.), the Old Meneely Bell Foundry, has but recently made and tuned a bell as large as the heaviest bells of 14 of the 20 imported English carillons in the United States.

Meneely & Co. (Inc.) has in the past cast bells as heavy as the largest bells in 18 of the 20 imported English carillons. There are just two imported carillons in the United States of America with heavier bells than have been cast in our foundry.

Meneely & Co. (Inc.) protests against the use of the word "carillon" for sets of 21 bells when used to evade, now or in the future, the import duty on chimes.

Meneely & Co. (Inc.) submits a definition of master carillons which, in our opinion, would be fair to the American bell founders and also grant the appeals of the Senators for their constituents, which is as follows:

"Master carillons of more than 37 bells, and parts thereof, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Chimes and carillons of 37 or less bells would then come in under musical instruments at 40 per cent ad valorem, which is the present rate.

We sincerely trust that the new tariff bill will afford us proper protection on chimes and carillons of 37 or less bells, for we are producing carillons of a high degree of perfection in competition with the English bell founders, and it is only with an adequate duty that we can compete in price.

Very truly yours,

MENEELY & CO. (INC.),
THE OLD MENEELY BELL FOUNDRY,
A. C. MENEELY,
ALFRED CLUETT MENEELY, Vice President.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMOOT. As soon as I get through.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought the Senator was through. I wanted to ask the Senator a question about the letter.

Mr. SMOOT. Just a minute (reading):

Carillon list taken from the advance sheets of the new edition of Carillon Music and Singing Towers of the Old World and the New, by William Gorham Rice, Albany, N. Y.:

	Pounds
Albany, N. Y., heaviest bell.....	11,200
Andover, Mass., heaviest bell.....	2,347
Birmingham, Ala., heaviest bell.....	1,709

	Pounds
Detroit, Mich., heaviest bell.....	6,720
Chicago, Ill. (St. Chrysostom Church), heaviest bell.....	5,600
Cincinnati, Ohio, heaviest bell.....	4,480
Cohasset, Mass., heaviest bell.....	11,760
Detroit, Mich., heaviest bell.....	2,296
Gloucester, Mass., heaviest bell.....	2,826
Indianapolis, Ind., heaviest bell.....	11,200
Mercersburg, Pa., heaviest bell.....	7,168
Mountain Lake, Fla., heaviest bell.....	23,520
New York, N. Y., heaviest bell.....	40,926
Nashville, Tenn., heaviest bell.....	1,344
Norwood, Mass., heaviest bell.....	7,840
Germantown, Pa., heaviest bell.....	6,720
Plainfield, N. J., heaviest bell.....	2,296
Princeton, N. J., heaviest bell.....	12,880
Rochester, Minn., heaviest bell.....	7,840
Springfield, Mass., heaviest bell.....	7,918

Mr. NORRIS. Now will the Senator yield, Mr. President?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to ask the Senator first a question about the letter, and then a question about the list that he has just read.

In the letter from Meneely & Co. they state the size of carillons that they have been making. Will the Senator tell me or tell the Senate where in the United States—or, for that matter, anywhere in the world—any of these bells more than 23 in number have been sold by that corporation and installed?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not think there is any such evidence.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think there is, either.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If so, it is not more than one instance.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the reason why I asked the question. The corporation writing this letter to the Senator tell what great bells they can make and are making, but the Senator can not point to any case where they have sold them anywhere, or anybody has bought them.

If the Senator has not the evidence, I will put the question now, and he can answer it to-morrow.

Now, I desire to ask the Senator a question about the list he read.

Mr. SMOOT. They say:

We have cast in our foundry bells as heavy as 12,800 pounds.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes. I am asking about that.

Now, I want to ask the Senator about that list. I think, unless we understand it, we might get the idea—and I know the Senator does not want to convey this idea—that the big bells mentioned in that list, since he read it in connection with the letter, are bells made by Meneely & Co. The Senator from Utah does not claim that, does he?

Mr. SMOOT. No; and the Senator from Utah did not say so.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that he did not say so, but the Senator read the list right after the letter, and an ordinary reader of the Record might get the idea that that was an exhibit to the letter.

As a matter of fact, the bells that the Senator has been reading from the list were not made in the United States. They were imported bells, I think, in every instance. I may be mistaken about some of them, but I think in every instance they have been imported.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know. This is part of an article by Mr. William Graham Rice, of Albany, N. Y., found in the new edition of Carillon Music and Singing Towers of the Old World.

Mr. NORRIS. All I want to do, Mr. President—and the Senator does not object to that, of course, because he is going to be fair about it—

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; I do not object.

Mr. NORRIS. All I want to do is to make it clear that anybody who got the impression that this firm of Meneely & Co., who wrote the letter, were also the manufacturers of those bells, would get an erroneous impression, because they did not make them. That list is taken from Mr. Rice's book.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I said.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Rice is a leading world authority on carillon bells; and he is one of the authorities that I expect to quote from to show that the bells that are put on the free list by my amendment are not made and never have been made in the United States, although we have had a tariff of 40 per cent for seven years; and the instance given by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] who refused to answer my question as to how many bells were included in the set he was talking about—

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I can answer it now, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. NORRIS. How many?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am reading from the Century Dictionary. The Century Dictionary gives this definition of a carillon:

A set of stationary bells tuned so as to play regularly composed melodies, and sounded by the action of the hand upon a keyboard or by machinery. It differs from a chime or peal in that the bells are fixed instead of swinging, and are of greater number. The number of bells in a chime or peal never exceeds 12; a carillon often consists of 40 or 50.

The chime or carillon made for Grace Church in New York consists of 20 bells, which, according to the definition in the Century Dictionary—

Mr. NORRIS. And they were made abroad.

Mr. KEAN. No; they were not.

Mr. BINGHAM. They were made by the Meneely Bell Co. in Troy, N. Y.; and undoubtedly President Hopkins, of Dartmouth, is sufficiently familiar with the English language so that I can assert to the Senator that the number of bells in the carillon at Dartmouth College is greater than 12, or he would not use the word "chime."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator has not yet answered the question which he said he was going to answer. It seems to me that a great educator—a man who not only makes tariffs but who educates the people and the growing generations of our country into higher things—should not refuse to answer a fair question which I asked him about the particular carillon he was talking about—how many bells there are in it. He has not answered it yet, although he said a few minutes ago that he was going to answer it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. When the Senator does come to answer it I think he will find that the particular carillon about which he has been talking will not be put on the free list by my amendment, will not be affected by the proviso in my amendment, because it does not apply to anything having a lesser number of bells than 25.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senator said I refused to answer. The only reason why I refused to answer was that I did not know.

Mr. NORRIS. That was perfectly plain.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator implied that I refused to answer because of some ulterior motive.

Mr. NORRIS. I assumed that the Senator knew. I did not know there was anything he did not know, but of course I am wrong. I apologize for assuming that he knew something he did not know. He did not know what I thought he knew.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Keyes] informs me that he is of the opinion that there are 24 bells in the carillon of Dartmouth College, which is in his State.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I would like to say just here, in connection with the letter the Senator from Utah read, that I think he will agree with me that what the author of that letter is afraid of is that this country will be flooded with bells. The particular thing we are concerned with now is carillons, not bells. We are not dealing with the whole subject of bells, but what Mr. Meneely is concerned about is that he fears if we take this duty off this country will be flooded with bells from all parts of the world. That does not follow at all. He is unnecessarily alarmed about this matter. The item with which we are concerned now is carillons, and a carillon is not a bell at all. It is a different thing.

Mr. SMOOT. He has reference to carillon bells.

Mr. FLETCHER. I know he talks of them in his letter, but he is alarmed about bells in general.

Mr. SMOOT. He is not interested in just bells.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I want to quote from a letter from Mr. Edward Bok, dated October 22, 1928, in which he said:

It is foolish for Meneely to take the stand that he could have made the bells employed—

Speaking about the bells at Mountain Lake—

because we submitted the proposed carillon to him, and our architect has a letter from him saying that he could not make the big bells. He is capable of making a set of chimes, but not a carillon, and, of course, there is a vast difference.

That is the whole point.

I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a communication to me of December 12, 1928, from Mr. Howard Fleming, and a statement connected with it.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAINFIELD, N. J., December 12, 1928.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In accordance with my interview with you on December 3, I desire to take this opportunity of presenting to you, prior to the hearing which has been requested by a number of churches and other organizations on bills for the admission of carillons free of duty into this country which they have imported from abroad, some of the fundamental reasons for granting them this relief:

First. The art of making a carillon, which was lost for over 300 years, was rediscovered by certain English and Belgian bell makers about seven or eight years ago, but has not yet been discovered or acquired by American bell founders.

Second. The carillon bell is different from the chime bell in that the carillon bell is accurately tuned so that the strike tone, the hum tone, and the first five tones of the harmonic series within each bell are perfectly in tune. In other words, the bell is in tune with itself. The art of thus tuning bells is not known in this country.

Third. There is no bell industry in this country to protect, for the reasons, among others, set forth in item (2).

Fourth. There are only about 125 people employed in the manufacture of musical bells within the United States.

Fifth. Carillon is used in this country by churches, charitable, religious, and benevolent organizations.

Sixth. The carillon is for public and not private use, as it must be hung in an open tower, and not inside of a building.

Seventh. The institutions and organizations using carillons are exempt from all other State and Federal taxation, and to force them to pay a duty on carillons is to take money which would be used for other charitable and benevolent purposes.

Eighth. The carillon can not be used for private profit but only for public musical education and enjoyment.

Ninth. The carillon must consist of at least 23 bells, each perfectly tuned within themselves and in tune with each other and their chromatic scale so as to produce two complete octaves; the larger carillons contain up to five complete octaves, so that there may be played on the carillon any music written for the piano or organ; whereas a chime has only certain notes, not a chromatic scale, and the music has to be transposed for the purpose of chime playing and the note intended by the composer of the music is not always obtainable in the chime; whereas it is always obtainable in the carillon.

Tenth. There are two precedents already established:

One for the Church of Our Lady of Good Voyage, at Gloucester, Mass.; bill introduced in the House of Representatives and approved in 1922.

One for the Church of Our Lady of the Rosary, at Providence, R. I.; bill introduced in the Senate and approved in 1924.

My request, therefore, is in line with what Congress has done for these two institutions, and it seems to me there is no reason why the other churches and institutions now numbering some 27, and others which are also to be brought in, should not be granted the same relief.

I also desire to call your attention to the fact that not only these institutions sought to procure carillons in the United States and have been forced to go to England, but also the American engineers who gave the memorial carillon to the library in Louvain met the same experience that they could not procure it in this country and purchased it in England for delivery in Belgium.

I am inclosing herewith affidavit from the American engineers setting forth their reasons for seeking this carillon abroad.

The committee on war memorial to American engineers was composed of the following eminent and distinguished gentlemen:

Charles M. Schwab, mechanical engineer; George W. Fuller, civil engineer; L. R. Lohr, military engineer; Arthur S. Dwight, mining engineer; Arthur W. Berresford, electrical engineer; George Gibbs, United Engineering Society; Edward Dean Adams, Engineering Foundation, chairman of committee.

Yours faithfully,

HOWARD FLEMING.

UNITED ENGINEERING SOCIETY,
New York, November 13, 1928.

CARILLON AT LOUVAIN, BELGIUM, IN MEMORY OF ENGINEERS OF THE UNITED STATES WHO GAVE THEIR LIVES IN THE GREAT WAR, 1914-1918

I, Edward Dean Adams, of New York City, chairman of the committee on war memorial to American engineers, make the following declaration:

In June, 1927, I went to Louvain as the delegate of the American Societies of Civil, Mining and Metallurgical, Mechanical, and Electrical Engineers, Engineering Foundation, and Engineering Societies Library to the celebration of the five hundredth anniversary of the University of Louvain. While in Louvain I visited the new library and its tower, being erected with funds given by hundreds of thousands of Americans to replace the ancient building burned at the outbreak of the war. I learned that complete provision had been made for the building, but no funds were available for a clock and a carillon,

without which no Belgian tower is complete. Spaces for a clock and a carillon had, nevertheless, been made in the tower.

While considering this unfortunate lack of carillon and clock, I remembered that no memorial had been erected to the professional engineers of the United States who had died in the war. The thought occurred to me then that there could be no more suitable memorial than a carillon and a clock in the Louvain Library tower. After my return I submitted my idea to Engineering Foundation at its meeting, October 20, 1927, and it was unanimously accepted. In due course the committee on war memorial to American engineers was officially appointed and empowered to act for the organizations that had sent me to Louvain and also for United Engineering Society and the Society of American Military Engineers. The cooperation of 11 other national engineering societies was secured.

While yet in the land of carillons in the summer of 1927 I began inquiries about carillons and their makers and continued this inquiry in England. The information collected indicated that whereas the best carillons were formerly made in the Low Countries some English makers now excelled. I also learned the clear distinction between carillons and chimes. Among makers mentioned I heard high commendations of the Croydon Bell Foundry, of Gillett & Johnston. I ascertained that this firm had made some notable carillons for installation in America. Therefore I visited Croydon, inspected the bell foundry, became acquainted with leading members of the firm, and made inquiries about its facilities and production capacity. Having been told of the expectation to dedicate the Louvain Library in the late spring or early summer of 1928, and realizing that the time unavoidably to be consumed in organizing my project would leave an unusually short interval for the production and installation of a great carillon, I obtained from Gillett & Johnston several proposals for carillons and clocks and an option on their production facilities. Furthermore, I examined all the literature in the English language on carillons, of which I could learn with the assistance of one or two libraries.

All this information and the proposals were submitted to the committee on war memorial, of which I had been made chairman. Other members of the committee supplemented my inquiries. We visited carillons in New York and Princeton and got information about others on this continent. All of them had been made in Europe. We learned of no makers of carillons in the United States. Mr. Meneely, of Troy, N. Y., called at our office and also sent literature about the products of the Meneely Bell Co. This maker has produced numerous important chimes, but we learned of no carillons among its output. Desiring to have so conspicuous a memorial the best in every respect, our committee sought expert advice. We learned that Frederick C. Mayer, organist of West Point Military Academy, had made a special study of the design, tuning, and operation of carillons, and was practicing as a carillon architect. We engaged him as our adviser. He assured us that no carillons were made in the United States and that our provisional selection of Gillett & Johnston was wise. One fact that was influential in our decision was the high reputation of Mr. Cyril F. Johnston for remarkable personal skill in tuning bells.

Naturally, our committee would have preferred to have an American memorial made in the United States, and our second choice under the circumstances would have been Belgium; but all our investigations indicated that the carillon desired could be made only in England. Besides there was no time limit by any other firm than Gillett & Johnston. Therefore we placed our order with them and the work was satisfactorily and punctually done.

EDWARD DEAN ADAMS,

Chairman Committee on War Memorial to American Engineers.

Edward Dean Adams, being duly sworn, doth depose and say that he is chairman of the committee on war memorial to American engineers, and that the foregoing is a true statement concerning the selection of a firm to produce and install the carillon and the clock therein described.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

County of New York, ss:

On the 15th day of November, 1928, before me personally came Edward Dean Adams, known to me to be the person who executed the foregoing statement, and he thereupon duly acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

T. F. HILBERT, Notary Public.

Notary Public, Bronx County, No. 73; Bronx County register No. 2969.

Certificates filed in New York County, No. 287; New York County register No. 9262. Commission expires March 30, 1929.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair) laid before the Senate sundry executive messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

SESSION LAWS OF ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which

LXXII—146

was read and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912, I transmit herewith an authenticated copy of the 1929 Session Laws of the Territory of Alaska.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 24, 1930.

NOTE.—Copy of the laws accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS, FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM (H. DOC. NO. 271)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Acting Secretary of State showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1928, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, as required by section 18 (a) of an act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes, approved May 24, 1924.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 24, 1930.

CLAIM OF HENRY BORDAY, A FRENCH CITIZEN, AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report concerning the claim of Mr. Henry Borday, a French citizen, against the United States for indemnity on account of injuries received when he was assaulted at his place of business at Port au Prince, Haiti, by two United States marines about October 3, 1916, with a request that the recommendations of the Secretary of State as indicated therein be adopted and that the Congress authorize the appropriation of the sum necessary to pay the indemnities suggested by the Secretary of State.

I recommend that in order to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State the Congress, as an act of grace and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises authorize an appropriation in the sum of \$1,000, with simple interest at 6 per cent from October 3, 1916, until the date of payment.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 24, 1930.

EMPLOYMENT OF SKILLED LABORERS

Mr. MOSES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 204), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to employ two skilled laborers, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,680 each per annum, until June 30, 1930.

FEDERAL AID IN ROAD BUILDING

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the able junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] has recently written a very impressive and studious article on the imperative necessity for more Federal aid in road building, published in the current number of the Manufacturers' Record. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

IMPERATIVE NECESSITY FOR MORE FEDERAL AID IN ROAD BUILDING

By Hon. TASKER L. ODDIE, United States Senator from Nevada

Every year sees an encouraging increase in the total mileage of our improved highways. The progress of new construction, reconstruction, and betterment is proceeding at a reasonable rate, but the utilization—that is, the increased use of the highways by the motor vehicles already in service and by each year's new registrations—is proceeding at an even more rapid rate. In other words, we are not keeping pace in the improvement of our roads with the rapidly growing demand and are not supplying as full facilities in improved roadways over which to operate our more than 26,000,000 vehicles as fast as they are needed or as fast as it would be good business for this Nation to provide.

In 1928, 50,465 miles of road were improved with surfaces by Federal, State, and local agents. In 1921, 41,171 miles were so improved. These figures include all types of surfacing. A considerable amount of the surfacing placed was for the betterment of old roads which had previously been improved to some degree, so that the net increase in surfaced mileage in 1928 was 37,416 miles as compared with 38,657 miles in 1927.

It will be necessary to continue on an increasing scale to strengthen and reconstruct the previously placed surfaces of the lighter and cheaper types of roads. This means that at the present rate of expenditures the number of miles of new construction which may be added each year to extend the mileage of year-round serviceable highways will decrease rather than increase.

STEADY INCREASE IN STATE EXPENDITURES FOR ROAD WORK

In 1921 expenditures by the States were more than \$397,000,000. The States increased their expenditures year by year until for this year it is estimated the amount will be about \$860,000,000. For 1921, expenditures by local organizations such as the county, township, and other subdivisions of the State, were over \$636,000,000. This has increased until expenditures for 1929 will be about the same as the State expenditures.

The support of the Federal Government is not, however, following the same advancing scale. In 1921 it paid to the States \$88,000,000, and in 1925 this was increased to \$92,000,000. In 1929, however, the actual payment by the Federal Government will drop to around \$79,000,000, or \$9,000,000 under 1921 figures.

The increase in the registration of motor vehicles, however, has shown a much larger percentage of growth than either State or local road expenditures. In 1921, there were registered 10,463,295 cars, including all types, and in 1929—eight years later—the total is about 26,500,000, or an increase of more than 250 per cent. This last figure should be kept in mind in discussing all matters of funds for road building and all matters of legislation relating to road construction.

VEHICLE USAGE INCREASES

But the increase in number of vehicles does not alone measure the growth of the problem, since there is a tendency for each vehicle to operate over a larger mileage—that is, the use of the motor vehicle by the public is increasing. This is partially due to the extension of serviceable highways and partially to the adjustment of our social and economic life to this mode of transportation. This adjustment is in some degree indicated by some of the conclusions reached in a recent bulletin relative to the Relationship between Roads and Agriculture in New York, issued by Cornell University, which presents some of the economic and social changes taking place in the farming districts.

Equally important changes are taking place in the urban districts involving the more extensive use of highway transportation. There are broad changes involving distributions of manufacturing enterprises which take these out of the congested metropolitan areas to smaller communities. The development of faster, safer motor vehicles contributes materially to their longer average distance use. These observations are included only to indicate a few of the changes that are taking place revolving around the ability of the Nation to supply and maintain serviceable year-round roads.

This development has been accomplished through the Federal-aid policy which was inaugurated in 1916 but which did not get under way on a large scale until 1920. The Federal-aid system consists of 190,000 miles of the principal traveled roads in the States. Of this whole system, there are 90,000 miles which have been or are now in the process of receiving at least the initial improvement. Of the more important items of this improvement, there have been bridges built over major streams which if placed end to end would cover a distance of 267 miles. During the fiscal year ended July 1, 1929, 7,402 miles of road received initial improvement, and 1,988 miles were improved with an advanced stage of construction. This means that roads which had previously been graded and drained were surfaced with some type of material.

GREAT MILEAGE OF LOW-TYPE ROADS BIG PROBLEM

In addition to the work done with Federal-aid and State funds on this system, a considerable amount of work has been done with State funds alone, so that it is now estimated that about 85 per cent of the whole Federal-aid system has received improvement in some degree. But much of this work is of the low type, which, to carry the ever-increasing traffic, must be raised to higher types—that is, from sand-clay to the better types.

There has been a constant transfer of mileage from the local systems to the State systems. When the Federal-aid legislation was first passed the total mileage of roads included, with the State systems, about 200,000 miles or less. Much of this mileage was included in the Federal-aid system as first established, but the States have continued to add to their State systems each year, so that now there has been more than a 50 per cent growth, or a total of 306,000 miles has been placed

under the jurisdiction of the State highway departments. This mileage includes the Federal-aid system.

Of the more than 300,000 miles of State roads included in the State highway systems at the end of 1928, 193,000 miles have been surfaced, of which 68,000 miles are of bituminous macadam or higher types. During the year 1928, 20,000 miles were surfaced, including 13,000 miles of new construction and about 7,000 miles of reconstruction.

Roads under the jurisdiction of local authorities, totaling over 2,700,000 miles, and distinct from the State and Federal roads, have been surfaced to the extent of 433,000 miles at the end of 1928. Of these, about 34,000 miles were bituminous macadam or the better types of surfacing. The improvement of these local roads is proceeding at the rate of about 30,000 miles per annum, but this mileage does not average as high type as the improvements on the State road systems.

It will be evident from the above that the principal roads of the Nation are far from improved. On the State systems nearly 37 per cent is unsurfaced, 41 per cent is of low-type surfacing, and only 22 per cent consists of bituminous macadam or the high types of roadways. Even important routes on the State systems still lack much work to complete them. It may be said that 66 per cent of the Federal-aid system and 78 per cent of the State systems are still in need of the type of improvement necessary to carry heavy traffic with that degree of economy which it is necessary to secure, unless the maintenance of this tremendous mileage of roads is to become a serious burden in the future.

MUST REBUILD BIG MILEAGE HARD-SURFACED ROADS TO PRESENT STANDARDS

There are many complaints as to congested highways and criticism is frequently made that roads built in previous years are not sufficiently wide or strong to meet present needs. This condition could hardly be otherwise than true when the 250 per cent increase in the number of vehicles operating upon the highways since 1921 is considered. However, congestion is due also to many other causes.

The transport survey in Ohio showed that the hourly peak of traffic was 216 per cent of the average hour, and in Pennsylvania showed the peak to be 202 per cent of the average hour. On Sundays in Ohio the traffic is 156 per cent of the average week day; in Vermont, 152 per cent; in New Hampshire, 167 per cent; and in Pennsylvania, about 170 per cent. There is a wide variation between the months of the year. In Ohio the peak-month traffic was reached in August, where it was 148 per cent of the average month. All of these may be termed normal peaks and there are more infrequent occasions where the traffic runs far above the average or normal peak.

Important highways near large cities are carrying an increasing traffic which has already reached figures of high proportions. In Cuyahoga County, Ohio, at considerable distances from the center of the city of Cleveland, are roads carrying from 10,000 to 20,000 vehicles per day; 5,000 to 10,000 vehicles per day are frequent.

We do not seem to reach any end to the growth in the use of the highways, but there is a most important favorable condition in that the revenue from the motor vehicle in the way of motor-vehicle licenses and gas taxes has shown a big increase. In 1921 the total net revenues, that is deducting cost of collection from gas taxes and motor-vehicle registrations, were about \$118,000,000. For last year it is estimated that the total revenues from these sources will reach \$765,000,000. This large increase in the revenue derived from automobile traffic is not only a justification for the investment which has been made in our highway system, but also provides a most important incentive for substantially increasing that investment at this time.

URGES SPEED IN ENACTING BILLS PROVIDING \$50,000,000 ADDITIONAL FEDERAL AID ANNUALLY

Every indication points to the desirability of increased Federal participation, not only from the standpoint of the decrease in Federal payments which has been taking place, as shown elsewhere in this article, but because of the necessity for the Nation to set a forward-looking example in dealing with this tremendous problem, and to help maintain a prosperous condition in the Nation by speeding up construction activities.

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that the companion bills introduced by Representative CASSIUS C. DOWELL, of Iowa, and Senator LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS, of Colorado, providing for \$50,000,000 per year in addition to the existing \$75,000,000 per year for Federal-aid road work, be speedily enacted. This proposed legislation has met with the approval of the leading road associations, officials, and authorities in the United States.

When the first Federal aid act was approved in 1916, Federal funds could only be used to the extent of a limitation of \$10,000 per mile, or not to exceed 50 per cent of the cost. In later measures this was increased to \$20,000, then decreased to \$16,250, and finally still further decreased to \$15,000 per mile, which is the present limitation. In the earlier years this limitation did not work so much to the disadvantage of improvement in the States, but with the tremendous increase in the use of the highways it has become necessary not only to build generally wider and heavier roads but, in the case of important through roads, to widen what may be termed the usual 2-way road to 4-way, which

means a roadway about 40 feet in width, allowing 10 feet for each vehicle lane. Also, there are many instances where in crossing swamps and in building through rugged or mountainous country the grading cost alone has taken almost the whole of the allowable Federal funds per mile.

NEED FOR INCREASE IN FEDERAL-AID ALLOWANCE PER MILE

We have come now to the time when the most serious problem encountered in some of the States is the widening of the roads or surfacing those which have been previously prepared at a relatively high cost. While the Federal highway act contemplates that the Federal Government on Federal projects shall pay up to 50 per cent of the cost, on about 18,000 miles of high-type pavement in the New England and Middle Atlantic States the average participation has been only 33 per cent. In the State of New Jersey, on 453 miles the average participation per mile has been about 29 per cent. In justice to the States which are facing the widening of their roads, or where the physical conditions require a heavy expenditure, provision ought to be made for an increase in Federal aid per mile.

There is yet another problem which is of great concern to the Western States. In the forest areas, which cover large sections of nearly all of the 11 so-called public-land States, there are about 12,000 miles of roads on the public-road system lying within or adjacent to these forest areas. There has been some improvement by the States, counties, and Federal Government on about 5,300 miles, or around 46 per cent of this total.

Nearly 33 per cent of this entire mileage lies upon our necessary links in the Federal-aid system, about 37 per cent are important links in the State road systems, and the remaining 30 per cent are county or community roads. In these States the Federal-aid system totals about 33,000 miles and nearly 76 per cent has been improved to some degree, while on the 3,800 miles lying upon the Federal-aid system in the forest areas, about 73 per cent has been improved, indicating the necessity for larger Federal funds to take up the lag in the improvement of this system. To provide adequate highways on these important links demands increased Federal appropriations.

NEED FOR INCREASED EXPENDITURES FOR ROADS IN FOREST RESERVES

Representative DON B. COLTON, of Utah, and I have introduced companion bills providing for increased appropriations for the Federal-aid roads within the forest reserves. We have also introduced companion bills which provide for Government financing for construction and maintenance of such portions of the Federal aid road system as lie within the boundaries of the Government-owned "unappropriated public domain" and Indian reservations in the public-land States in the West, which lands contribute no tax income to these States. In order that the development of the Federal-aid system of roads throughout the whole country may uniformly progress, it is essential that these bills be enacted without delay.

The successful and efficient manner in which the Federal aid road program has been conducted by the State highway departments and the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, under the able leadership of its chief, Thomas H. MacDonald, is the best assurance that an enlarged program of national road construction will be successfully carried on.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal for January 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, and 23 be approved. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I would like to be recognized, so that I may proceed in the morning to debate the pending amendment relating to carillons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized, so that he may proceed in the morning.

RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, January 25, 1930, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 6), 1930

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

To be colonels

Lieut. Col. Clarence Curtis Culver, Air Corps, from January 18, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Frederick Goodwin Turner, Cavalry, from January 21, 1930.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Joseph Choate King, Cavalry, from January 17, 1930.
Maj. Martyn Hall Shute, Infantry, from January 18, 1930.
Maj. Ralph McTyeire Pennell, Field Artillery, from January 21, 1930.

To be majors

Capt. James Madison Garrett, jr., Field Artillery, from January 17, 1930.
Capt. Alan Pendleton, Infantry, from January 18, 1930.
Capt. Julian Weeks Cunningham, Cavalry, from January 21, 1930.
Capt. Sam George Fuller, Cavalry, from January 21, 1930.

To be captains

First Lieut. Leighton Nicol Smith, Cavalry, from January 10, 1930.
First Lieut. Charles Wilbur Pence, Infantry, from January 10, 1930.
First Lieut. Jerome Grigg Harris, Infantry, from January 12, 1930.
First Lieut. Henry Eaton Kelly, Infantry, from January 12, 1930.
First Lieut. Claude Bayles Mickelwait, Infantry, from January 13, 1930.
First Lieut. William Barmore Sharp, Infantry, from January 13, 1930.
First Lieut. Arthur Charles Perrin, Ordnance Department, from January 14, 1930.
First Lieut. Marcus Ellis Jones, Cavalry, from January 14, 1930.
First Lieut. Harold Patrick Hennessy, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 17, 1930.
First Lieut. Walter Asbury Bigby, Infantry, from January 17, 1930.
First Lieut. Fred E. Gaillard, Infantry, from January 18, 1930.
First Lieut. Robert Robinson, Signal Corps, from January 19, 1930.
First Lieut. Herman Odelle Lane, Infantry, from January 21, 1930.
First Lieut. Wilford Reagan Mobley, Cavalry, from January 21, 1930.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Richard Tonkin Mitchell, Infantry, from December 11, 1929.
Second Lieut. George Edward Lightcap, Infantry, from December 13, 1929.
Second Lieut. John Archer Stewart, Infantry, from December 13, 1929.
Second Lieut. Samuel Henry Fisher, Field Artillery, from December 13, 1929.
Second Lieut. Dennis Milton Moore, Infantry, from December 15, 1929.
Second Lieut. Houston Val Evans, Infantry, from December 16, 1929.
Second Lieut. Clark Norace Bailey, Infantry, from December 17, 1929.
Second Lieut. Victor Emmanuel Phasey, Infantry, from December 17, 1929.
Second Lieut. Clyde Davis Eddleman, Infantry, from December 18, 1929.
Second Lieut. Russell Leonard Moses, Infantry, from December 18, 1929.
Second Lieut. John O'Day Murtaugh, Cavalry, from December 20, 1929.
Second Lieut. Sarratt Thaddeus Hames, Infantry, from December 21, 1929.
Second Lieut. Virgil Rasmuss Miller, Infantry, from December 22, 1929.
Second Lieut. James Somers Stowell, Air Corps, from December 26, 1929.
Second Lieut. Arthur LeRoy Bump, jr., Air Corps, from December 27, 1929.
Second Lieut. Reeve Douglas Keiler, Infantry, from December 31, 1929.
Second Lieut. George Emmert Elliott, Infantry, from December 31, 1929.
Second Lieut. William Wallace Cornog, jr., Infantry, from December 31, 1929.
Second Lieut. Demas Thurlow Craw, Air Corps, from January 3, 1930.
Second Lieut. Henry Isaac Kiel, Infantry, from January 4, 1930.

Second Lieut. Daniel Harrison Hundley, Infantry, from January 7, 1930.

Second Lieut. William Walrath Lloyd, Infantry, from January 10, 1930.

Second Lieut. Jacob Robert Moon, Infantry, from January 10, 1930.

Second Lieut. Thomas Harrison Allen, Infantry, from January 10, 1930.

Second Lieut. Raymond Rodney Robins, Infantry, from January 12, 1930.

Second Lieut. Peter Sather, jr., Field Artillery, from January 12, 1930.

Second Lieut. Richard Garner Thomas, jr., Infantry, from January 13, 1930.

Second Lieut. Frank Faron Carpenter, jr., Field Artillery, from January 13, 1930.

Second Lieut. Ralph Parker Eaton, Infantry, from January 14, 1930.

Second Lieut. Henry Dahnke, Infantry, from January 14, 1930.

Second Lieut. Robert Carlyle Andrews, Infantry, from January 17, 1930.

Second Lieut. Herbert Frank McGuire Matthews, Infantry, from January 17, 1930.

Second Lieut. Buford Alexander Lynch, jr., Infantry, from January 17, 1930.

Second Lieut. Noah Mathew Brinson, Infantry, from January 18, 1930.

Second Lieut. Albert John Dombrowsky, Infantry, from January 19, 1930.

Second Lieut. Jean Dorbant Scott, Infantry, from January 21, 1930.

Second Lieut. Robert Walter Stika, Infantry, from January 21, 1930.

Second Lieut. Ovid Oscar Wilson, Infantry, from January 22, 1930.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Capt. Forrest Ralph Ostrander, Medical Corps, from January 21, 1930.

Capt. Aubin Tilden King, Medical Corps, from January 22, 1930.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

First Lieut. Harry B. Liversedge to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 17th day of January, 1930.

Second Lieut. Luther A. Brown to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of July, 1928.

The following-named noncommissioned officers of the Marine Corps to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, probationary for two years, from the 25th day of January, 1930:

Corpl. John Wehle.

Corpl. Lewis R. Tyler.

Corpl. William P. Battell.

Corpl. Edson L. Lyman.

Sergt. James P. Berkeley.

Sergt. Peter A. McDonald.

Sergt. Archibald D. Abel.

Corpl. William W. Childs.

Corpl. Charles E. Shepard, jr.

Corpl. Michael McG. Mahoney.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Zebedee Vick to be postmaster at Corona, Ala., in place of Zebedee Vick. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

ARIZONA

Joseph P. Downey to be postmaster at Miami, Ariz., in place of J. P. Downey. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

Harry B. Riggs to be postmaster at Patagonia, Ariz., in place of H. B. Riggs. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

CALIFORNIA

Ethel R. Costello to be postmaster at Acampo, Calif., in place of E. R. Costello. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Edward L. Dithridge to be postmaster at Baldwin Park, Calif., in place of E. L. Dithridge. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Isaac D. Jaynes to be postmaster at Buena Park, Calif., in place of I. D. Jaynes. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Violet VerLinden to be postmaster at Colma, Calif., in place of Violet VerLinden. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Edyth P. Dunkle to be postmaster at Firebaugh, Calif., in place of R. F. Hildreth, resigned.

William R. Stephens to be postmaster at Roseville, Calif., in place of W. R. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Jennie C. Gallant to be postmaster at San Martin, Calif., in place of J. C. Gallant. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Henry W. Nash to be postmaster at Stirling City, Calif., in place of H. W. Nash. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Webster W. Bernhardt to be postmaster at Ventura, Calif., in place of W. W. Bernhardt. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Hugh W. Judd to be postmaster at Watsonville, Calif., in place of H. W. Judd. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

COLORADO

Frank L. Barton to be postmaster at Haxtun, Colo., in place of F. L. Barton. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Christopher C. Eastin to be postmaster at Kremmling, Colo., in place of C. C. Eastin. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Sylvester E. Hobart to be postmaster at Nunn, Colo., in place of S. E. Hobart. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

Loran G. Denison to be postmaster at Telluride, Colo., in place of L. G. Denison. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Cora E. Taggart to be postmaster at Wheat Ridge, Colo., in place of C. E. Taggart. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

CONNECTICUT

William E. Gates to be postmaster at Glastonbury, Conn., in place of W. E. Gates. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

John E. Casey to be postmaster at Kent, Conn., in place of J. E. Casey. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

John H. Delaney to be postmaster at Middlebury, Conn., in place of J. H. Delaney. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

Durward E. Granniss to be postmaster at New Preston, Conn., in place of D. E. Granniss. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Charles A. Jerome to be postmaster at Plainfield, Conn., in place of C. A. Jerome. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Edward Perkins to be postmaster at Suffield, Conn., in place of Edward Perkins. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Frank M. Smith to be postmaster at Willimantic, Conn., in place of F. M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

Robert O. Judson to be postmaster at Woodbury, Conn., in place of R. O. Judson. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

FLORIDA

Anna W. Lewis to be postmaster at Everglades, Fla., in place of A. W. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

GEORGIA

Robert L. Lovvorn to be postmaster at Bowdon, Ga., in place of R. L. Lovvorn. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1930.

IDAHO

Chester O. Cornwall to be postmaster at Rupert, Idaho, in place of C. O. Cornwall. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

ILLINOIS

Arthur H. Cross to be postmaster at Atwood, Ill., in place of A. H. Cross. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

Roy J. Arseneau to be postmaster at Bourbonnais, Ill., in place of R. J. Arseneau. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

William O. Baker to be postmaster at Christopher, Ill., in place of W. A. Rush, resigned.

Oscar L. Anderson to be postmaster at Cobden, Ill., in place of O. L. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

Howard L. Scott to be postmaster at Fox Lake, Ill., in place of H. L. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

Paul W. Gibson to be postmaster at Louisville, Ill., in place of P. W. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Albert L. Weible to be postmaster at New Athens, Ill., in place of A. L. Weible. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

Carlyle Pemberton to be postmaster at Oakland, Ill., in place of Carlyle Pemberton. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

Elmer C. Nethery to be postmaster at Palestine, Ill., in place of E. C. Nethery. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

Albert R. Cooper to be postmaster at Pesotum, Ill., in place of A. R. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

John B. Dillon to be postmaster at Sadorus, Ill., in place of J. B. Dillon. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

Rudolph Mueller to be postmaster at Sherrard, Ill., in place of Rudolph Mueller. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

Norredon Cowen to be postmaster at Sorento, Ill., in place of Norredon Cowen. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

Norman A. Jay to be postmaster at Steeleville, Ill., in place of N. A. Jay. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

LeRoy Howell to be postmaster at Zeigler, Ill., in place of LeRoy Howell. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

INDIANA

Charles W. Culbertson to be postmaster at Brazil, Ind., in place of C. W. Culbertson. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Woodson E. Greenlee to be postmaster at Coatesville, Ind., in place of W. E. Greenlee. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Elmer L. McKnight to be postmaster at Fowler, Ind., in place of E. L. McKnight. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Carl C. Davis to be postmaster at Ramsey, Ind., in place of C. C. Davis. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

IOWA

Orien J. Perdue to be postmaster at Altoona, Iowa, in place of O. J. Perdue. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

James H. Post to be postmaster at Carroll, Iowa, in place of J. H. Post. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Ralph H. Holloway to be postmaster at Churdan, Iowa, in place of R. H. Holloway. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Alfred Wright to be postmaster at Denison, Iowa, in place of Alfred Wright. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Edwin J. Frisk to be postmaster at Des Moines, Iowa, in place of E. J. Frisk. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

George L. Evans to be postmaster at Elma, Iowa, in place of G. L. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Carrie H. Randall to be postmaster at Epworth, Iowa, in place of C. H. Randall. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Fred A. Robinson to be postmaster at Estherville, Iowa, in place of F. A. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Olger H. Raleigh to be postmaster at Graettinger, Iowa, in place of O. H. Raleigh. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Emmet M. Henery to be postmaster at Grand Junction, Iowa, in place of E. M. Henery. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Francis D. Winter to be postmaster at Hinton, Iowa, in place of F. D. Winter. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Martin J. Severson to be postmaster at Jewell, Iowa, in place of M. J. Severson. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Walter J. Overmyer to be postmaster at Lacona, Iowa, in place of W. J. Overmyer. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Carl G. Austin to be postmaster at Lineville, Iowa, in place of C. G. Austin. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Emily L. Gibson to be postmaster at Reinbeck, Iowa, in place of E. L. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Paul H. Harlan to be postmaster at Richland, Iowa, in place of P. H. Harlan. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Arthur E. Norton to be postmaster at Rowley, Iowa, in place of A. E. Norton. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Leona B. Christensen to be postmaster at Swea City, Iowa, in place of L. B. Christensen. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Clarence W. Rowe to be postmaster at Vinton, Iowa, in place of C. W. Rowe. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Roy H. Bedford to be postmaster at What Cheer, Iowa, in place of R. H. Bedford. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

KANSAS

Otto E. Becker to be postmaster at Bazine, Kans., in place of O. E. Becker. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Clarence R. Haymond to be postmaster at Burdett, Kans., in place of C. R. Haymond. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

John R. Shoup to be postmaster at Cimarron, Kans., in place of J. R. Shoup. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Floyd I. Shoaf to be postmaster at Clay Center, Kans., in place of F. I. Shoaf. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Asabel A. Castle to be postmaster at Clayton, Kans., in place of A. A. Castle. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Mary C. Carroll to be postmaster at Conway Springs, Kans., in place of M. C. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

John W. Baker to be postmaster at De Soto, Kans., in place of J. W. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Ruth Satterthwaite to be postmaster at Douglass, Kans., in place of Ruth Satterthwaite. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Bertram W. Wernette to be postmaster at Dresden, Kans., in place of B. W. Wernette. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Shamus O'Brien to be postmaster at Florence, Kans., in place of Shamus O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Fred G. Kienzle to be postmaster at Great Bend, Kans., in place of Porter Young, resigned.

Earl W. Davis to be postmaster at Grinnell, Kans., in place of E. W. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

William T. Flowers to be postmaster at Havensville, Kans., in place of W. T. Flowers. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Anna E. Waterman to be postmaster at Healy, Kans., in place of A. E. Waterman. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

Ovid Butler to be postmaster at Hoisington, Kans., in place of Ovid Butler. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Carl A. Reynolds to be postmaster at Humboldt, Kans., in place of C. A. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Leo L. George to be postmaster at Irving, Kans., in place of L. L. George. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

D. Dee Davis to be postmaster at Larned, Kans., in place of D. D. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Ralph W. Martin to be postmaster at Moran, Kans., in place of R. W. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Dee F. Hahn to be postmaster at Phillipsburg, Kans., in place of D. F. Hahn. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

George W. Connelly to be postmaster at Plainville, Kans., in place of G. W. Connelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Ruth N. Nickerson to be postmaster at Rexford, Kans., in place of R. N. Nickerson. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

John A. Coffman to be postmaster at Sedgwick, Kans., in place of J. A. Coffman. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

James M. Kendall to be postmaster at Summerfield, Kans., in place of J. M. Kendall. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

J. Raymond E. Simmons to be postmaster at Wellsville, Kans., in place of J. R. E. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

KENTUCKY

Belle Gray to be postmaster at Corbin, Ky., in place of Belle Gray. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Benjamin F. Wright to be postmaster at Seco, Ky., in place of B. F. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

LOUISIANA

William Z. Lewis to be postmaster at Aleo, La., in place of W. Z. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Ruth W. McCleish to be postmaster at Athens, La., in place of R. W. McCleish. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Joseph D. Hebert to be postmaster at Cottonport, La., in place of J. D. Hebert. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1930.

Marguerite L. Tatum to be postmaster at Gibsland, La., in place of M. L. Tatum. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Edwin R. Ford to be postmaster at Jonesville, La., in place of E. R. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Auburtin H. Barre to be postmaster at Mooringsport, La., in place of A. H. Barre. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Mary S. Hunter to be postmaster at Pineville, La., in place of M. S. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Lawrence J. Bonin to be postmaster at St. Martinville, La., in place of L. J. Bonin. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Samuel M. Plonsky to be postmaster at Washington, La., in place of S. M. Plonsky. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

MAINE

Fred W. Preble to be postmaster at Bingham, Me., in place of G. L. Baker, resigned.

Fremont A. Hunton to be postmaster at Readfield, Me., in place of F. A. Hunton. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Leo M. Cyr to be postmaster at Rockwood, Me., in place of L. M. Cyr. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Lemuel Rich to be postmaster at Sebago Lake, Me., in place of Lemuel Rich. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Joseph M. Gerrish to be postmaster at Winter Harbor, Me., in place of J. M. Gerrish. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

MASSACHUSETTS

Benjamin S. Whittier to be postmaster at East Walpole, Mass., in place of B. S. Whittier. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

Horace D. Prentiss to be postmaster at Holyoke, Mass., in place of H. D. Prentiss. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

Forrest D. Bradshaw to be postmaster at South Sudbury, Mass., in place of F. D. Bradshaw. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Roger W. Cahoon, jr., to be postmaster at West Harwich, Mass., in place of R. W. Cahoon, jr. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

MICHIGAN

Sylva Blain to be postmaster at Alba, Mich., in place of Sylva Blain. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Fred W. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Bellevue, Mich., in place of F. W. Fitzgerald. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Ernest Muscott to be postmaster at Breckenridge, Mich., in place of Ernest Muscott. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Charles G. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Breedsville, Mich., in place of C. G. Chamberlain. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Perry F. Powers to be postmaster at Cadillac, Mich., in place of P. F. Powers. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Martin C. Kilmark to be postmaster at Coloma, Mich., in place of M. C. Kilmark. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Karl A. Boettger to be postmaster at Dexter, Mich., in place of K. A. Boettger. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Curtis G. Reynolds to be postmaster at Dundee, Mich., in place of C. G. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

David E. Hills to be postmaster at Fife Lake, Mich., in place of D. E. Hills. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Helen L. Brown to be postmaster at Inkster, Mich., in place of H. L. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Robert H. Benjamin to be postmaster at Mackinac Island, Mich., in place of R. H. Benjamin. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

John A. Meier to be postmaster at Manistee, Mich., in place of J. A. Meier. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

George N. Jones to be postmaster at Marine City, Mich., in place of G. N. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Harry N. Colby to be postmaster at New Lothrop, Mich., in place of H. N. Colby. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Leslie A. Quale to be postmaster at Onkama, Mich., in place of L. A. Quale. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Ray G. Turner to be postmaster at Onsted, Mich., in place of R. G. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Victoria Jesionowski to be postmaster at Posen, Mich., in place of Victoria Jesionowski. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Alfred Buetow to be postmaster at Reese, Mich., in place of Alfred Buetow. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Charles W. Munson to be postmaster at Republic, Mich., in place of C. W. Munson. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

May Rowley to be postmaster at St. Charles, Mich., in place of May Rowley. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Augustus D. Thorp to be postmaster at Sand Lake, Mich., in place of A. D. Thorp. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

J. Harry Wright to be postmaster at Sherwood, Mich., in place of J. H. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Victor L. Hardees to be postmaster at Trout Creek, Mich., in place of V. L. Hardees. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

MINNESOTA

Bernard McGrath to be postmaster at Barnesville, Minn., in place of Bernard McGrath. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Concetta Dal Vago Taraborelli to be postmaster at Buhl, Minn., in place of Paul Sartori, resigned.

Lambert J. Dols to be postmaster at Cologne, Minn., in place of L. J. Dols. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Chris N. Nesselth to be postmaster at Deer River, Minn., in place of C. N. Nesselth. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

James C. Wilson to be postmaster at Grygla, Minn., in place of J. C. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Stanley A. Torgerson to be postmaster at Hawley, Minn., in place of S. A. Torgerson. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Axel P. Lofgren to be postmaster at Karlstad, Minn., in place of A. P. Lofgren. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

George W. Fried to be postmaster at Luverne, Minn., in place of G. W. Fried. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Olof M. Groven to be postmaster at Mentor, Minn., in place of O. M. Groven. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Wilbert F. Ott to be postmaster at Nashwauk, Minn., in place of W. F. Ott. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Lavinie E. Holmberg to be postmaster at North Branch, Minn., in place of M. P. Zeien. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1928.

William R. Gates to be postmaster at North St. Paul, Minn., in place of W. R. Gates. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

John A. Fridgen to be postmaster at Parkers Prairie, Minn., in place of J. A. Fridgen. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Anna E. McDonald to be postmaster at Shevlin, Minn., in place of L. M. Hannem, removed.

John Jensen to be postmaster at Winger, Minn., in place of John Jensen. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

MISSOURI

Paul Schork to be postmaster at Monticello, Mo., in place of C. E. Collnot, resigned.

MONTANA

Elias O. Sorvick to be postmaster at Antelope, Mont., in place of E. O. Sorvick. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

James F. Blenkner to be postmaster at Broadus, Mont., in place of J. F. Blenkner. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Carroll E. Griffin to be postmaster at Glendive, Mont., in place of C. E. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

John R. Stewart to be postmaster at Ingomar, Mont., in place of J. R. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Charles A. Worthing to be postmaster at Lambert, Mont., in place of C. A. Worthing. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

George W. Fenton to be postmaster at Laurel, Mont., in place of G. W. Fenton. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Ralph E. Rorabeck to be postmaster at Lavina, Mont., in place of R. E. Rorabeck. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Alfred S. Opheim to be postmaster at Opheim, Mont., in place of A. S. Opheim. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

John A. Bywaters to be postmaster at Sandcoulee, Mont., in place of Jennie Sullivan, resigned.

Elbert L. Stackhouse to be postmaster at Thompson Falls, Mont., in place of E. L. Stackhouse. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

NEBRASKA

Leslie J. Hummell to be postmaster at Burwell, Nebr., in place of L. J. Hummell. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Loa Hubbard to be postmaster at Chambers, Nebr., in place of Loa Hubbard. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Fred A. Scofield to be postmaster at Columbus, Nebr., in place of F. A. Scofield. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

William J. Stilgebouer to be postmaster at Danbury, Nebr., in place of W. J. Stilgebouer. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Orley D. Clements to be postmaster at Elmwood, Nebr., in place of O. D. Clements. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

William S. Brown to be postmaster at Fairmont, Nebr., in place of W. S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Frank G. Frame to be postmaster at Fullerton, Nebr., in place of F. G. Frame. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Luther A. Howard to be postmaster at Hyannis, Nebr., in place of L. A. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1930.

Alonzo A. Jackman to be postmaster at Louisville, Nebr., in place of A. A. Jackman. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

Edward H. Hering to be postmaster at Orchard, Nebr., in place of E. H. Hering. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

Walter S. Tyler to be postmaster at Palisade, Nebr., in place of W. S. Tyler. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Nellie L. Miller to be postmaster at Rulo, Nebr., in place of N. L. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

August Dormann to be postmaster at Scottsbluff, Nebr., in place of August Dormann. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

Joseph B. Hines to be postmaster at Wahoo, Nebr., in place of J. B. Hines. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Carl A. Holmquist to be postmaster at Wausa, Nebr., in place of William Berridge, deceased.

NEVADA

Jeanann M. Fay to be postmaster at East Ely, Nev., in place of J. M. Fay. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

George F. Smith to be postmaster at Reno, Nev., in place of G. F. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

NEW JERSEY

Helen Mylod to be postmaster at Glen Ridge, N. J., in place of Helen Mylod. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

Alvin C. Stover to be postmaster at Pennington, N. J., in place of A. C. Stover. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

NEW YORK

George A. Phillips to be postmaster at Bemus Point, N. Y., in place of G. A. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Louis P. Miller to be postmaster at Cairo, N. Y., in place of L. P. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Arthur K. Lansing to be postmaster at Cambridge, N. Y., in place of A. K. Lansing. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

William Tracey to be postmaster at Canandaigua, N. Y., in place of E. P. Gardner, deceased.

John H. Roberts to be postmaster at Canastota, N. Y., in place of J. H. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

William M. Stuart to be postmaster at Canisteo, N. Y., in place of W. M. Stuart. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

William B. Donahue to be postmaster at Catskill, N. Y., in place of W. B. Donahue. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Fred McIntosh to be postmaster at Churchville, N. Y., in place of Fred McIntosh. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Francis L. Worden to be postmaster at Coxsackie, N. Y., in place of F. L. Worden. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Louis H. Buck to be postmaster at Dannemora, N. Y., in place of L. H. Buck. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Eva C. Sager to be postmaster at Frewsburg, N. Y., in place of E. C. Sager. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

John Newton to be postmaster at Holcomb, N. Y., in place of John Newton. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

William C. Calkins to be postmaster at Houghton, N. Y., in place of W. C. Calkins. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Solomon Feinberg to be postmaster at Lake Placid, N. Y., in place of Solomon Feinberg. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Marian L. Woodford to be postmaster at Marcellus, N. Y., in place of M. L. Woodford. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Robert H. Johnston, jr., to be postmaster at Merrick, N. Y., in place of R. H. Johnston, jr. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

George M. Atwell to be postmaster at Mountain Dale, N. Y., in place of G. M. Atwell. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Edgar M. Schanbacher to be postmaster at Newfane, N. Y., in place of E. M. Schanbacher. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Lillian M. James to be postmaster at North Creek, N. Y., in place of J. C. Davison, deceased.

Frank G. Sherman to be postmaster at Oneonta, N. Y., in place of F. G. Sherman. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Harry T. Weeks to be postmaster at Patchogue, N. Y., in place of H. T. Weeks. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Lionel J. Desjardins to be postmaster at Piercefield, N. Y., in place of L. J. Desjardins. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Frank P. Daley to be postmaster at Port Henry, N. Y., in place of F. P. Daley. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Ethel Kelly to be postmaster at Pyrites, N. Y., in place of Ethel Kelly. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

William D. Streeter to be postmaster at Richland, N. Y., in place of W. D. Streeter. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Fergus E. Fitzsimmons to be postmaster at St. Bonaventure, N. Y., in place of Alexander Hickey, deceased.

William Storey to be postmaster at Sonyea, N. Y., in place of William Storey. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Stanley D. Francis to be postmaster at Tannersville, N. Y., in place of S. D. Francis. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Fred D. Seaman to be postmaster at Unadilla, N. Y., in place of F. D. Seaman. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

William B. Stewart to be postmaster at Walden, N. Y., in place of W. B. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Warren A. Bush to be postmaster at Wilson, N. Y., in place of W. A. Bush. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Edward W. Elmore to be postmaster at Yorkville, N. Y., in place of E. W. Elmore. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clyde H. Jarrett to be postmaster at Andrews, N. C., in place of C. H. Jarrett. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Bettie Martin to be postmaster at Biscoe, N. C., in place of Bettie Martin. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Amelia B. Stepp to be postmaster at Black Mountain, N. C., in place of A. B. Stepp. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Marvin E. Johnson to be postmaster at Candor, N. C., in place of M. E. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

James Lee Sloan to be postmaster at Davidson, N. C., in place of J. L. Sloan. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Iredell V. Lee to be postmaster at Four Oaks, N. C., in place of I. V. Lee. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Reuben H. Staton to be postmaster at Hendersonville, N. C., in place of R. H. Staton. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Pierce P. Richards to be postmaster at Lawndale, N. C., in place of P. P. Richards. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Ira E. Tucker to be postmaster at Polkton, N. C., in place of I. E. Tucker. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Charles R. Hester to be postmaster at St. Pauls, N. C., in place of C. R. Hester. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Blaney W. Hill to be postmaster at Snow Hill, N. C., in place of B. W. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Friedlen B. Jones to be postmaster at West Jefferson, N. C., in place of F. B. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Otto S. Woody to be postmaster at Whitakers, N. C., in place of O. S. Woody. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ada E. Olson to be postmaster at Fingal, N. Dak., in place of A. E. Olson. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Noyes H. Whitcomb to be postmaster at Flasher, N. Dak., in place of N. H. Whitcomb. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

Meeda McMullen to be postmaster at Forest River, N. Dak., in place of Meeda McMullen. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Arthur B. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Hope, N. Dak., in place of A. B. McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Ruth L. Gibbons to be postmaster at Lawton, N. Dak., in place of R. L. Gibbons. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Leif O. Fjeld to be postmaster at Mayville, N. Dak., in place of L. O. Fjeld. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Ettephina C. Winkler to be postmaster at Montpelier, N. Dak., in place of E. C. Winkler. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1930.

Florence F. Davenport to be postmaster at Napoleon, N. Dak., in place of M. C. Houser, resigned.

William E. Burhans to be postmaster at Sentinel Butte, N. Dak., in place of W. E. Burhans. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Milton T. Hefty to be postmaster at Walcott, N. Dak., in place of M. T. Hefty. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Thaddeus C. Michael to be postmaster at Willow City, N. Dak., in place of T. C. Michael. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

OHIO

Benson M. Harrison to be postmaster at Alexandria, Ohio, in place of B. M. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

William H. Campbell to be postmaster at Galena, Ohio, in place of W. H. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

Richard Hagel to be postmaster at Gypsum, Ohio, in place of Richard Hagel. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

Jacob E. Davis to be postmaster at Kingsville, Ohio, in place of J. E. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

Gailord A. Case to be postmaster at Loudonville, Ohio, in place of G. A. Case. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Lloyd R. Wallace to be postmaster at Mount Victory, Ohio, in place of L. R. Wallace. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Charles S. Kline to be postmaster at Port Washington, Ohio, in place of C. S. Kline. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

Ralph E. Saner to be postmaster at Powhatan Point, Ohio, in place of R. E. Saner. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

John P. Locke to be postmaster at Tiffin, Ohio, in place of J. P. Locke. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

OKLAHOMA

Walter Waller to be postmaster at Carter, Okla., in place of Walter Waller. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Rosa B. Britton to be postmaster at Cyril, Okla., in place of R. B. Britton. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Jesse W. Pinkston to be postmaster at Drumright, Okla., in place of J. W. Pinkston. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Edwin C. Willison to be postmaster at Elk City, Okla., in place of E. C. Willison. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Rose Crowder to be postmaster at Krebs, Okla., in place of Rose Crowder. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

David King to be postmaster at Luther, Okla., in place of David King. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

John W. Vandervort to be postmaster at Madill, Okla., in place of W. S. Florence, resigned.

Frank J. Kohr to be postmaster at Poteau, Okla., in place of F. J. Kohr. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

William M. Bennett to be postmaster at Sentinel, Okla., in place of W. M. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Alta G. Stockton to be postmaster at Sparks, Okla., in place of A. G. Stockton. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

OREGON

Stephen A. Easterday to be postmaster at Clatskanie, Oreg., in place of S. A. Easterday. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Ronald E. Esson to be postmaster at Sandy, Oreg., in place of R. E. Esson. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Frank B. Hamlin to be postmaster at Springfield, Oreg., in place of F. B. Hamlin. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

PENNSYLVANIA

Craig M. Fleming to be postmaster at Chambersburg, Pa., in place of C. M. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

Glenn W. Irvin to be postmaster at Conneaut Lake Park, Pa., in place of G. W. Irvin. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Marion Rosbach to be postmaster at Forksville, Pa., in place of Marion Rosbach. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Paul A. Hepner to be postmaster at Herndon, Pa., in place of P. A. Hepner. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

James J. Donnelly to be postmaster at Johnsonburg, Pa., in place of J. J. Donnelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1930.

Ralph E. Kelder to be postmaster at Matamoras, Pa., in place of R. E. Kelder. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

Franklin T. Dindinger to be postmaster at Monaca, Pa., in place of F. T. Dindinger. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Jean C. Lewis to be postmaster at Weedville, Pa., in place of J. C. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1930.

Alden M. Schnell to be postmaster at Youngsville, Pa., in place of A. M. Schnell. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

RHODE ISLAND

Luke J. Ward to be postmaster at Wickford, R. I., in place of L. J. Ward. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rosa B. Grainger to be postmaster at Lake View, S. C., in place of R. B. Grainger. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

David E. Sauls to be postmaster at Smoaks, S. C., in place of D. E. Sauls. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Paul E. Bryson to be postmaster at Woodruff, S. C., in place of P. E. Bryson. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William A. Dalziel to be postmaster at Davis, S. Dak., in place of W. A. Dalziel. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

Tillie M. Cowman to be postmaster at Gayville, S. Dak., in place of T. M. Cowman. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

Myrtle M. Giles to be postmaster at Lane, S. Dak., in place of M. M. Giles. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

TENNESSEE

Blanche Godsey to be postmaster at Bluff City, Tenn., in place of Blanche Godsey. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Augustus F. Shults to be postmaster at Caryville, Tenn., in place of A. F. Shults. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Granville W. Harp to be postmaster at Jellico, Tenn., in place of G. W. Harp. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

TEXAS

Hugh T. Chastain to be postmaster at Alvarado, Tex., in place of H. T. Chastain. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1930.

Henry J. Whitworth to be postmaster at Avinger, Tex., in place of H. J. Whitworth. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Elmer Carlton to be postmaster at Carlton, Tex., in place of Elmer Carlton. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Charles F. Wilson to be postmaster at Celina, Tex., in place of C. F. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1930.

Fred W. Nelson to be postmaster at Clifton, Tex., in place of F. W. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

George B. Black to be postmaster at Comanche, Tex., in place of M. J. Sullivan, deceased.

William C. Young to be postmaster at Garrison, Tex., in place of W. C. Young. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Alonzo Phillips to be postmaster at Loraine, Tex., in place of Alonzo Phillips. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

Fay F. Spragins to be postmaster at Martindale, Tex., in place of F. F. Spragins. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Mae Sheen to be postmaster at Mertzon, Tex., in place of Mae Sheen. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Lucy Breen to be postmaster at Mineola, Tex., in place of Lucy Breen. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Mary L. Young to be postmaster at Newcastle, Tex., in place of M. L. Young. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Cora E. Antram to be postmaster to Nocona, Tex., in place of C. E. Antram. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1930.

Maude A. Price to be postmaster at Petrolia, Tex., in place of M. A. Price. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Lillie Brown to be postmaster at Ralls, Tex., in place of Lillie Brown. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

Bessie B. Hackett to be postmaster at Raymondville, Tex., in place of B. B. Hackett. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

James A. Carter to be postmaster at Richland Springs, Tex., in place of J. A. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

William T. Phillips to be postmaster at Stamford, Tex., in place of W. T. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1930.

John B. White to be postmaster at Waller, Tex., in place of J. B. White. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1930.

Wade Arnold to be postmaster at Wellington, Tex., in place of Wade Arnold. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

UTAH

Ewell C. Bowen to be postmaster at Hiawatha, Utah., in place of E. C. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1930.

Henry C. Ward to be postmaster at Myton, Utah, in place of H. C. Ward. Incumbent's commission expires January 25, 1930.

Joseph F. MacKnight to be postmaster at Price, Utah, in place of J. F. MacKnight. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

VIRGINIA

William T. Hopkins to be postmaster at Newport News, Va., in place of W. T. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

William C. McCormick to be postmaster at Raphine, Va., in place of W. C. McCormick. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

John P. Middleton to be postmaster at The Plains, Va., in place of J. P. Middleton. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

James R. Tompkins to be postmaster at Tom's Creek, Va., in place of J. R. Tompkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Alonzo L. Jones to be postmaster at Virgillna, Va., in place of A. L. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

WASHINGTON

Rollie K. Waggoner to be postmaster at Bickleton, Wash., in place of R. K. Waggoner. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Roy E. Carey to be postmaster at Hartline, Wash., in place of R. E. Carey. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

James E. Clark to be postmaster at Ryderwood, Wash., in place of J. E. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

WEST VIRGINIA

Joe W. Bailey to be postmaster at Kenova, W. Va., in place of Jerome Akers, removed.

Sherman R. Jones to be postmaster at Lundale, W. Va., in place of S. R. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Fernando D. Williams to be postmaster at Matoaka, W. Va., in place of F. D. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1930.

Thomas L. Wolfe to be postmaster at Ravenswood, W. Va., in place of J. H. Latham, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Margaret L. Staley to be postmaster at Birnamwood, Wis., in place of M. L. Staley. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

John H. Sterling to be postmaster at Ferryville, Wis., in place of J. H. Sterling. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

George Oakes to be postmaster at New Richmond, Wis., in place of George Oakes. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Frank S. Brazeau to be postmaster at Port Edwards, Wis., in place of F. S. Brazeau. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

Stanley R. Morse to be postmaster at River Falls, Wis., in place of S. R. Morse. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Walter J. Nelson to be postmaster at Waupaca, Wis., in place of W. J. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Albert L. Fontaine to be postmaster at Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., in place of A. L. Fontaine. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1930.

WYOMING

Elmer T. Beltz to be postmaster at Laramie, Wyo., in place of E. T. Beltz. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, January 24, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite One, Thy presence is the sanctuary of love. With all our manifold weaknesses and with the consciousness of many transgressions, we bring ourselves before Thee. We praise Thee that it is Thy nature to nourish imperfection, to forgive iniquity, and to bear us on to the perfect day. Dear Lord, in these days of much suffering and hardship, open the hearts of our people to be bountiful; to spend and to be spent for the sake of the poor and distressed. O that the holy name of the Master may no longer divide but bring together. Do Thou lead the Christian nations of the globe to set the example of nobility, generosity, justice, purity, and truth. O blessed Lord God, inspire them not in a mere crusade but in a wonderful ministry to manhood and in a new brotherhood born of a fine appreciation of all peoples the world over. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2005. An act to authorize the city of Oakland, Calif., to use the Coast Guard cutter *Bear* as a nautical training ship.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN D. CLARKE, OF NEW YORK

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by my colleague, Hon. JOHN D. CLARKE, before the New York State Agricultural Society at Albany, on the 22d instant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The speech is as follows:

AGRICULTURE FROM A NATIONAL STANDPOINT

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Roosevelt, friends, and followers of agriculture, I assure you it was a privilege and a pleasure to accept the cordial invitation of Commissioner Pyrke to come to Albany and present the picture of our national objective for agriculture, as it has developed, in my mind, through the eight years I have sought to play my part in a sympathetic, yet sound way, in the cause of the hard-working, long-suffering farmer, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

Viewed nationally there is just one yardstick to apply to the objective of agriculture, namely, "economic equality." This is fundamental in the law of our land, our Constitution, as it is in the very soul and spirit of all our American institutions. Like every other basic industry, agriculture is entitled, under our theory of government, to economic equality; no more should it demand; no less does it deserve.

Viewed nationally the problem of promoting economic equality involves:

1. Individually, 6,000,000 American farm homes, with 30,000,000 of our people, directly and vitally concerned in receiving a fair return for their labor and on their investment. For on that fair return rest American standards of living, that include not alone creature comforts within the home itself, but rural schools so adequately maintained that every farmer's child may have his or her chance in America's mental training ground; rural churches so financially supported that real moral

centers are not only available to our American youth, but are kept high in their efficiency, to assist in setting up in young lives ideals that shall reflect later on in trained minds, healthy bodies, and moral standards as part and parcel of their American citizenship.

2. Financially agriculture can be represented as a \$60,000,000,000 enterprise, entitled, everything else being equal, to a fair return upon its investment, though this does not mean that every farmer, competent or incompetent, is to be guaranteed an income on his or her investment, for I hold that 15 per cent of our farmers are incompetent, and that that 15 per cent assist in creating exaggerated surpluses which raise hallelujah with prices as well as demoralize our markets.

3. Our heritage in land was approximately 2,000,000,000 acres, of which around 25 per cent, or 500,000,000 acres, may now be included, in the term "improved farm lands," with 350,000,000 acres devoted to crop production alone.

The story of agriculture begins even before that of our political evolution into a nation. As early as 1749 Benjamin Franklin, philosopher, patriot, statesman, recommended that a study of agriculture be made a part of the course in the academy in Philadelphia, the little school that was ultimately to become the great University of Pennsylvania. It is equally interesting to know that the American Philosophy Association, founded in 1744 by Franklin, had as an offshoot in 1785 the Philadelphia Association for Promoting Agriculture, clearly indicating Ben Franklin's intense interest in our cause.

In our own State of New York Doctor Mitchell was a far-seeing pioneer in the cause as president of Columbia University, or Kings College, as it was originally called. As early as 1792 this college offered a course in agriculture, or as it was called in the original prospectus, a course in "husbandry and commerce."

In Washington itself, the Nation's Capital, their first agricultural fair was held in 1804, and it was so successful that the city promised to contribute \$50 toward premiums for the fair to be held the following year.

Despite this early dawning on the consciousness of the far-seeing organizers and builders of this United States of America of the importance of agriculture, no great, forward-looking steps of progress came forth until 1862. In the meantime, however, there were being tried in the crucible of fire and experience schools and colleges sustained privately. These were found unable to meet the demands of national agriculture.

Consequently, along about 1856 agitation began for contributions of land and funds for the endowing of this fundamental work.

When the immortal Lincoln became a candidate for President he was put under the cross-fire of questioning, and that heroic soul was asked whether he would support the college land grant bill. He replied, "If elected I will sign your bill for State universities." To me, historically speaking, 1862 is the beginning of the multitude of steps found necessary, because of changing economic conditions, to promote economic equality, nationally, for agriculture.

In 1862 the National Department of Agriculture was established. In 1862 President Lincoln, true as always to his political promises, signed the Morrill Act, which was the beginning of a movement that was literally to touch elbow with every farm household within the United States.

Viewed nationally, we need no picture painted now of the struggles, ups and downs of the cause from the early days until 1862, but we need again to remind ourselves of the successive steps taken by the Federal Government in developing the picture of the responsibility of that Government in national leadership.

To the original thirteen States twenty more States were added up to 1862. All along the line the national picture is developing, whether it be financially, industrially, or in the field of agriculture, and more and more it becomes apparent that national leadership in the cause is fundamental and essential. Under the Morrill Acts 1 and 2 there begins to take form the institution we now term the land-grant college. Each of the separate States, under the terms of those acts, became entitled to its 30,000 acres of land, or land script equivalent thereto for each Senator and Representative in Congress. If the land were sold, the proceeds were to be used as a permanent fund by the land-grant colleges. Subsequent acts enlarged the scope of the Morrill Act so that the States received in land or land script the equivalent of 10,600,000 acres. Most of this land was sold, and there has been received from the sale nearly \$21,000,000. This has been increased by other land grants by 9,300,000, and the present property appraisal of the land-grant colleges attended by whites alone is \$427,000,000.

There have evolved 69 land-grant colleges, all now carrying on their vitally important work for agriculture. The Federal Government makes its contributions under the Morrill Acts, the Capper-Ketcham Act, and other legislation necessary properly to meet the material demands.

This is supplemented by State aid; that makes the work of the land-grant colleges, experiment stations, and other institutions invaluable, since it furnishes direct contact with almost every farm in this broad land of ours. No one can fail, who studies the problem, to realize these vitally important factors and their true worth in the rural communities better than those who appealed to those same communities for help, or who have observed the magnificent work